

Draft Refined Preferred Plan

Prepared for the Woodland General Plan Steering Committee Meeting, June 9, 2015

1 Background and Objectives

The Draft Refined Preferred Plan is based on findings from the Development Scenarios Analysis and feedback from various stakeholders, including decision makers, the General Plan Steering Committee (GPSC) and community members. Community input thus far has pointed to numerous areas of agreement about the Preferred Plan; for instance, strengthening the historic downtown district and promoting orderly growth that does not detract from the downtown core were identified as top priorities by the many stakeholders.

Building on this input, the objective of the Draft Refined Preferred Plan and supporting materials is to engage the GPSC in a discussion about the key questions and issue areas where policy direction is unresolved. The following memorandum presents the main issue areas of the Preferred Plan, a description of the draft policy direction based on input from the community, and finally a list of topics or questions where input from the GPSC is needed to determine the preferred policy direction for the General Plan.

2 Issue Areas

INFILL DOWNTOWN AND ON KEY CORRIDORS

Mixed-use and commercial infill development will be prioritized and allowed to proceed at any time. Infill sites where redevelopment is likely to occur are clustered in the downtown area and along the Main Street and East Street corridors. Additionally, the updated General Plan will include policies that provide meaningful incentives and remove constraints to promote development Downtown and along these key corridors.

SPECIFIC PLAN AREAS

The Development Scenarios Analysis evaluated the impacts of development occurring in three different specific plan (SP) areas: the south, known as SP-1 (which largely overlaps with the Spring Lake Master Plan Remainder Area or MPRA); the east, known as SP-2 (which consists of the City-owned 900 acre property and several other adjacent parcels north and south of I-5); and the north, known as SP-3 (which is largely bounded by Kentucky Avenue on the south, I-5 to the north, and the railroad tracks to the east). SP-1 was also broken into three sub-areas: A (east of Highway 113), B (between East Street and Highway 113) and C (west of East Street).

SP-1

Buildout of the Spring Lake Specific Plan will remain the first priority of new development areas. Once development in Spring Lake reaches a certain level, development in the SP-1/MPRA area may proceed. Project proponents may begin preparation of a Specific Plan for this area at any time, and this specific plan may include just SP-1A or additional areas. Unlike SP-2 and SP-3, this area does not require a flood solution to be in place. Additionally, infrastructure installed for the Spring Lake Specific Plan has already been sized to accommodate growth in the MPRA.

SP-2

Conditions must exist, including funding and design of a comprehensive flood solution, before preparation of a Specific Plan or any development in SP-2 will be allowed to proceed..

SP-3

Development in the SP-3 area that is consistent with underlying General Plan land use designations may occur at any time, provided that such development does not preclude the implementation of a future locally preferred flood solution. If development on any parcel in the SP-3 area would require a General Plan Amendment (e.g. if a residential use is desired), a Specific Plan for SP-3 area would be required. The Specific Plan must also identify and include a funding strategy for a flood solution identified if the proposed development is to occur on flood-affected properties.

Gateways

Numerous stakeholders expressed that Woodland’s gateways to the north and south should be enhanced, regardless of where residential growth occurs, in order to better draw regional visitors and create an improved “sense of arrival” into Woodland. The South Gateway is located within the SP-1/MPRA area at the Country Road 25A exit of Highway 113. The General Plan will promote improvements in this area intended to create a vibrant gateway with commercial or agriculture technology (AgTech) uses and/or a business park. Development in the South Gateway may be allowed to proceed at any time, even if a Specific Plan for the larger SP-1/MPRA area has not been approved.

The North Gateway is located within the SP-3 area, south of I-5 at the West Street exit. Like the South Gateway, the General Plan will promote improvements to the North Gateway, creating a commercial and/or AgTech hub. As with other areas to the north and east of the city, flooding issues will be a development constraint in this area, unless a flood solution is designed and funded.

In addition, the General Plan will include a policy to review and potentially amend the Entryway Overlay Zone (EOZ) as it applies to these two areas, providing additional development standards and design guidelines as necessary to achieve the Plan’s objectives.

INDUSTRIAL AREA

Development in the industrial area to the northeast will be encouraged at any time. Given that this area is vulnerable to flooding, in the absence of a comprehensive flood solution, the General Plan will include information on which properties are most likely to develop without a flood solution

in place and provide policies to encourage development and strengthen the industrial area's viability in a flood-constrained environment. An assessment district will be needed in the future to help finance flood control and/or other infrastructure improvements.

TARGET GROWTH IN PLANNING PERIOD (THROUGH 2035)

The Development Scenarios Report analyzed a range of residential growth through 2035, per the City Council's direction. The scenarios contemplated adding 4,000 new housing units (0.8 percent annual growth) on the low end to approximately 9,000 new housing units (1.7 percent annual growth). A range of job growth was also considered, ranging from approximately 8,600 to 11,000 new jobs by 2035.

Feedback from the community workshop indicated that the Preferred Plan should accommodate residential growth in the midpoint of the range analyzed (between 6,500 and 7,500 new housing units by 2035). Participants did not express a desired job growth rate per se; rather, robust job growth that keeps pace with (or exceeds) residential growth was desired. Participants also placed a high priority on the *quality* of jobs gained, rather than just quantity. The Refined Draft Preferred Plan should target a rate of job growth that is even with or slightly higher than housing unit growth, approximately 1.5-1.6 percent annually. Strong economic development policies, to support land use planning, are a necessity to achieve this growth rate.

OTHER GROWTH-RELATED POLICIES AND REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the policies described above pertaining to the development of the various specific plan areas, such as needing a flood solution in place for development of SP-2, several other requirements would apply to development in any new specific plan area. These include:

- Annexation and tax sharing agreements negotiated with Yolo County for currently unincorporated areas
- Development Agreements established with the City to accompany any new Specific Plan or master plan (e.g. the Woodland Commerce Center in the industrial area)
- Preparation of a Corridor Plan or significant update to the East Street Specific Plan (and accompanying subsequent General Plan Amendment) if the rail line along East Street were to be relocated

3 Policy Questions

The following list presents policy questions that the Preferred Plan must address. The City would like input from the GPSC members regarding where they fall on the “policy spectrum” for each one of these questions.

Policies are typically written to fall on a “spectrum” of flexibility to restrictiveness. The range in typical wording includes:

Spectrum of Flexibility (Carrot vs. Stick)

Require	vs.	Prohibit
Encourage	vs.	Discourage
Incentives	vs.	Penalties
Allow	vs.	Prevent
Promote	vs.	Limit

With this framework in mind, think about what might constitute more or less restrictive policies for each of the following topics. Where do you fall on the spectrum for each one?

1. Consider the means by which to encourage, require, and/or promote infill development. For example:
 - Limit peripheral growth
 - Impose fees or assessments on greenfield development to support infill needs
 - Reduce fees for infill
 - Reduce affordability requirements for infill
2. Triggers, timing, requirements to move from development of the Spring Lake Specific Plan to the next Specific Plan Area (likely SP-1/MPRA). For example:
 - Allow moving to the MPRA
 - Encourage the planning process to begin as it can take several years for the planning and environmental work to be completed
 - Restrict commencement of residential construction in MPRA until certain % of build out of Spring Lake.
3. Considerations on moving from SP-1/MPRA to the next peripheral development area(s) for residential development. Consider:
 - Should there be limits on the number of Specific Plans going at one time?
 - Impact to the General Fund
 - High cost of investment in initial infrastructure
 - Dilution of focus to multiple areas could delay amenities and improvements

- Providing many options allows for infusion of new infrastructure and development to an area
 - Ability to fund needed school facilities and school transportation needs for students outside school boundaries.
 - Assuming a flood solution is designed and funded, what triggers and/or considerations should be made in choosing between East (SP-2) or North (SP-3) as the next development area?
 - What key aspects of the future community’s development should be considered when evaluating where to move the focus of development, including, accessibility, fiscal implications, community character, etc.?
4. Should development happen around the two “gateway” interchanges independent of specific plans? If so, what is the best way to encourage this, given constraints and costs?
- Incentives to encourage business park development
 - Allow a broad mix of uses in these areas to encourage a mix of development.
 - Residential pays for a larger share of the infrastructure burden to encourage business park and commercial uses.
 - Business Park and commercial at the interchange to not be subject to any build out criteria.
 - Pre-entitle desired development through the General Plan, EIR, zoning and tax sharing, etc...
5. Should the development of jobs and housing be connected? If so, what is the best way to do this?
- Require new job generating land uses as part of each new growth area.
 - Incorporate policies and triggers in entitlements for new residential growth areas that tie residential permits to new commercial development. Require an analysis with new development of like quality and quantity of jobs to serve future residents of the development
 - Require that more dimensions of the jobs/housing relationship be explored including balance (numbers of jobs vs homes), match (local wages as compared to local home prices), and phasing (number of jobs vs number of homes at any given point)
6. Overall, how should the desires for “flexibility” and “orderly growth” be balanced? Can they both occur or are they mutually exclusive? Consider the implications of each.
- Allow flexibility to accommodate new ideas and market situations
 - Balance this with strategic fiscal policies that ensure that development is fiscally sound and the city does not overreach on desired amenities that may not be able to be funded
 - If preserving Prime farmland within the Urban Limit Line is a priority, should this provision go back to the voters to amend the ULL boundary?

Appendix: Agriculture Impacts

All new growth areas are located within the Urban Limit Line (ULL), approved by the voters in 2006. The ULL was enacted to designate adequate land to allow for development and densification of Woodland over the long term while preserving and protecting agricultural, natural resource, and open space uses outside the boundary.

Some of the land proposed for development within the ULL has yet to be annexed. In those cases, upon annexation and development, property owners would need to comply with agricultural mitigation requirements (typically one acre permanently conserved for every acre converted to urban development or other non-agricultural uses). In addition, Yolo County and its cities are currently working on the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP), which when adopted will set forth additional mitigation requirements that would apply to newly developed property.

The California Department of Conservation defines six different categories of agricultural land:

- **Prime Farmland** has the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields.
- **Farmland of Statewide Importance** is similar to prime farmland, but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture.
- **Unique Farmland** consists of lesser quality soils used for the production of the State's leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but may include nonirrigated orchards or vineyards as found in some climatic zones in California.
- **Farmland of Local Importance** is cultivated farmland that has soils which meet the criteria for prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance, except that the land is not presently irrigated. This category might also include other nonirrigated farmland.
- **Farmland of Local Potential** is prime or statewide soils that are not presently irrigated or cultivated.
- **Grazing Land** is land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock.

Woodland contains all six types of agricultural land within the areas designated for Specific Plans 1, 2 and 3. Development of the entirety of SP-1/MPRA would have the largest impact on Prime Farmland, converting 701 acres, or approximately 45 percent of the Prime Farmland located within the city's ULL. Specifically, SP-1A would convert 367 acres, SP-1B would convert 199 acres and SP-1C would convert 135 acres. Development of SP-3 would also have a significant impact on Prime Farmland, converting 391 acres to urban uses. Conversely, development of SP-2 would have very little impact on Prime Farmland, converting only 9 acres. However, much of the

other land within the SP-2 area is still classified as farmland of lesser quality, which would still be impacted.

Table 1 shows the amount of farmland in each category that would be converted within each specific plan area.

Table 1: Converted Farmland within Specific Plan Areas by Category (acres)

<i>Specific Plan Area</i>	<i>Prime Farmland</i>	<i>Farmland of Statewide Importance</i>	<i>Unique Farmland</i>	<i>Farmland of Local Importance</i>	<i>Farmland of Local Potential</i>	<i>Grazing Land</i>	<i>Total</i>
SP-1	701	0	0	0	31	0	732
<i>SP-1a</i>	367	0	0	0	10	0	377
<i>SP-1b</i>	199	0	0	0	21	0	220
<i>SP-1c</i>	135	0	0	0	0	0	135
SP-2	9	392	414	0	39	135	989*
SP-3	391	0	0	21	42	0	454*
Total Acreage	1,101	392	414	21	112	135	2,175

*Note: Acreage represents the entirety of SP-2 and SP-3, whereas the Development Scenarios Analysis assumed that only approximately 25 percent of SP-2 (roughly 250 acres) and/or 50 percent of SP-3 (roughly 300 acres) would be likely to develop by 2035.

Sources: *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), 2012; City of Woodland, 2013; Yolo County, 2013; SACOG Mapping Center, 2013; Dyett and Bhatia, 2015*