

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Item: 47/28/2016

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions – applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects – requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions – applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects – requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions – applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects – requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions - applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects - requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions – applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects – requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions – applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects – requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.

**Summary Table of Issues
Local Serving Uses – Report Back
July 28 Planning Commission Hearing**

Issue Area	Issue Summary	Options
Living 75% Threshold	75% Threshold intended to modify following each approval, resulting in (a) focus on threshold change, not project, during project hearings, and (b) Creates uncertainty for applicants which policy threshold to reference during application process	(a) Maintain as is (b) Modify - Require longer period of time for review of statistical data prior to changing threshold (5-10 years) (c) Modify to be fixed threshold.
Creation of a Cap to replace a threshold	SMPAC Letter has requested that the threshold be converted to a Cap to place an ultimate limit on the size of local serving uses	(a) Maintain as is. Allow more time and case studies regarding application of local serving policies to new projects before considering change to existing threshold approach. (b) Modify the local serving provisions to convert threshold to cap, could be higher level (100%) than the 75% percentile threshold.
Cumulative Analysis	Public input / SMPAC discussion has commented that the thresholds do not adequately account for cumulative impacts from multiple proposed local serving uses collectively upon rural communities such as SMPAC	(a) Maintain as is. Cumulative Impacts evaluated in CEQA. Cumulative Impacts accounted for with change in background environment if new projects approved. (b) Modify Local Serving provisions to require more formal review of cumulative impacts.
Parking Ratios for Institutional Uses	SMPAC Letter has requested change in parking standards (Institutional Uses) from 1 per 4 seats to 1 per 2 seats	(a) Maintain as is. (b) Modify to change standard – requires additional research to support creation of new standard.

Clean up of Terminology and References	Several instances of references and terminology in Zoning Ordinance related to Local Serving Uses that are inconsistent.	(a) Modify to clean up.
Mixed Use Projects and Local Serving Provisions	Unclear in Local Serving Provisions - applicability of provisions to other uses such as Agricultural and Residential	(a) Text Amendments to clarify applicability of provisions (b) Modify provisions to apply to broader classification of projects - requires additional research and broader evaluation of shift in overall land use policies with potential ramifications.