

# GENERAL PLAN CHANGES: LAND USE ELEMENT

**RED=deleted by City Council**

**GREEN=added by City Council**

## Introduction:

1. *P. 5 & 7 Introductory Statement: Council changed the Role of the Plan, p. 5 & 7, adding Goals and Implementing Actions in addition to Policies as being unenforceable with the addition of a strong reminder that the City Council and staff only has the power to decide if the GP will be followed; the General Plan as written creates no mandatory duty. Self- to increase political power to regulate.*

*(2. The Introductory Statement for each Element was deleted. Without that statement as a preface to each Element readers cannot gain an overall idea of the "state of the City" in that area and therefore would not know why the Goals, Policies and implementing Actions were deemed necessary as stated.) Self -- to prevent knowledge of why the Element is justified as written?*

3. *P. 1 of Land Use: Section 2.2 Community Development Framework, last paragraph:*

*The increasing pressures to grow caused serious concern in the community back in the 1970's, and resulted in a Growth Management System in the late 1970's. At that time, public workshops and a phone survey conducted for the 93 GP Update indicated that the principal land use concern was the rate of growth in the city. The community was generally concerned that there would be a loss of charm and beauty, increased traffic conditions and an inadequate water supply. For the 2030 GP Update, a phone survey, Town Hall meetings and mail-in survey were conducted and the community still highlights all these concerns - increased traffic, inadequate water and preservation of small town character. Therefore, the City should follow the long-standing philosophy that growth in St. Helena should be carefully managed, and that each of these decades-long public concerns are adequately addressed in future land use determinations.*

*This is an inaccurate statement that contradicts the the GPSUC records of the EIR hearings and community comments received by the Committee. The statement should have reflected that a majority of the surveyed people wanted to extend streets and develop the east side but the Town Hall meeting people (heavily east side around 200) did not agree. The GPSUC voted not to change the recommendation because there were far more surveyed people, around 1,000 - 2,000. The survey was was done by a neutral professional firm. The Town Hall meeting was organized by proponents against the results of the survey.*

**P. 3 Land Use: Business & Industrial Areas: These uses (bus. & industrial) are located along Adams Street and Library Lane east of Railroad Avenue and on the southern end of the City surrounding Dowdell Lane. Self -- to deflect development from the east side.**

**P. 4 Land Use: Community and Natural Resource Areas: However, wineries in AG land may utilize a small portion of onsite land for provision of affordable employee housing thus alleviating some of the low and moderate housing needs in the City, while simultaneously reducing commute traffic. Self -- to put low cost housing away from the rest of town.**

**Roads are part of Open Space, but are not contributors to natural resource, public health, recreation, etc. as stated above. No Pro -- Roads are not considered Open Space in Urban Planning disciplines.**

**P. 6: The Residential Growth Management System limits the number of building permits available for market rate homes each year. Affordable housing and second units are exempt from the program. residential growth each year. Self -- no support for affordable housing on the Council.**

**P.7: And finally, the Growth Management System limits the allowed number of new residential permits, with exceptions for affordable and secondary dwelling units. Self.**

**P. 9: LU1.1** Require new development to occur **in a logical and orderly manner** within well-defined boundaries and be consistent with the ability to provide urban services. *Self -- the most logical places are on the east side.*

**P.10:** The Urban Limit Line may only expand when the amount of developable land within the Urban Limit Line is insufficient to implement the General Plan policies **or when logical to include developed lands receiving urban services from the City.** *The City Council wants to annex Meadowood but were denied by LAFCO because the County wants the tax base and TOT.*

#### **POLICIES:**

**LU2.4** **Discourage development at low densities (i.e. one dwelling unit per acre or less), except where development protects agricultural uses or woodlands and watershed habitat and efficiently uses land.** *Self -- this describes the Hunter property on the east side.*

#### **Implementing Actions:**

**LU2.B** **Consider the impact of new development on surrounding residences, such as solar access. Explore opportunities to establish a neighborhood categorization system that allows for strict design standards in historic neighborhoods and more relaxed or creative standards in others.** *Self -- the Council wants a historic looking town, everywhere, regardless of owners' design preferences.*

**LU4.D** **Implement appropriate traffic improvements to provide safe ingress and egress to the industrial areas from State Route 29.** . *Self-- It means no connecting streets on the east side.*

#### **Policies:**

**LU5.1** **Prohibit conversion of existing farmland to non-agricultural uses.** *Self -- to bar any future housing from being built on the east side.*

**LU5.3** **Limit Strictly limit development on properties existing at the time of the adoption of this General Plan that are designated or used as agricultural and are outside of the Urban Limit Line land.** *Self -- in reference to the Adams St. property which is proposed for development and is on the east side.*

**LU5.6** **Permit wineries and other agricultural related industry to locate in the city if their location does not adversely impact surrounding uses or city services (water, traffic, etc.) or the quality and character of the community.** *This would have formed the basis for the WINERY ORDINANCE.*

#### **Implementing Actions:**

**LU5.F** Evaluate discretionary, re-zonings or General Plan amendments **outside the Urban Limit Line** to determine their potential for impacts on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance mapped by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and avoid converting these farmlands **where feasible. Where conversion of farmlands mapped by the state cannot be avoided, require long-term preservation of one acre of existing farmland of equal or higher quality for each acre of state-designated farmland that would be rezoned or re-designated to non agricultural uses.** This protection may consist of establishment of farmland easements or other similar mechanism, and the farmland to be preserved shall be located within the City and preserved prior to approval of the proposed zoning or General Plan amendment. *Self -- Deleting this prevents "trading" farmland for housing space, regardless of owners' wishes, etc.*