

2021 LDC Zone Map Restart
 Ledger of Issues and Discussion
 Draft Date: 13Oct2022

Date	Topic	Discussion/Comments	Action/Direction to Staff
18-May-22	How to translate MH to 2021 zones?	R2 or R3 for MH replacement? Need to modify text to make it work. R5 doesn't work everywhere contextually. R4 or R5 could work in more locations with some text modifications.	Propose text amendments and zone map scenario(s)
18-May-22	M1 goes to EMP	General consensus that this works - maybe some tweaks?	Propose text amendments if necessary
18-May-22	OI Zone -the minimum district size is too large and limits its applicability	The INS district is a relatively equal replacement for the OI, though that was not the INS's original intent. The district minimum would need to be removed to be a better fit, as well as modifications to the general description. There are about 335 parcels, totaling around 1,519 acres, zoned OI under the 2005 code.	Staff to research and recommend minimum size
18-May-22	Rural - which zones in the 2021 LDC are the closest translation	AG and RH are the closest. Needs more discussion. Public opinion is that any zone change that limits their ability to keep domesticated farm animals is considered a down zoning.	Further investigate and report back
18-May-22	Rural Residential - which zones in the 2021 LDC are the closest translation	Most RR zones are in the northern center of the County. Some text changes needed to get R1 to more closely match. R1 does not allow the animal uses that RR does. RT is not as similar? Public opinion is that any zone change that limits their ability to keep domesticated farm animals is considered a down zoning. There are only a few properties currently zoned RR.	Further investigate and report back
18-May-22	The nuances of allowing 2- 3- or 4-dwelling unit structures in the R2 and R3 zones was too complicated for residents to understand.	Further discussion is necessary	Further investigate and report back

18-May-22	Worksheet - Which 2021 LDC zone district translations and text do not revising, and which need revisions	Zones without highlighting were identified by 0 commissioners as needing revisions, those in light red were identified by 1-2 commissioners, those in medium red were identified by 3-4, and those in dark red by 5 or more. No zones were highlighted dark red.	Create map translation scenarios and hold discussions on the items identified as needing revisions. Ongoing process.
18-May-22	Zone Map Revisions	General discussion on how the "translated" zone designations were interpreted and applied to the "base" translation map	Direction to produce additional map variations based on the meeting discussion
6-Jun-22	CM Newton motion related to "lived character" and to "re-evaluate/rezone if not developed within 7 years"	Motion related to "lived character" and to "re-evaluate/rezone if not developed within 7 years". Amending a zoning approval without due process is unlawful. Both of these concerns are comprehensive plan/land use element issues. Best response is a policy or rule to review the appropriateness of "large" development rezone approvals every 5 years when Comprehensive Plan is reviewed.	Discussion started - no direction to staff yet
6-Jun-22	How to translate MH to 2021 zones?	R2 or R3 for MH replacement? Need to modify text to make it work. R5 doesn't work everywhere contextually. R5 could work better with some text modifications.	Tentatively determined that HM, RT, R5 for MH Parks; HM, RT, R1, R2 for individual units; motion from PC at future meeting?
6-Jun-22	It is not clear why the 2021 code combines the 2 Park and recreation zones into a single open space zone	The PR district is not currently mapped/used, nor has it ever been. It was created at the request of RCRC. The TROS was then created around 2007 to address an issue with a golf course potentially being redeveloped into housing. The new OS zone fulfills all of these needs.	No action necessary; OS designation sufficient

6-Jun-22	Rural - which zones in the 2021 LDC are the closest translation	Agricultural uses, including livestock as a use, are principal uses under the 2005 LDC. These are also principal uses in the 2021 LDC for the RT, HM, and AG districts. Four general accessory uses are listed in the 2005 LDC, while the 2021 LDC has many more because it is more specific. "Domesticated Farm Animals" could be added as an accessory use. Also, staff has observed that the general public does not understand the concept of "Accessory Use" and so further clarification/education may be needed.	Criteria were proposed for evaluating whether RU should translate to AG, HM, or RT. AG is > 35 acres; HM is 3 - 35 acres; RT is 1.5 - 3 acres. Use Assessor and BL data to help determine. Create a map version.
6-Jun-22	The HM district may not be necessary - it was recommended early in the 2021 LDC drafting process to fill the gap between AG and RT		Discussion occurred; decided to not eliminate HM zone at this time.
6-Jun-22	The nuances of allowing 2- 3- or 4- dwelling unit structures in the R2 and R3 zones was too complicated for residents to understand.	Options include: 1. remove multi-dwelling uses from R2 and R3, 2. make the regulations for multi-dwelling uses more restrictive, 3. Increase minimum lot size for multi-dwelling uses in R2 and R3	Successful motions to remove duplex, 3-plex, and 4-plex uses from R2, R3, R4 zone designations; and to remove townhouse use from R4 zone.
6-Jun-22	Zone Map Revisions	Map versions 0.1 and 0.2 discussed. Static vs interactive maps discussed	Continue with static maps for various iterations; include street names on maps. Once final draft version identified, change to interactive map for additional public review and input.
27-Jun-22	"Homestead" and "Agriculture" are also tax classifications. Suggest creating a new name for the Homestead (HM) and Agriculture (AG) zone designation to reduce confusion.	Homestead alternative names could be "Agrestic", "Farmstead", "Exurban", or "Homesteading". "Agricultural" district could be "Agrarian", "Working Lands", "Agricultural Production", and "Commercial Agriculture".	Not discussed yet

27-Jun-22	CM Newton motion related to "lived character" and to "re-evaluate/rezone if not developed within 7 years"	Staff recommends ordinance or comprehensive plan amendment requiring a review of the appropriateness of "large" development rezone approvals every 5 years when Comprehensive Plan is reviewed.	Discussion started - no direction to staff yet
27-Jun-22	Rural Residential - which zones in the 2021 LDC are the closest translation	R1 is a faithful translation of the RR district. The land uses allowed under R1 are the same as RR, and farm animals are accessory uses in both districts. Translating RR to RT would be an upzoning and downzoning for properties currently zoned RR as it would give greater use permissions but would cut density in half.	Discussion started - no direction to staff yet
27-Jun-22	Update and revise definitions of "multi-family" uses and structures	Definitions for "multi-family" related terms should be revised to "multi-unit", "multi-dwelling", "single-family attached" and other more accurate terms. Handout to be created.	Not discussed yet
27-Jun-22	Zone Map Revisions	Discuss new map iterations based on previous direction from Planning Commission	
8-Sep-22	Zone Map Revisions	Review translation table based zoning map	Continue to refine the zoning designations for properties that are currently zoned industrial but that were developed residential or commercial. Post the map version reviewed by the PC on 08sep22 online.
8-Sep-22	"As to Manufactured Homes: I move to recommend removal of manufactured homes from R2 zoning district."	There was substantive discussion regarding "the gap" between the large lot zoning designations (AG, HM, RT, R1) the high density R-5 zoning designation that allows manufactured home parks. At issue is if it is appropriate to require a large lot to have a manufactured home.	Motion passed
8-Sep-22	"As to Farm supply and machine sales and service: I move to recommend addition of Farm Supply and machine sales Permitted by right in HM zoning district."	There was brief discussion of minimal substance	Motion passed

8-Sep-22	"As to Farm distribution hub: I move to recommend the addition of Farm distribution hub permitted by right in the RT zoning district."	There was substantive discussion regarding the definition of "Farm Distribution Hub" and the scope of potential activities. At issue is if the smaller lot sizes of the RT zone designation and their proximity to non-rural residential properties are appropriate for the smells and sounds associated with this activity/land use.	Motion passed
8-Sep-22	"As to Veterinary Services (livestock): I move to recommend the addition of Veterinary services (livestock) permitted by right in the RT zoning district."	There was substantive discussion regarding the scope of "Veterinary Services (Livestock)" and the impact on adjacent property owners. It was noted that livestock related veterinary services typically do not involve the boarding of animals.	Motion passed on split vote 6-2
8-Sep-22	"As to Animal Shelter: I move to recommend the addition of animal shelters permitted by right, subject to special requirements in the AG, HM, RT zoning districts."	There was substantive discussion regarding the scope and definition of "Animal Shelter". At issue is the scope of an animal shelter, and the fact that it involves the extended boarding and care of animals.	Motion to defer for further review and consideration until the 03Oct22 meeting.
8-Sep-22	"As to animal services Veterinary hospital or clinic: I move to recommend the addition of Veterinary hospital or clinic permitted by right subject to special requirements in the AG, HM, RT zoning districts."	Without discussion, this item was moved for deferral	Motion to defer for further review and consideration until the 03Oct22 meeting.
8-Sep-22	"I move to increase the maximum lot density of the new AG zoning district from 0.15 dwelling units per acre to 0.33 dwelling units per acre."	There was brief, but substantive discussion. At issue is the appropriateness of the AG zone dwelling unit density of 0.15 units per acre in the 2021 LDC (effectively 1 unit per 6.7 acres).	Motion passed

8-Sep-22	"I move to increase the maximum lot density of the new HM zoning district from 0.33 dwelling units per acre to 0.66 dwelling units per acre."	There was brief, but substantive discussion. At issue is the appropriateness of the HM zone dwelling unit density of 0.33 units per acre in the 2021 LDC (effectively 1 unit per 3). There was a question raised regarding the congruence of the minimum zoning designation size and the zoning density (effective minimum lot size); ACA Jensen explained that the two are different metrics and so not mutually exclusive.	Motion passed
8-Sep-22	"I move to increase the maximum lot density of the new RT zoning district from 0.67 dwelling units per acre to 1.0 dwelling units per acre."	There was brief discussion.	Motion passed
8-Sep-22	"I move to designate any parcel comprising 35 acres or more that was zoned RU under the 2005 LDC zoning scheme be assigned the AG zoning district in the 2021 LDC zoning re-mapping."	There was substantive discussion and the Commission members referred to a draft map prepared by CP&D Staff demonstrating the practical outcome of this action.	Motion passed
8-Sep-22	"I move to designate any parcel comprising more than 3 acres but less than 35 acres that was zoned RU under the 2005 LDC zoning scheme be assigned the HM zoning district in the 2021 LDC zoning re-mapping."	There was substantive discussion and the Commission members referred to a draft map prepared by CP&D Staff demonstrating the practical outcome of this action.	Motion passed
8-Sep-22	I move to designate any parcel comprising 3 acres or less that was zoned RU under the 2005 LDC zoning scheme be assigned the RT zoning district in the 2021 LDC zoning re-mapping.	There was substantive discussion and the Commission members referred to a draft map prepared by CP&D Staff demonstrating the practical outcome of this action.	Motion passed

8-Sep-22	"I move to amend the new LDC text to provide a 6-month period of time during which an owner of property currently zoned RU may apply with no application fee for a zoning map amendment as to said property if they believe said property should be assigned a zoning district other than the newly-assigned district. The 6-month period would begin the day the newly-adopted land development code and zoning map take effect."	There was lengthy discussion involving staff and various Commission members. At issue is the anticipated number of potential requests, the amount of time those requests might take to process, and what is trying to be achieved. It was determined that the intent is to assist the owners of properties that were previously zoned RU to obtain the most appropriate RT, HM, or AG designation for their property. An education/information campaign is an important part of the process and may take some time; so additional time was recommended.	Amended motion passed; 12 month period of time and limited to requests for previous RU properties to an RT/HM/AG zone designation.
8-Sep-22	"I move to delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(4) which provides for zero lot line development and any other provisions for zero lot line development of singlefamily dwellings..."	There was lengthy and substantive discussion. At issue is the appropriateness of the types of attached units within traditionally single family detached neighborhoods. ACA Jensen suggested deferring this motion until he prepares the new definitions of the different types of attached and detached units as that may inform the discussion.	Motion to defer for further review and consideration until the 03Oct22 meeting.
8-Sep-22	"I move to delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(5) which provides for the complete elimination or massive reductions on minimum lot width requirements in instances involving cluster development and any other provisions for cluster development of single-family dwellings..."	There was lengthy and substantive discussion. At issue is the physical layout of subdivisions and the dedication of openspace. ACA Jensen observed that a "cluster subdivision" may have the same number of units per acre as a "dispersed lot subdivision", but they visually appear differently. The Commission discussion included the topics of open space preservation, affordability, and diversity. There was discussion as to simply striking the section versus replacing it with alternate language.	Amended motion passed; delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(5) and request CP&D staff prepare alternative language based on current best practices.
3-Oct-22	As to Animal Shelter: I move to recommend the addition of animal shelters permitted by right, subject to special requirements in the AG, HM, RT zoning districts.	There was substantial discussion regarding minimum lot standards, potential adjacent uses, and other related issues.	Motion passed to add the Animal Shelter use as "SR" in AG and HM zones

3-Oct-22	As to animal services Veterinary hospital or clinic: I move to recommend the addition of Veterinary hospital or clinic permitted by right subject to special requirements in the AG, HM, RT zoning districts.	There was substantial discussion regarding minimum lot standards, potential adjacent uses, hours of operation, and other related issues.	Motion passed to add the Veterinary Hospital or Clinic use as "SR" in AG and HM zones
3-Oct-22	I move to delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(4) which provides for zero lot line development and any other provisions for zero lot line development of singlefamily dwellings:	Chair Branham clarified that this motion refers to "single family <u>detached</u> dwellings" and not single family <u>attached</u> dwellings such as townhouses, patio homes, etc. There was moderate discussion on the issue.	Motion passed to delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(4) without a replacement/substitution
3-Oct-22	I move to delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(5) which provides for the complete elimination or massive reductions on minimum lot width requirements in instances involving cluster development and any other provisions for cluster development of single-family dwellings:	There was lengthy discussion among the Commission members. Topics included the price and affordability of new housing, environmental impacts, the physical character of different lot sizes and configurations, and other related topics.	Motion passed to delete subsection 26-3.1(f)(4) and to direct staff to draft a substitute standard
3-Oct-22	Green incentive bonuses	There was lengthy discussion regarding the density bonuses for the performance of certain "green" or environmentally friendly practices. One of the concerns was that some of the criteria are now industry standard. An example was a bonus for putting energy star appliances and fixtures in new residential construction. Several commission members felt that more information was needed before making a decision.	Staff was directed to research and provide additional information to the Commission.

3-Oct-22	Zone Map Revisions	<p>The Commission reviewed the translations from M-1 to the 2021 LDC zone designations. Staff explained that the M-1 zone predates the 2005 code, and has a lot of non-conforming uses. As such, there is not one or two zones that it translates into. The map presented showed Staff's best effort at translating the current development on M-1 properties into 2021 zone designations. There were several numbered parcels on the map that staff had specifically called out because the current property uses were either residential or someother non-conforming use.</p>	<p>Staff was directed to provide an electronic copy of the M-1 map to the commission for further analysis, and to consolidate the information from all previous maps into one map for final commission discussion.</p>