



MEETING DATE: November 14, 2018

AGENDA ITEM: 5.D

ATTACHMENT: 4

REPORT TO GENERAL PLAN 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE

Subject: Discussion of Land Use Element Goals, Policies, and Programs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the October meeting, we introduced the Steering Committee to the goals, policies, and actions in the General Plan 2020 Land Use Element. At the November meeting, we will go through this material in more detail, discussing potential changes to the policies, new policies, and new or revised implementing programs. In addition to the policies in the Land Use Element, we will also be addressing the land use-related policies in the Neighborhoods Element. The excerpted policies in this report from the Neighborhoods Element apply citywide and should be considered along with other citywide policies affecting land use.

REPORT

The following pages include a matrix listing San Rafael’s Land Use goals, policies and programs. The matrix includes a column that provides ideas (from staff) for the Committee to consider as it evaluates the content of the Element. The matrix also includes a column with Steering Committee member comments, including those comments received as of November 1, 2018. Only one Steering Committee member has provided comments thusfar—we hope more will follow.

Committee members are encouraged to review the matrix before the November 14 meeting and come prepared to discuss their thoughts on the policies. We are particularly interested in ideas for new policies covering topics which were not addressed in General Plan 2020, and on updated implementation measures for the policies that are currently listed.

The matrix includes all goals, policies, and programs in the Land Use Element, along with the citywide goals, policies, and actions that currently appear in the Neighborhoods Element (the remainder of the Neighborhoods Element includes “place-based” policies addressing Downtown and specific geographic areas of the city. These policies will be updated collaboratively with neighborhood organizations and residents in each area.)

In 2015, the City completed an evaluation of General Plan 2020 which included recommendations on some of the actions. Those recommendations are incorporated in the matrix as appropriate.

Land Use Element Policy Discussion Matrix

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Goal 1	Growth to Enhance the Quality of Life. It is the goal of the City of San Rafael to have growth that serves community needs and enhances the quality of life in San Rafael. San Rafael values its historically significant and inspirational natural setting, with the widest variety of cultural, residential, employment, and entertainment offerings in Marin County. While the city will not grow significantly, it will be important to maintain and improve the existing types and areas of development that make San Rafael such a desirable place.	<i>Goal remains valid—but does “quality of life” need to be defined more clearly? Perhaps growth should “enhance the experience of living and working in San Rafael.” Also last sentence suggests the city “will not grow significantly”—this is subjective. perhaps rephrase.</i>	<i>(JR): Replace “growth” with “change”? A key concern is to preserve existing housing stock (and perhaps increase) serving our immigrant community and should be a policy as we go forward. This is both a social and economic imperative for our city</i>
Policy LU-1	Planning Area and Growth to 2020 Plan the circulation system and infrastructure to provide capacity for the total development expected by 2020.	<i>Still a valid policy—but should we note it works both ways? .e., we should also not grow beyond the capacity of the circulation system and infrastructure.</i>	<i>(JR) Focus on strategic long-term capital improvement objectives including seeking regional investments in roadway, transit and active transportation network and facility improvements that provide regional and local benefit: Recommend a more active advocacy role to advance the city’s interest in attracting regional, state and federal resources to regional serving improvements in and proximate to San Rafael with significant local benefit</i>
Program LU-1a	Five-Year Growth Assessment. As part of the five-year General Plan update, review San Rafael’s growth, traffic capacity, traffic mitigation list and traffic mitigation fee. Assess growth assumptions and modify land use and circulation policies as needed.	<i>Clarify—potentially delete reference to “five-year update” and say “As part of the periodic review and evaluation of the General Plan”</i>	<i>(JR) Add focus on non SOV infrastructure capacity SMART, Bus transit, Active Transportation etc.</i>

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-2	<p>Development Timing For health, safety and general welfare reasons, new development should only occur when adequate infrastructure is available consistent with the following findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project-related traffic will not cause the level of service established in the Circulation Element to be exceeded; b. Any circulation improvements needed to maintain the level of service standard established in the Circulation Element have been programmed and funding has been committed; c. Environmental review of needed circulation improvement projects has been completed; d. The time frame for completion of the needed circulation improvements will not cause the level of service in the Circulation Element to be exceeded, or the findings set forth in Policy C-5 have been made; and e. Sewer, water, and other infrastructure improvements will be available to serve new development by the time the development is constructed. 	<p><i>Clauses “a” through “d” of this policy will need to be rewritten to reflect SB 743 and the limits on using level of service as a metric for allowing development. The idea of linking development approval to infrastructure capacity remains valid, however—and the city will continue to retain metrics for making that determination.</i></p>	<p>JR: Add Flood Risk and Sea Level Rise Adaptation. Add forestry management and fuel modification.</p> <p>JR: Focus resources to strategically increase capacity in regional and local facilities that supports San Rafael’s land use and fiscal policies</p>
Program LU-2a	<p>Development Review. Through the development and environmental review processes, ensure that policy provisions are evaluated and implemented. The City may waive or modify any policy requirement contained herein if it determines that the effect of implementing the same in the issuance of a development condition or other approvals would be to preclude all economically viable use of a subject property.</p>	<p><i>Remains valid and reflects the necessity of adopting policies that do not constitute a “taking” of private property. Carry forward.</i></p>	<p>(JR) State environmental law is now emphasizing VMT vs LOS how do we respond to this?</p>
<p><i>Policy LU-3 (Project Selection Process) was deleted in a 2016 General Plan Amendment</i></p>			

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-4	<p>Reasonable Interim Use of Property Allow a landowner reasonable interim use of property in areas where development is precluded pending needed traffic improvements. Structures should not be permanent, and uses should be low- or off-peak traffic generators.</p>	<p><i>We may want to say this differently—the idea of interim use of property should be supported, but the cause may not always be traffic congestion. There may be economic factors, or other infrastructure constraints.</i></p>	
Program LU-4a	<p>Reasonable Interim Uses. In the zoning ordinance establish land uses that allow reasonable interim uses for properties that are in areas with limited traffic capacity for development. Examples include contractor’s yards, new car storage, modular office and storage, and outdoor recreation.</p>	<p><i>This is done on a case by case basis. Again, potentially delete the reference to limited traffic capacity as the sole reason someone may seek an interim use on a property.</i></p>	
Policy LU-5	<p>Urban Service Area Oppose urban development in areas adjacent to San Rafael's Urban Service Area boundary.</p>	<p><i>Perhaps rephrase to clarify this refers to unincorporated open space and not adjacent cities.</i></p>	
Program LU-5a	<p>Urban Service Area Review. Review and consider revisions to the City's Urban Service Area every five years as part of the General Plan Review, or in conjunction with a LAFCO-initiated boundary review.</p>	<p><i>Retain five year reference, but potentially delete reference to “General Plan Review.” Are there other time triggers? Need to update based on current LAFCo efforts.</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-6	<p>Annexation Prior to urban development, areas that can reasonably be served through extension of the existing service area of the City should be annexed.</p> <p>a. Annexation of already developed unincorporated islands (Los Ranchitos, Country Club, Bayside Acres, California Park, Mt. Tamalpais Cemetery) and developed portions of the Marinwood/Lucas Valley neighborhoods should be dependent on resident interest, the cost/revenue implications of the provision of City services to the area, and the availability of City services.</p> <p>b. Developed and undeveloped areas of Santa Venetia are not expected to be annexed to the City within the time frame of the plan due to flood and seismic hazards and urban service costs associated with existing infrastructure conditions.</p>	<p><i>Part “a” remains valid and should be carried forward. Does Santa Venetia need to be singled out in part “b” as not desirable for annexation due to flood and seismic costs and infrastructure—or are these issues sufficiently covered by part “a”?</i></p>	
Program LU-6a	<p>LAFCO. Encourage LAFCO to adopt Urban Service Area and annexation policies for the San Rafael Planning Area consistent with adopted General Plan policies. Consistent with Council Resolution not to annex or serve the St. Vincent’s and Silveira properties, work with LAFCO to remove them from the City’s Sphere of Influence.</p>	<p><i>The first sentence should be retained. The second sentence should be deleted, as it’s already happened. The text should reference current LAFCo efforts.</i></p>	
Policy LU-7	<p>Land Use Planning in Surrounding Jurisdictions Continue to monitor and work with surrounding jurisdictions to ensure that land uses outside the community will have a positive effect on San Rafael.</p>	<p><i>Still valid. Carry forward as is.</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program LU-7a	Development Adjacent to San Rafael. Work with the County and other local jurisdictions to review applications for development in areas adjacent to San Rafael's city limits and within the Sphere of Influence.	<i>Still valid. Carry forward as is. Are there any specific areas of concern to address in future actions?</i>	
Policy LU-8	<p>Density of Residential Development Residential densities are shown in Exhibit 11, Land Use Categories. Maximum densities are not guaranteed but minimum densities are generally required. Density of residential development on any site shall respond to the following factors: site resources and constraints, potentially hazardous conditions, traffic and access, adequacy of infrastructure, City design policies and development patterns and prevailing densities of adjacent developed areas.</p> <p>When development is clustered to avoid sensitive areas of a site, density provided to the entire site may be transferred to the remaining portion of the site, providing all factors listed above can be met.</p> <p>Transfer of density among properties shall only be permitted when unique or special circumstances (e.g., preservation of wetlands or historic buildings) are found to exist which would cause significant environmental impacts if the transfer were not allowed.</p>	<p><i>Policy remains valid and should be carried forward. The commitment to minimum densities is important and ensures the efficient use of land. Are the factors listed (for determining density) still valid and complete?</i></p> <p><i>The latter part of Policy LU-8 is still valid. Perhaps this should be a separate policy, as it deals with clustering and density transfer, rather than the determinants of density.</i></p>	
Program LU-8a	Residential Zoning. Implement Land Use Element densities by setting appropriate maximum allowed densities in the zoning ordinance.	<i>Potentially add a new action regarding the use of FAR (or other metrics) to regulate density in areas where smaller, affordable units are desired.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program LU-8b	Transfer of Density. Continue to implement zoning regulations governing the transfer of density among properties.	<i>Carry forward</i>	
Policy LU-9	<p>Intensity of Nonresidential Development Commercial and industrial areas have been assigned floor area ratios (FARs) to identify appropriate intensities (see Exhibits 4, 5 and 6). Maximum allowable FARs are not guaranteed, particularly in environmentally sensitive areas. Intensity of commercial and industrial development on any site shall respond to the following factors: site resources and constraints, traffic and access, potentially hazardous conditions, adequacy of infrastructure, and City design policies.</p> <p>a. Where the existing building is larger than the FAR limit and no intensification or change of use is proposed, the property may be redeveloped at the same size as the existing building if parking and design requirements in effect at the time of the new application can be met.</p> <p>b. FAR transfers between or among sites shall not be permitted except where the City Council finds the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development of the beneficiary parcel is consistent with the General Plan 2020, except that FARs or maximum densities may be exceeded, and <p>(continues on next page)</p>	<p><i>Consider breaking this into more than one policy, as it presents a number of related—but different—ideas. The concept of regulating intensity based on the factors listed here is still relevant and may be carried forward. The idea of allowing sites that already exceed the allowable FAR to be redeveloped at that intensity provided they meet parking/design standards also seems to remain appropriate. The conditions for FAR transfers remain valid. Allowances for higher FAR around Andersen/101/Francisco may require further discussion. Are there other locations where exceedance of FAR limits should be considered—and why?</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-9 continued	<p>2. The proposed development will comply with all applicable zoning and design parameters and criteria as well as traffic requirements; and one or both of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Unique or special circumstances are found to exist (e.g., preservation of wetlands or historic buildings) that would cause significant environmental impacts if the transfer is not allowed, and/or ii) A significant public benefit will be provided, such as securing a new public facility site (e.g. park, school, library, fire station, police station). <p>c. Through Planned Development rezoning, consider allowing a higher floor area ratio at the shopping center sites located at the crossroads of Andersen Drive, Highway 101, and Francisco Blvd. West where it would facilitate redevelopment with improved parking, access, landscaping and building design.</p>		
Program LU-9a	Nonresidential Zoning. Implement nonresidential levels of development and FAR transfer policies through allowed floor area ratios in zoning districts.	<i>“Continue to implement...” May need a policy for using FAR in mixed use projects too.</i>	
Policy LU-10	Planned Development Zoning Require Planned Development zoning for development on a lot larger than five acres in size, except for the construction of a single-family residence.	<i>Many communities are moving away from this approach. It creates a very cumbersome zoning system, with unique regs. for each site. Reconsider.</i>	
Program LU-10a	Planned Development Zoning. Continue to maintain a Planned Development zoning district.	<i>Carry forward.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-11	<p>School Site Reuse or Redevelopment Where it is in the community's interest to retain public recreation facilities in accordance with Parks and Recreation policies, and/or the childcare policy, cluster development so that the public recreation or childcare use may be preserved. The following uses are allowed on school sites retained by the districts: housing and public and quasi-public uses, such as child care programs; adult day care programs; education, recreation, cultural programs and activities; and churches and religious institutions.</p>	<p><i>Should review the list of allowable uses on surplus school sites and confirm the direction provided by this policy with the School Districts.</i></p>	<p>(JR) Extend policy to include infill rental housing particularly BMR for teachers and their families</p>
Program LU-11a	<p>Zoning for School Sites. Continue to implement school site reuse and redevelopment through zoning regulations and through the development review process.</p>	<p><i>Still valid, though there are fewer sites available for reuse</i></p>	
Policy LU-12	<p>Building Heights Citywide height limits in San Rafael are described in Exhibits 7 and 8. For Downtown height limits see Exhibit 9:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Height of buildings existing or approved as of January 1, 1987 shall be considered conforming to zoning standards. b. Hotels have a 54-foot height limit, except where a taller height is shown on Exhibit 9 (Downtown Building Height Limits). c. Height limits may be exceeded through granting of a zoning exception or variance, or through a height bonus as described in LU-13 (Height Bonuses). 	<p><i>Are there desired changes to height limits for hotels, height bonuses, other land uses, or specific areas of the city? Would more guidance for zoning exceptions and variances be beneficial here? Is there a need to clarify or revise the height map(s)?</i></p>	<p><i>JR: Subject to Downtown Precise Plan</i></p>

EXHIBIT 10: HEIGHT BONUSES

Location	Maximum Height Bonus	Amenity (May provide one or more of the following)
Fourth Street Retail Core Zoning District	12 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing • Public courtyards, plazas and/or passageways (consistent with Downtown Design Guidelines) • Public parking (not facing Fourth Street)
PG&E site in the Lindero Office land use district	24 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park (privately maintained park with public access, adjacent to Mahon Creek; an alternative is tennis courts tied to Albert Park.) • Community facility (10,000 sq. ft. or more in size)
Second/Third Mixed Use East Zoning District	12 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing • Public parking • Overhead crosswalks • Mid-block passageways between Fourth Street and parking on Third Street
Second/Third Mixed Use West District, north of Third Street and east of C Street	18 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public parking
West End Village	6 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing • Public parking • Public passageways (consistent with Downtown Design Guidelines)
Lincoln Avenue between Hammondale and Mission Avenue	12 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Housing • See NH-120 (Lincoln Avenue)
Marin Square	12 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing
North San Rafael Town Center	24 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing
Citywide where allowed by zoning.	12 feet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hotel <small>(see Policy LU-20)</small>

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-13	<p>Height Bonuses A height bonus may be granted with a use permit for a development that provides one or more of the amenities listed in Exhibit 10 (see next page), provided the building’s design is consistent with Community Design policies and design guidelines. No more than one height bonus may be granted for a project.</p>	<p><i>See questions above. The list of amenities in Exhibit 10 should be reviewed, and the bonuses themselves should be confirmed to make economic sense.</i></p>	<p>(JR) Exhibit 10 West End village 6’? doesn’t equal a story not sure what this does...</p>
GOAL 2	<p>It is the goal of the City of San Rafael to maintain balance and diversity in the community. San Rafael reflects a mosaic of land use patterns that have changed over time, creating a visual framework for the city that continues to evolve in response to the community’s sense of balance and compatibility. Our desire to avoid intensification must be balanced with the development required to provide jobs and housing, and to sustain an evolving, vital community. We must also continue to appreciate the importance and desirability of having neighborhoods of differing levels of density and activity.</p>	<p><i>Maintaining a balanced, diverse mix of uses is still a valid goal, and the narrative here is mostly accurate. However, the referenced “desire to avoid intensification” should be clarified, since the plan will likely support intensification in a few key locations.</i></p>	<p>(JR) Should “avoid intensification” be substituted with something else? It seems that certain areas are being identified where change and intensification is anticipated. Perhaps focus intensification is specific areas where mixed use, and alternative to SOV capacity is available or planned.</p>
Policy LU-14	<p>Land Use Compatibility Design new development in mixed residential and commercial areas to minimize potential nuisance effects and to enhance their surroundings.</p>	<p><i>And conversely, development in such settings should not impede the operation of existing uses.</i></p>	<p>Perpetuates the Euclidian zoning policies for the past when heavy industry adversely impacted health and safety of adjacent residents and rich folks didn’t want to be next to production. Should we be revisiting this in the light of changing working habits and far less invasive modern industry? We may have a desire to protect critical industry and services that serve the north bay and would be adversely impacted by unhappy residential neighbors (think Berkeley Forge)</p>

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program LU-14a	Land Use Compatibility. Evaluate the compatibility of proposed residential use in commercial areas through the development review process.	<i>Are there certain parameters that should be identified here? Text should deal with the appropriateness of residential in a variety of settings—office, commercial, industrial, etc.</i>	
Policy LU-15	Convenience Shopping Encourage the retention and improvement of existing retail stores and services in residential neighborhoods that provide needed neighborhood services and reduce traffic.	<i>Still valid, but update in light of the repositioning of retail centers and the potential for other uses as retail and services evolve</i>	
Program LU-15a	Neighborhood Commercial. Evaluate the compatibility of proposed neighborhood commercial center use or upgrades through the development review process, and involve neighbors early in the development review.	<i>Perhaps elaborate on “compatibility” (with other retail stores? Adjacent uses? Neighborhoods?)</i>	
Policy LU-16	Building and Automotive Services Maintain availability of sites for building, automotive and service industries important to San Rafael's economy and the convenience of its residents and businesses.	<i>Still valid—carry forward (and potentially expand to other sectors?)</i>	(JR) (1) Separate Building from Automotive as they are likely to have distinctly different futures. (2) Identify policies that retain and strengthen our building serving businesses and industries (including improving regional access to East San Rafael) (3) Identify policies anticipating transition away for existing automobile sales and repair models.
Program LU-16a	Building and Automotive Services. Continue to provide adequate sites for building, automotive and service industries in the appropriate zoning districts. Sites with industrial and light industrial zoning may be redesignated and rezoned to a different land use with Council determination that the new use provides a substantial neighborhood or citywide benefit.	<i>The last sentence should be discussed. Does “substantial neighborhood or citywide benefit” include housing?</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-17	Limited Retail and Service Uses in Industrial and Office Areas Allow limited retail and service uses that serve area businesses/workers to locate throughout industrial/office and industrial areas.	<i>Still valid—verify that this policy is working and not causing loss/erosion of industrial space or conflicts with industrial activities.</i>	
Program LU-17a	Retail and Service Uses in Industrial and Office Areas. Continue to provide adequate sites for small local-serving retail and service businesses in industrial and office zoning districts.	<i>This more or less repeats the policy. “Adequate sites” might be better called “opportunities”</i>	
Policy LU-18	Lot Consolidation Commercial and higher density residential parcels less than 6,000 square feet in size should be encouraged to be combined to provide adequate parking and circulation, minimize driveway cuts on busy streets, and maximize development and design potential.	<i>Revisit this. A lot consolidation policy would be great, but this policy sends mixed messages and is not really about consolidation. Providing adequate on-site parking on a small lot may be infeasible and not desired if shared parking can be provided nearby.</i>	
Program LU-18a	Lot Consolidation. Continue to encourage small lot consolidation through zoning regulations.	<i>Still valid. Carry forward.</i>	
Policy LU-19	Childcare Plan for and encourage the development of new and the retention of existing childcare centers to meet neighborhood and citywide childcare needs. In conjunction with the school districts, encourage continuation of childcare programs at school sites because of their suitability for such uses and convenient locations in residential neighborhoods.	<i>May also want to include language about minimizing the potential for negative off-site impacts through development standards compliant with state law, etc.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program LU-19a	Zoning for Childcare Programs. Evaluate and revise if necessary zoning requirements to allow childcare centers in all zoning districts except Hillside Resource Residential, Hillside Residential and Water and Open Space Districts. The City may waive FARs for childcare centers in nonresidential and mixed-use buildings.	<i>Update based on current status. Changes were made in 2005.</i>	
Program LU-19b	Fees for Childcare Programs. Where possible, waive application and permit fees for childcare centers. Consider exempting childcare centers from traffic mitigation fees.	<i>Update based on current status.</i>	
Policy LU-20	Hotels, Motels and Inns Encourage redevelopment and upgrading of existing motels and hotels. Visitor accommodations are a desired land use because they are a low traffic-generator and a high tax-generator, and because they have identifiable benefits to the neighborhood such as job training programs. With a Use Permit, allow hotels, motels and inns in most commercial, multifamily and industrial zoning districts. With a Use Permit, allow bed-and-breakfast inns in High Density, Medium Density and Large Lot Residential Land Use Districts. Hotels are not subject to floor area ratio requirements. The City Council may approve a height bonus per LU-13 (Height Bonuses) if it finds that the hotel will be a significant community benefit and that the design is acceptable and consistent with City design policies and guidelines.	<i>Confirm that this is still valid—is the FAR exemption preferable to an FAR bonus? Are any changes needed to ensure that hotels remain a desired use? Are there any issues with obsolete motels that could (should) be converted to other uses? We may also want to address short-term rentals in a companion policy to this one.</i>	
Program LU-20a	Hotel Zoning. Maintain zoning ordinance regulations allowing height bonus and exemption from FARs for hotels.	<i>Verify that specific zoning changes are not desired. 10-yr report suggested deleting this.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-21	<p>Ministorage and Storage Ministorage is allowed in light industrial/office and industrial districts. For lots facing Highways 101 or 580 or the Bay, the ministorage use must be located at the rear of the lot behind an active streetfront use. Ministorage may be permitted with an FAR of up to 1.0 if the following findings can be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The facility is needed in the community; The project is compatible with surrounding uses; The project is designed so that it cannot be converted to other, more intensive uses; and, The location is appropriate for this type of use. <p>In other land use districts, ministorage may be allowed in existing buildings, provided that the mini-storage is not located along the street frontage and complies with the FAR limits allowable in the districts.</p>	<p><i>Does the demand for mini-storage still warrant this policy? Are the findings still adequate and appropriate? Also the last sentence implies that mini-storage is allowed in all zones.</i></p> <p><i>Are there other land uses (besides child care, automotive, mini-storage and hotels) that require their own policies?</i></p>	<p>(JR) Is mini storage truly a priority land use for San Rafael? Should we be promoting or discouraging this land use when we have far more significant needs? What are the benefits to our city – presumably fiscal and low traffic generation?</p>
Program LU-21a	<p>Ministorage Zoning. Maintain zoning ordinance regulations for mini-storage use allowance and location limitations.</p>	<p><i>10-yr evaluation suggested deleting this action, as it is done.</i></p>	
Policy LU-22	<p>Odor Impacts Consider odor impacts when evaluating land uses and development projects near wastewater treatment plants, or treatment plant expansion projects.</p>	<p><i>Still valid. Potentially expand to cover other potential odor conflicts (housing above restaurants, etc).</i></p>	
Program LU-22a	<p>Project Evaluation. Evaluate odor impacts as part of development review.</p>	<p><i>Still valid</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy LU-23	<p>Land Use Map and Categories Land use categories are generalized groupings of land uses and titles that define a predominant land use type (See Exhibit 11). All proposed projects must meet density and FAR standards (See Exhibits 4, 5 and 6) for that type of use, and other applicable development standards. Some listed uses are conditional uses in the zoning ordinance and may be allowed only in limited areas or under limited circumstances. Maintain a Land Use Map that illustrates the distribution and location of land uses as envisioned by General Plan policies. (See Exhibit 11).</p>	<p><i>The last sentence should be the first sentence. Otherwise, the policy remains.</i></p>	
Program LU-23a	<p>Zoning Ordinance Amendments. Revise the zoning ordinance, including the zoning map, to implement General Plan land use designations, densities, intensities, and policies, and to meet requirements of State law and court decisions.</p>	<p><i>Very likely that this will need to be done again once GP 2040 is adopted, so carry forward.</i></p>	
Program LU-23b	<p>Subdivision Ordinance Amendments. Revise the subdivision ordinance where necessary for conformance with General Plan land use designations, densities, intensities, and policies and include provisions for adequate enforcement of conditions of subdivision map approval.</p>	<p><i>Include if needed to implement new GP policies or correct known deficiencies with the existing ordinance.</i></p>	
Program LU-23c	<p>Live/work Regulations. Revise live/work zoning regulations to ensure that live/work units are appropriately designed and used for combined residential and business uses.</p>	<p><i>Not yet done. Should also include a policy providing direction on live-work. Some discussion of where this use is appropriate would be helpful.</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program LU-23d	Industrial Zoning Districts. Reevaluate and modify as needed definitions and FARs for Industrial and Light Industrial/Office Zoning District.	<i>Vague as stated. Should replace this with an action that lays out more specifically the desired direction for these areas, so that standards are appropriately adjusted. In general, more policy direction on the future of industrial land would be helpful.</i>	
NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT			
Goal 5	Distinctive Neighborhoods It is the goal for San Rafael to have neighborhoods of integrity and distinctive hometown character. San Rafael is a city of neighborhoods that support each other and provide a network of parks, gathering places and services. The unique identity, distinctive design and upkeep of each neighborhood will continue to be a source of pride.	<i>Still valid. Carry forward.</i>	
Policy NH-1	Neighborhood Planning Engage neighborhood associations in preparing neighborhood plans for their area.	<i>Still valid, though could potentially be rephrased to explain the city's role.</i>	
Program NH-1a	Neighborhood Planning Process. Develop a neighborhood planning process where there is significant desire or need for a neighborhood plan. As of July, 2003, neighborhoods expressing a desire for a neighborhood plan are Bret Harte, Gerstle Park, Lincoln/San Rafael Hill, the Santa Margarita area in the Terra Linda neighborhood and the Canal.	<i>Need to update, and discuss whether the concept of a "waiting list" for neighborhood plans is still viable. Some of the updated neighborhood-level planning can be handled through the General Plan Update.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy NH-2	<p>New Development in Residential Neighborhoods Preserve, enhance and maintain the residential character of neighborhoods to make them desirable places to live. New development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance neighborhood image and quality of life • Incorporate sensitive transitions in height and setbacks from adjacent properties to respect adjacent development character and privacy, • Preserve historic and architecturally significant structures, • Respect existing landforms and natural features, • Maintain or enhance infrastructure service levels, and • Provide adequate parking. 	<p><i>This is a very important policy that frames the priorities for neighborhood conservation and enhancement, and the criteria for evaluating infill development and other changes. Should confirm that this list is still reflective of current issues and objectives for neighborhoods.</i></p>	
Program NH-2a	<p>Zoning Ordinance. Continue to implement and update the Zoning Ordinance as needed to include the criteria listed above.</p>	<p><i>OK to carry forward. Are there other tools needed to implement Policy NH-2?</i></p>	
Policy NH-3	<p>Housing Mix Encourage a housing mix with a broad range of affordability, character, and sizes. In areas with a predominance of rental housing, encourage ownership units to increase the variety of housing types.</p>	<p><i>First sentence is still on point. Second sentence requires discussion. Should the converse (encouraging rental opps in ownership areas?) also be encouraged?</i></p>	
Policy NH-4	<p>Improve Property Maintenance Require owners to maintain their properties in good condition and appearance and to eliminate unsafe and unhealthy conditions.</p>	<p><i>Policy remains relevant and should be carried forward</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program NH-4a	Code Enforcement. Maintain an effective Code Enforcement program that engages with neighborhoods and business groups and works in partnerships with appropriate City staff to address nuisances and zoning code violations.	<i>Still valid. Carry forward.</i>	
Program NH-4b	Design Review Conditions of Approval. Through development review, require that design review approval include language whereby owners maintain landscaping in good condition.	<i>Why only landscaping and not other aspects of construction? Should this be revised to address water conservation issues?</i>	
Program NH-4c	Property Maintenance Standards Ordinance. Consider adoption of a property maintenance standards ordinance to maintain minimum standards of the appearance of property, and to sustain property values in a neighborhood.	<i>Discuss if this remains relevant and feasible.</i>	
Policy NH-5	Safe Streets Provide neighborhood streets that are safe, pleasant, and attractive to walk, cycle and drive along.	Mobility Element	
Policy NH-6	Bicycle- and Pedestrian-Friendly Streets Create bicycle-and pedestrian-friendly residential streets with large street trees, sidewalks and other appropriate amenities.	Mobility Element	
Program NH-6a	Narrow Streets. In new streets, consider modifying street standards to allow narrower streets that promote bicycle and pedestrian activity and safety, while still providing for emergency and service access. Public streets must be designed to Caltrans and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials standards.	Mobility Element	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy NH-7	Neighborhood Identity and Landmarks Enhance neighborhood identity and sense of community by retaining and creating gateways, landmarks, and landscape improvements that help to define neighborhood entries and focal points.	Community Design Element	
Policy NH-8	Parking Maintain well-landscaped parking lots and front setbacks in commercial and institutional properties that are located in or adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Promote ways to encourage parking opportunities that are consistent with the design guidelines.	<i>Seems like there are more issues related to parking than just landscaping and design (spillover parking onto residential streets, etc.)</i>	
Program NH-8a	Restore Parking Spaces. Continue Code Enforcement efforts to work with apartment owners to restore parking spaces being used for storage.	<i>Does this continue to be an issue? Are there other actions that should be added?</i>	
Program NH-8b	Additional On-Site Parking. In neighborhoods with excessive on-street parking, work with property owners to add on-site parking where feasible as part of review of expansion or remodels.	<i>This is confusing as written. Change "excessive on-street parking" to "insufficient on-street parking supply"</i>	
Program NH-8c	Permit Parking. In neighborhoods with excessive on-street parking, evaluate the benefits and drawbacks of a Permit Parking Program (i.e. to limit cars per unit and/or to limit nonresidential cars) where supported by a significant majority of neighborhood residents.	<i>Need to discuss. There may be other options, such as time limits (see recent Canal experience).</i>	
Program NH-8d	Zoning Ordinance Review. Evaluate and amend as necessary zoning regulations to ensure adequate on-site parking, and sufficient screening of parking areas adjacent to residences.	<i>Perhaps frame differently so as not to imply more parking will be required. Should update, following a discussion about parking needs and policies.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy NH-9	Nuisance Vehicles Minimize the number of abandoned vehicles, excessive signs on vehicles and vehicles being used as homes, on streets and private property.	<i>Discuss in light of current conditions. Is "Excessive Signs on Vehicles" really an issue?</i>	
Program NH-9a	Abandoned Vehicle Program. Continue the abandoned vehicle abatement program.	<i>OK to carry forward</i>	
Program NH-9b	Vehicles as Residences. Continue to implement, and strengthen as necessary, City ordinances that prohibit overnight residential use of vehicles within the public right-of-way on public property, and on private property.	<i>May require discussion based on current conditions and changes since 2004.</i>	
Policy NH-10	Neighborhood Centers Support the vitality of attractive, viable neighborhood centers by using incentives to encourage desired mixed-use, local-services and to create areas for the community to gather. Assist these centers to adapt to changing community needs. Retain existing neighborhood centers unless it can be clearly demonstrated that local-serving uses are not economically feasible.	<i>Should precede LU-15? Suggest rewording/editing this policy but maintaining the direction it provides. Some of the content (assisting the centers and creating incentives) should be moved to an implementing program.</i>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Policy NH-11	<p>Needed Neighborhood Serving Uses Give priority to "needed neighborhood serving uses". Examples of needed neighborhood serving uses are: supermarkets; craft stores; cafes; restaurants; drug stores; neighborhood shopping centers which include uses such as dry cleaners, delis and markets, video stores, etc.; health and medical facilities and services; as well as improved public uses and services such as parks, schools, child care, and police services. Other similar uses that serve primarily neighborhood residents and/or employees and receive broad neighborhood support may also qualify.</p>	<p><i>Need to update this list and determine how to best reposition neighborhood shopping centers and other neighborhood commercial uses in light of changing shopping patterns, technology, lifestyle changes, etc. The last sentence is the key, but requires discussion.</i></p>	
Policy NH-12	<p>Schools Work with the school districts to use active school sites as neighborhood gathering places and recreational amenities. Retain local schools where possible, but when reuse is necessary, housing development at prevailing densities in the immediate area should be the appropriate land use. Where it is in the community's interest to retain public recreation, on-site density transfers will be allowed to the remaining school site acreage, provided the resulting housing design is compatible with the neighborhood character.</p>	<p><i>Repeats Policy LU-11, but with a different angle. Suggest combining both policies and verifying that any school sites reused are to be developed at "prevailing densities"—particularly if the open space is retained.</i></p>	
Policy NH-13	<p>Religious Institutions, Educational Facilities, and other Community Organizations Support community partnerships and communication between neighborhoods and schools, religious and other institutions to enhance mutual understanding and the benefits of collaboration.</p>	<p><i>Policy is fine, but a little vague. Perhaps focus on resolving potential operational and design issues, like parking, noise, privacy, and other compatibility issues.</i></p>	

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Steering Committee Members
Program NH-13a	Community Partnerships. Through the development review process, encourage or require the establishment of committees which include both neighborhood and institutional representatives to address potential impacts and foster better communications.	<i>OK to carry forward, but creation of such committees should not solely be an outcome of the “development review process” and should be part of ongoing community relations.</i>	