

December 26, 2010

Re: Land Use Section, Fairhaven Neighborhood Plan Draft

From: Janet Simpson

Most of the suggested changes to the Land Use Section seem appropriate. Some of the current Land Use Regulations were included because it was our understanding from Jackie Lynch that we should include those in order to make sure that they were not lost. Apparently that was a misunderstanding. We do continue to affirm that current regulations need to stay in place. There are some places where we consider the comments on regulation as policy, not regulation, and we believe that they should be included here. Overall, we certainly appreciate improved language and land use expertise.

In the sections where you say there needs to be a rezone, Type VI process, I read that just as a notation. We understand that we're asking for rezones. We are indicating the directions that we wish those to go.

p. 44, paragraph 5, last sentence. Perhaps we could change to: "Numerous residents, commercial owners, and commercial property owners contributed to elements of this plan." (We aren't saying everyone agrees, but we do think there should be recognition on those who worked on it.)

FLUG-1 – I believe you're agreeing to keeping this. Perhaps we could add: "This can be done through an urban village master planning process." This is a goal. FLUP-1 is a policy statement. As in the Comp Plan, things are sometimes repeated. I believe our goal is that these be re-assessed. Since we don't currently know what all stakeholders want to achieve, I'm not sure we can include that in the goal.

FLUG-6 – Could add: "required by the Critical Areas Ordinance and *updated as needed as new best science becomes available, especially to determine setbacks and other needs.*"

FLUP-4 -- ...pedestrian friendly character of the area (add) "*and have been endorsed by a significant neighborhood survey.*"

Under A: - Add 2nd sentence" "*It is suggested that new development regulations include provisions that heights above a standard height of 35 feet...*

We consider this a policy statement, including criteria, and believe it should be present to direct regulations.

B. is also a policy statement. Maybe would be clearer if said: The industrial function need *for height* should be used.... We don't include criteria here because that probably would be more appropriate in regulations.

C & D are extensions of regulations to a greater area and were included both, as said above re. our understanding. I don't think we have a significant need to have these here.

FLUP-5 6 , 8– These may be addressed in the Master Village Plan but we also think they should be here as policy.

FLUP-15 – Perhaps rather than “ensure” we should say “seek” or “recommend.” . I’m hoping that your notes indicate questions that would be answered by the City. Again, this is a policy that we would like.

FLUP-19 - This was a designation we worked out with the Port rep. I bow to your better knowledge of what exists. I believe the purpose was to move from the Marine limitation and add planning.

FLUP-35 - I believe the change is in the addition of “design review, view, height, and parking restrictions” and because we are asking to combine 2A & 2B which do have different regulations. We are asking that the new 2 have this zoning.

Area 5: Comment re. FLUP 1-8 - We believe those policies should apply to this area.

FLUP 33-34 – Again, included because we understood we needed to in order to maintain them.

FLUP 35 – I believe the addition is the “with shoreline, design review, height and view conditions.” Those are not in the current zoning.

FLUP-38 – Do our visions need to completely agree with that plan? Can we say “It would be desirable for the neighborhood to add additional community gardens in this area.”

Area 8, FLUP-40 - addition of “design review.” Is what I believe is different.

Area 9/9A, FLUP-41. – The two areas have slightly different zoning; we were seeking to combine them into the one mentioned.

Area 10, 2nd paragraph. “ *As expansion of the sewage treatment plan occurs, we would still hope to maintain parts of this area as open space.....*” Our policy would not be that all open space goes away

FLUP – 42 - We don’t want to delete this as a policy. Perhaps a way to combine....I don’t think the plans are inconsistent with what we have said here.

Area 11 - I believe that we are state a policy that expands the protection beyond what is currently given. Your wording changes that. Why can’t we keep the policy statement as is? The CAO and perhaps Shoreline Master Plan will change over time.

Thank You.