Legislation Text

File #: 13-287, **Version:** 1

City of Woodland

STAFF REPORT

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

DATE: October 15, 2013

SUBJECT: Woodland General Plan Update - Growth Projections; Alternative Land Use Scenarios; Analysis Criteria for Land Use Scenarios

Recommendation for Action

Staff recommends that the City Council receive the staff presentation(s) and following discussion and comment, direct staff to take the following actions:

1) Growth Projections -Use modified regional projections (contained herein) for General Plan land use and CEQA purposes and include General Plan policies and triggers to monitor and respond to actual growth patterns over time.
2) Alternative Land Use Scenarios -Proceed with analysis and testing of three identified land use scenarios.
3) Criteria for Analysis of Land Use Scenarios - Proceed with analysis and comparison of alternative land use scenarios as described herein.

Staff Contact

Cindy Norris, Principal Planner - 530 661-5911, cindy.norris@cityofwoodland.org

Fiscal Impact

The proposed General Plan update is authorized for funding in the Capital Budget in FY 2012/13 in the amount of $917,000. An additional amount of $183,000 will be requested in the FY 2013/14 Capital Budget for a total of $1,100,000. The full fiscal impact associated with the General Plan Update is estimated at $1.1 million. Staff is evaluating the costs-to date and projected costs anticipated to complete the Update under the revised schedule and will be preparing a General Plan Update budget overview and discussion for a future meeting of the City Council.

Background

The purpose of this City Council agenda item is to: report back regarding growth projections; identify and seek confirmation of three alternative land use scenarios; and confirm analysis criteria for alternative land use scenarios. The staff and consultant team will present information related to each item and be available to answer questions of the Council

and public.

Growth Projections

CONTEXT - Assumptions regarding the pace and phasing of growth for purposes of general planning and CEQA analysis can dramatically affect analytical outcomes in both good and bad ways, and this should be carefully considered. On the one hand, aggressive demand projections reflect optimism about the future. They indicate a "welcome-ness" to growth and provide important flexibility to accommodate unknown market conditions. Jurisdictions with multiple choices for market-supported growth may attract more development interest than jurisdictions with limited land choices that may not match the desires or capabilities of any particular developer.

On the other hand, State planning law requires that all elements of the General Plan be internally consistent, which means that infrastructure and roadways must be sized to match land use yields as depicted on the General Plan land use diagram and defined in the Land Use Element. Beyond sizing the infrastructure adequately, the City must also establish funding mechanisms to ensure that the infrastructure will be constructed and that adequate funding will be available for long-term operations and maintenance. Moreover, State environmental law requires full mitigation of impacts associated with projected growth, which is generally defined by the growth projections developed by the agency.

What this means is that overestimating demand can lead to unintended consequences including oversized infrastructure, increased costs to construct infrastructure, and (if less growth really occurs) less money actually collected when it is needed thus potentially precluding the ability to construct the infrastructure in a timely fashion. This can result in partially constructed neighborhoods without related/required support services and amenities including schools, parks, paths, etc. Projects that exceed demand and fail to be absorbed may also be harmful to the local business climate and real estate market due to vacancies and underutilization. Moreover, not all growth yields positive benefits for the community; type, quality and timing of growth matters.

The approach proposed by staff is to use the best available reliable information to develop reasonable growth projections for purposes of planning and environmental review, and build in policies and triggers that address sequencing and phasing of growth. This allows for a "best of both worlds" approach that ensures reasonable availability of land and sizing of infrastructure, with reasonable development costs and fees, yet also provides required "triggers" or thresholds for reassessment.

In other words, the actual growth rate experienced over time would be used as a tool, not a constraint. An agreed upon reasonable growth projection (see "Conclusion" sub-section below) would be used for initial phasing, CEQA analysis, infrastructure planning, and fee programs. Policies would be added to establish re-assessment points (e.g. every ten years; at 80% build-out of active growth area; etc.) or triggers (e.g. rail realignment; flood solution; etc.) at which time growth trends would be re-evaluated.

By using policies to create a strategy for phasing and sequencing of growth, the City can also ensure: maximum opportunities for community benefit, efficient provision of services and infrastructure, maximized tax revenue, master land use planning within an area, and preservation of land use and development opportunities for later years.

OVERVIEW -- The Economic and Fiscal Background Report (BAE, dated April 29, 2013) utilized growth projections prepared for the region by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for the purposes of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). Demand projections from this report were as follows for the period from 2014 through 2035:

Dwelling units 4,000
Jobs 5,000

In addition to the SACOG projections of dwelling units and jobs, the Background Report characterized non-residential growth potential as follows:

Office 250,000 square feet
Retail 400,000 square feet (plus additional sites to capture regional demand)
Industrial 1,500,000 square feet

This information was presented to the City Council at the June 11, 2013 joint workshop of the City Council and Planning Commission. Feedback was received from landowner representatives and the Council to further investigate the growth projections.

In response to this, the General Plan team developed two alternative growth projections to utilize in completing the Opportunities Report. These alternative projections provided a more expansive range of growth possibilities for the period from 2014 through 2035 as follows:

Dwelling units 4,000 to 7,100
Jobs 5,000 to 9,500

Subsequently, Tim Taron of Hefner Stark and Marois provided an overview of various possible population projections and residential absorption assumptions prepared by the firm Development Planning and Financing Group (DPFG Memorandum, draft dated August 21, 2013; revised dated September 16, 2013, Attachment F). The report does not address job growth or non-residential demand. It is important to note that the information in this report cannot be directly compared to the work summarized above because it addresses a different time period. For the period 2008 through 2035 this report identifies the following range of projections:

Population 15,700 to 28,500
Dwelling units 5,200 to 10,600

The General Plan team completed a review of the draft DPFG Memorandum (BAE, dated September 30, 2013, Attachment E) concluding that while some of the numbers may be overly aggressive, the memo provides a useful overview of alternative projections. When adjusted to reflect the same time period being used by the General Plan team (2014 through 2035) the dwelling unit demand projection range from the DPFG memo is as follows:

Dwelling units 4,450 to 8,200

The General Plan team also completed a more detailed assessment of retail growth opportunities (Attachment D, BAE, dated September 30, 2013) in response to questions that emerged from the June 11, 2013 joint workshop. Among other things, this report investigated the issue of sales tax leakage. The overall picture is that Woodland is doing a good job capturing estimated local taxable sales. Using 2012 data developed by MuniServices for sales tax revenues and leakage of taxable sales, BAE converted the sales tax gap figures to taxable sales, and then converted that into square feet of store space, assuming $300 per square foot in retail sales. If the City were able to capture 100 percent of the gap in the identified categories (furniture, auto dealers, restaurants, and other retail), there might be demand for about 130,000 square feet of additional retail space, plus a few auto dealers. As such the retail demand number could be increased by that amount to account for existing leakage and projected growth through 2035.

Local retail 530,000 square feet

The BAE memo also examined conflicts between strategies to revitalize downtown and economic development opportunities in the southeast along I-5 and identified considerations to accomplish both goals including targeting specific uses for the downtown area and precluding the location of these uses elsewhere. The memo concludes that planning for approximately 20 to 50 acres (200,000 to 500,000 square feet) of possible additional regional retail demand would help ensure economic development flexibility. This would be in addition to the retail demand figure presented above:

Regional retail opportunity 200,000-500,000 square feet

CONCLUSION -- The adjusted DPFG range for residential demand is very similar to the expanded range of 4,000 to 7,100 noted above that was developed independently by the General Plan team. Ignoring the lows and the highs in all the projections, a reasonable residential demand number to use for the General Plan is likely somewhere in the middle. Similarly, a jobs number somewhere in the middle is likely to be the most reasonable as well. Absent compelling new information related to the non-residential demand, it appears appropriate to continue to utilize the original non-residential projections, with the adjustment to local retail mentioned above and the addition of regional retail. Therefore the staff recommends use of the following projections to update the Opportunities and Challenges report and for use throughout the rest of the General Plan Update process. These numbers reflect a 38 percent increase in residential demand as compared to the original report, a 46 percent increase in jobs, a 33 percent increase in retail demand from the local population, and a quantification of regional retail that was not provided in the prior reports:

Dwelling units 5,500
Jobs 7,300
Office 250,000 square feet
Local retail 530,000 square feet (projected increase in local demand plus 100% capture of existing leakage)
Regional retail opportunity 200,000-500,000 square feet
Industrial 1,500,000 square feet

It is important to note that these numbers reflect projected new "demand", but do not reflect likely new "development". This is because the City has existing vacant inventory and approved undeveloped projects that could accommodate at least a portion of the projected new demand. Development of existing designated but vacant sites, existing underutilized sites, and approved but undeveloped projects would accommodate some or all of this demand depending on policies and phasing ultimately adopted in the General Plan. This is particularly true as related to residential, retail, and industrial land which are sectors in which the city has significant existing space or approved but not developed land. The location, characteristics, and condition of existing vacant and underutilized retail and industrial, in particular, may affect utilization and/or repurposing to meet new demand. The background reports drafted to date discuss these issues in greater detail.

Alternative Land Use Scenarios

Using the work and analysis undertaken to date, the General Plan team has identified three alternative land use scenarios for consideration by the City Council (Attachment A, Scenarios A, B, C and Attachment B, Land Use Scenario Comparison Table). It is important to note that these scenarios are not intended to be stand-alone General Plan land use alternatives. Rather they have been developed to specifically "test" certain possible land use considerations and combinations, as input for the development of the upcoming preferred land use alternative. The key question for consideration is whether the scenarios have been constructed broadly enough to provide the necessary information for the development of a preferred land use alternative. Within the bounds of the budget, scope, and schedule, the staff believes that the following three proposed scenarios do meet this goal:

SCENARIO A - Scenario A continues the City's current pattern of concentrating the majority of new residential development in the south, together with focused development in the East Street and the Main Street corridors and Downtown. Complementing build-out of the Spring Lake Specific Plan (SLSP), the Spring Lake Master Plan Remainder Area (MPRA) is developed as a largely residential area. A business park is proposed just north of the State Route (SR) 113/County Road 25A interchange, which would create a new employment center at the southern gateway. A new "Corridor Mixed Use (CMU)" designation is applied in the East Street Specific Plan area and in a key node at West Main and Ashley. The northwest area retains its industrial/service commercial nature, and the Knaggs property is designated as Urban Reserve. Gateway II is developed with general commercial and a node of high density residential. The 22 acres east of Costco and south of I-5 are designated Highway Commercial. A new Highway Commercial/Industrial Flex designation is applied to the area north of Interstate (I)-5 at County Road 102. No development occurs on the 900-acre property east of the wastewater treatment facility and the regional park designation remains park/open space in this option. Thus, this scenario is not dependent on flood solutions to meet the city's residential and employment needs.

SCENARIO B - Scenario B is intended to test partial build-out of the MPRA coupled with residential development in the northwest and along East Street north of the Community and Senior Center. The western portion of the MPRA is designated Urban Reserve, while the portion east of SR 113 is developed with a business park and a range of residential uses. The East Street and the Main Street corridors will have a mix of uses, and Downtown would include new commercial and residential development. Additional residential development occurs in the northwest portion of the General Plan planning area (north of Kentucky Avenue) on the Knaggs property, and the new Agricultural Industrial designation would be applied west of West Street, north of Kentucky Avenue. In addition to its use in the East Street Specific Plan area, the CMU designation is also applied along the West Main Street corridor. Gateway II has a mix of business park and residential development. Highway commercial uses are expanded on the 22 acre site east of Costco and further. No development occurs on the 900-acre property east of the wastewater treatment facility. The regional park site is designated for habitat conservation on a portion and the remainder as park/open space. In this scenario Downtown is seen as developing with a greater emphasis on office and retail with a moderate amount of residential development. Development in the Kentucky Avenue area would be dependent on a flooding solution in that area.

SCENARIO C - Scenario C shifts the "center of gravity" of Woodland to the east, allowing substantial new residential development to occur in the 900-acre Conaway Ranch area east of the wastewater treatment facility. The development of this area would be contingent on a comprehensive flood solution being identified and implemented, as well as a sufficient buffer created between the wastewater facility and any new development to the east. This scenario does not envision any development occurring in the MPRA during the General Plan horizon and as a result it is designated Urban Reserve, while a larger amount of residential development is assumed in the northwest. Business Park and more extensive regional commercial areas are designated along the Interstate 5 corridor in the east. Treatment of Downtown and the key corridors is similar to Scenario B; however, this scenario would place the greatest emphasis on unique commercial and entertainment uses developing in the Downtown and the least emphasis on residential in this area, to reinforce the Downtown as Woodland's core. A new designation, Kentucky Corridor Mixed Use, would be used to allow for a mix of appropriate uses and encourage enhancement of Kentucky Avenue as well as application of the Agricultural Industrial designation to help promote new businesses and private improvements to the area adjacent to the south side of the I-5. A larger amount of residential development is shown south of the Gateway II site, with a new designation of Residential Mixed Use which allows a range of densities and also requires commercial, office, and education. This new designation is also shown on the regional park site and on the property to the north. The scenario provides for a significant area of land to be identified as open space, park, and habitat corridor east of CR 102. A business park is located east of the County jail facilities. Large portions of this scenario-in the Kentucky Avenue area and in the east-would be contingent on a comprehensive flooding solution.

MAP DESIGN - For each scenario a conceptual land use diagram has been prepared. The map design shows existing General Plan land use designations faded in the background. Opportunity sites (e.g. vacant land, farmland, and underutilized land within the Urban Limit Line) are identified with black outlining. Areas where new development or changed development is proposed are shown in fully saturated color. There are also a number of new proposed land use designations which are described below. Existing General Plan Land Use definitions have been included as Attachment C.

Downtown Mixed Use (DMU). DMU allows and encourages a mix of uses, horizontal and vertical, to promote downtown revitalization. Emphasis is on specialty and local-serving retail, tourist services, offices and professional services, dining, arts, entertainment, and housing. Density/intensity standards to be determined; approximate maximum standards could be 40 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) for residential and a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 4.0 for non-residential. Applies exclusively to all or part of the Downtown Specific Plan area.

Corridor Mixed Use (CMU). CMU allows and encourages a mix of uses, horizontal and vertical, to promote corridor revitalization, but at lower intensities than DMU. Uses are less regulated; corresponding zoning should be form-based and performance-based in order to promote flexibility, minimize non-conformance issues, and focus improvements on appearance and urban design. Density/intensity standards to be determined; approximate maximum standards could be 30 du/ac for residential and 2.0 FAR for non-residential. Applies primarily, but not exclusively, to the East Street Specific Plan area and West Main Street.

powered by Legistar™

Highway Commercial/Industrial Flex (HC/IF). This designation emphasizes commercial highway uses and limited commercial service uses, while also accommodating light industrial and "green technology" uses. Auto and equipment sales, hotel and motels, and restaurants servicing the traveling public are allowed. Manufacturing, fabrication or large warehousing uses and outdoor storage are not allowed. These designations are applied in transitional gateway areas adjacent to major corridors; therefore high quality design is a critical component. Allowed intensity of land uses to be determined.

Business Park (BP). BP accommodates master planned concentrations of light industrial, research and development businesses, green technology, agriculture-related technology, and office uses. Uses with low employment intensities, such as manufacturing, warehousing and storage, are not permitted. The designation encourages walking and bicycling within the master plan areas, as well as connections to adjacent uses. The designation allows a limited amount of commercial uses, including eating establishments for workers, and visitor commercial uses adjacent to freeway corridors. Note this is a revised definition for an existing designation. Allowed intensity of land uses to be determined.

Kentucky Corridor Mixed Use. (KMU) is applied specifically to the Kentucky Avenue corridor. It allows a range of uses relating to commercial service, light industrial, and agricultural industrial to promote corridor revitalization. Uses are less regulated; corresponding zoning should be form-based and performance-based in order to promote flexibility, minimize non-conformance issues, and focus improvements on appearance and urban design. Kentucky is acknowledged to be a main truck travel corridor and as such limited residential use would be considered. Compatibility between residential and more intensive uses shall be carefully considered with the intent being to eventually reduce and possibly eliminate conflicts. Buffering requirements and intensity standards to be determined.

Agricultural Industrial (AI). AI encompasses a mix of commercial and industrial uses that directly support the agricultural economy. These could include, but are not limited to, food processing, storage facilities, agriculture-related wholesale, and equipment sales and service. Agriculture-related technology and research and development uses are not intended for this designation; rather these uses are better suited to the Business Park designation. Adjacent to an interchange, a truck service facility that serves regional long-distance truck haulers can be considered with a conditional use permit.

*Residential Mixed Use (RMU)***.** RMU provides for approximately 75 percent residential in a mixed format allowing densities to range from 8 to 25 du/ac, while requiring a mix of commercial, office, and educational uses. Development in this designation requires significantly enhanced design and amenities to tie in with regional park uses and an open space system, with enhanced treatment along the CR 102 corridor.

Urban Reserve (UR). This designation is applied to land within the Urban Limit Line (ULL) for which urban uses are assumed at a future point, but for which a determination of appropriate land use is not provided at this time. No urban development may occur on these lands prior to a comprehensive assessment of appropriate land use within the context of development (existing and trends) within the entire City and as a part of a General Plan amendment process. Allowable uses include uses specified under the Agriculture (A) and Open Space (OS) designations. Note this is a revised definition for an existing designation.

Residential Master Plan (RMP)**.** The RMP designation applies to new residential growth areas, where a mix of housing types and densities is desired. A comprehensive land use and services plan would be required for development under this designation, which may be in the form of a specific plan or mater plan. Specific plans, including content, are dictated by State law (Government Code 65450 et. seq). The term "master plan" however, is not defined by state law and allows for the City to be more flexible in the planning requirements for development in this designation.

For each RMP designation, two densities are assigned: over the entire designated area, a minimum *overall average* density must be met. In addition, individual development projects within the area (e.g. a single family subdivision or

powered by Legistar™

an apartment complex) must meet or exceed a minimum *project* density. This will allow a developer to vary the product type and mix within a larger development while ensuring that an overall target is met. Ultimately, the updated General Plan will define additional requirements for these master plan areas, such as public facilities and services to be provided. These designations are not used on infill sites.

RMP-E (Executive)

Minimum overall average density:	2 du/ac
Minimum individual project density:	1 du/ac

RMP-L (Low)

Minimum overall average density:	6 du/ac
Minimum individual project density:	4 du/ac

RMP-M (Medium)

Minimum overall average density:	12 du/ac
Minimum individual project density:	8 du/ac

RMP-H (High)

Minimum overall average density:	20 du/ac
Minimum individual project density:	16 du/ac

COMMON ELEMENTS IN ALL SCENARIOS - To assist in evaluating and to allow for comparison and contrast of selected review factors, several assumptions have been made about key elements that will be held constant in all of the scenarios.

- Encourage/promote mixed use infill in Downtown.
    - There are slight variations in the mix of infill uses, with greater residential emphasis in Scenario A, balance between residential and commercial uses in Scenario B, and predominantly commercial uses in Scenario C. Designation descriptions will be tailored once a preferred strategy is identified.
- Revitalize older commercial corridors, specifically East Street and West Main Street
- Prioritize build-out of Spring Lake Specific Plan (treatment of the Master Plan Remainder Area varies across the scenarios)
- Diversify and strengthen job base, including establishment of a business park
- Diversify and strengthen retail (build on regional presence, serve community needs, address cultural niches with different formats)
- Identify and work towards implementation of a comprehensive flood solution.
    - However, Scenario A is not contingent on a flooding solution, while a portion of Scenario B (northwest area) is contingent on a flooding solution. Large portions of Scenario C are contingent on a flooding solution.
- Enhance neighborhood connectivity, including expansion to the internal bicycle and pedestrian network and establishment of a recreational trail/path system on Woodland's periphery
- Promote good urban design
- Promote joint partnership with the Woodland Joint Unified School District and the Woodland Community

powered by Legistar™

College.

- Focus on sustainability and quality of life amenities

MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATIONS -- As part of the General Plan Update process an assessment and review of the existing General Plan land use designations and definitions will be prepared. It is anticipated that many of the land use designations will be proposed for modification to be consistent with the direction of the General Plan Update. The description of the current Urban Reserve designation will be modified to be consistent with the Urban Limit Line requirements approved by voters in 2006.

Criteria for Analysis of Alternative Land Use Scenarios

The following criteria have been identified for analysis and comparison of the test scenarios:

- Economic and fiscal impacts to the City (e.g. evaluation of the extent to which scenarios enhance economic opportunities, including tax and other general fund revenue as compared to service costs, including fire, police beats, and park acreage/amenities impacts, with an analysis of the General Fund net fiscal impact of each scenario, including sensitivity analysis for key assumptions)

- Impacts to traffic circulation, mobility, and roadway level of service (e.g. analysis based on the following performance measures: total daily vehicle miles of travel (VMT), total daily vehicle hours of travel (VHT), total daily vehicle hours of delay (VHD) or lane-miles of congested roadways, daily roadway segment LOS for up to five locations, and PM peak hour LOS for up to five intersections)

- Comparison of land use acreage by designation (e.g. total and net new acreage by General Plan land use designation will be identified, and broken down by acreage within city limits, the Sphere of Influence (SOI), and outside the SOI but within the Urban Limit Line)

- Comparison of build-out population, employment by type (e.g. retail, industrial, etc.), and housing units (e.g. estimates of population, dwelling units, and jobs will be derived from the density and intensity assumptions associated with the General Plan land use categories)

- Identification of key environmental differences (e.g. flood risk differences between scenarios and implications as related to compliance with new flood regulations at the State level; impacts to prime agricultural land; transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions; and impacts to important habitat)

- Identification of major wet utility infrastructure requirements (e.g. capacity and extent of existing water, sewer, and stormwater systems; major infrastructure extensions needed to serve new growth areas)

- General assessment of proximity of new residential to existing schools (e.g. to identify potential mis-matches between existing and planned school facility location and student generation)

- Comparison of sustainability elements (e.g. increased bicycle and pedestrian mobility, increased energy generation options, job/housing balance, density to support transit options, etc.)

- Comparison of synergistic effects (e.g. land use placement that facilitates achieving long term goals such as rail relocation; provision of services to older, underserved residential and commercial uses; flood assessment district participation, etc.)

The use of these criteria in preparing this analysis will help the public and decision-makers understand the consequences of various land use and growth options, serve as a tool for discussion of priorities, and support the development of the

preferred land use alternative later in the process.

Next Steps

Based on the direction received from the City Council at this meeting, the General Plan team will proceed with the analysis and comparison of the alternative land use scenarios. A report of the findings will be prepared and released by February 2014, along with any appropriate revisions to the Opportunities report. In February 2014 we will schedule a community workshop and meetings before the Steering Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council to review the alternatives analysis. It is anticipated that in March 2014 the City Council will be asked to identify a preferred alternative which will become the basis for the development of the Draft General Plan, Draft EIR, and Draft Climate Action Plan. These documents will be released in mid-September 2014. There will be additional public meetings in October 2014 through January 2015. A final decision on adoption of the new General Plan is anticipated in February 2015.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that the City Council receive the staff presentation(s) and following discussion and comment, direct staff to take the following actions:

1) Growth Projections -Use modified regional projections (contained herein) for General Plan land use and CEQA purposes and include General Plan policies and triggers to monitor and respond to actual growth patterns over time.

2) Alternative Land Use Scenarios -Proceed with analysis and testing of three identified land use scenarios.

3) Criteria for Analysis of Land Use Scenarios - Proceed with analysis and comparison of alternative land use scenarios as described herein.

Prepared by: Heidi Tschudin, General Plan Project Manager

Reviewed by: Cindy Norris, Principal Planner

Ken Hiatt, Community Development Director

Paul Navazio, City Manager

Attachments:

A) Scenarios A, B, C (3 pages)
B) Land Use Scenario Comparison Table
C) Current General Plan Land Use Designations (pages 1-4 through 1-9)
D) BAE Memorandum dated September 30, 2013, Retail Discussion
E) BAE Memorandum, dated September 30, 2013, Alternative Woodland Growth Projections
F) DPFG Memorandum, dated September 16, 2013