



CITY OF FORT BRAGG

Incorporated August 5, 1889
416 N. Franklin St.
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
Phone: (707) 961-2823
Fax: (707) 961-2802
ci.fort-bragg.ca.us

RECEIVED
OCT 03 2005
DIV. OF HOUSING
POLICY DEVELOPMENT HCD

September 30, 2005

Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse & Planning Unit
PO Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Dept. of Housing & Community Development
Housing Policy Division
1800 Third St., Rm 430
Sacramento, CA 94814

SUBJECT: City of Fort Bragg Annual General Plan Status Report (2004-05)

To whom it may concern:

Attached, for your information, is the City of Fort Bragg's Annual General Plan Status Report which was prepared in compliance with Government Code Section 65400(b). It was presented to the Fort Bragg City Council on September 26, 2005.

If you have questions or would like to discuss the report, please feel free to contact me at (707) 961-2823, ext. 108, or lruffing@fortbragg.com. Written comments should be directed to the Fort Bragg Community Development Department, 416 North Franklin Street, Fort Bragg, CA 95437. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda Ruffing".

Linda Ruffing
Community Development Director

Attachments

CITY OF FORT BRAGG

2004-05 ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GENERAL PLAN

RECEIVED
OCT 03 2005
DIV. OF HOUSING
POLICY DEVELOPMENT HCD



Report Accepted by City Council on September 26, 2005

BACKGROUND

State planning laws require that each year, the City Council receive a report on the status of the general plan and progress in its implementation. According to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research:

"The intent of the statute is to ensure that the General Plan directs all land use decisions and remains an effective guide for future development. Because the role of the general plan is to act as a "constitution" for the long-term physical development of a community and because it is required to be updated periodically to reflect current circumstances, it is critical that local planning agencies periodically review the general plan and its implementation. The Progress Report is a tool for doing this."

SUMMARY

Annual Report on Housing Needs. The following list identifies specific actions taken by the City in the past year to address housing needs in the community:

1. The Council adopted a comprehensive update of the City's zoning regulations (Land Use & Development Code) to implement the 2002 General Plan. These regulations address State density bonus laws, General Plan inclusionary zoning requirements, and provide additional incentives for the development of affordable housing.
2. The City completed construction of the East Oak Street Storm Drain Improvement Project to support the Rural Communities Housing Development Corporation (RCHDC) sweat-equity housing project on Hocker Lane using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.
3. The City initiated construction of the Dana Street Extension Project to support Habitat for Humanity's sweat-equity housing project on East Oak Street using CDBG funds.
4. The City completed construction of interior improvements, an addition and accessibility improvements for the Harrison Street House—a residential facility for developmentally disabled adults using CDBG funds.
5. The City initiated the planning and design phase for an addition to the Hospitality House emergency shelter using CDBG funds.
6. The City applied for and received a \$500,000 Community Development Block Grant to establish a housing rehabilitation loan program to help preserve residences owned and/or occupied by low income residents in our community.
7. In 2004, 23 building permits were issued for new single family residences (10 of which were for "affordable" residences under construction by RCHDC and Habitat for Humanity).

8. Eight new residential parcels were created by subdivisions approved by the City.
9. The City approved a use permit for a temporary winter emergency shelter that was operated by the Ukiah Community Center.
10. The Fort Bragg Redevelopment Agency contributed \$10,000 to the preparation of a countywide census on homelessness.
11. Approximately \$750,000 is available in the Redevelopment Agency Low & Moderate Income Housing Fund to assist in the production, retention and rehabilitation of affordable housing units.

Status of the General Plan. Several actions were taken by the Council during the past year relating to the General Plan, including the following:

1. In July 2004, the City adopted a comprehensive update of all of the City's land use and development regulations (Land Use & Development Code). The new Code was necessary to provide consistency with and implementation for General Plan policies. It also provides for permit-streamlining by establishing administrative review of several planning processes that previously required action by the Planning Commission.
2. In July 2004, the City adopted Citywide Design Guidelines that are intended to promote positive design characteristics in future development to preserve and enhance the character of Fort Bragg.
3. In November 2004, the City adopted General Plan Amendment 1-04 which included 14 relatively minor amendments to the General Plan. A list of amendments which were deferred for a future "clean-up" amendment is included as Attachment 1.
4. In January 2005, the City began collecting a "general plan maintenance fee" as part of the development fees collected through the building permit process. These fees are restricted revenues that the City can use to offset the costs associated with keeping the General Plan and its implementing ordinance current.

Major Planning Activities. During the past year, the City has engaged in the following major long-range planning activities:

1. The City completed the first phase of the Georgia-Pacific Mill Site Reuse Study and adopted a "Statement of Position" regarding reuse of the former Mill Site. The initial planning effort was intended to help inform the future preparation of a specific plan for the property.
2. The City completed the Mill Site Parkland Management Plan that establishes a preliminary framework for the acquisition and development of parkland and open space on the Mill Site.

3. The City entered into negotiations with Georgia-Pacific for the acquisition of approximately 78 acres of coastal parkland and received an approximately \$4.2 million grant from the State Coastal Conservancy for the acquisition.
4. Congressman Mike Thompson, on behalf of the City, has submitted a request for a Congressional Appropriation of \$2.1 million for construction of a bicycle and pedestrian trail on the new parkland.
5. The City submitted a request to the “Recreation Trails and Conservation Assistance” program run by the National Park Service for assistance with the conceptual planning and design of the coastal trail.
6. The City prepared a conceptual study for development of a wetland treatment system (marsh) on the Mill Site to enhance the City’s wastewater treatment facility.
7. The City prepared a draft Citywide Economic Development Strategy and conducted two community workshops to help refine the planning document.
8. The City conducted the first community workshop for a feasibility study for the Fort Bragg Marine Science Institute.
9. The City completed construction of the first project for the Downtown Revitalization Plan—installation of a traffic signal and streetscape improvements at the Main Street and Laurel Street intersection. Design and engineering for streetscape improvements for other parts of the central business district are underway. The City applied for and received a \$1.24 million Transportation Enhancement grant for installation of streetscape improvements in the central business district.
10. The City completed the park design phase for Pomo Bluffs Park and initiated construction of the 25-acre park project.
11. The City completed the Residential Streets Safety Plan which evaluated and prioritized safety improvements in its residential neighborhoods. Based on the Plan, a “Safe Routes to Schools” grant application was submitted in the 2005 funding cycle.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Table 1 - Potential Future General Plan “Clean Up” Amendments

**TABLE 1
POTENTIAL FUTURE GENERAL PLAN "CLEAN UP" AMENDMENTS**

No.	Type of Amendment	Proposed Change(s)	Comments
1	Visual Resource Policy	<p>Delete Program LU-4.2.2 (p. 21) pertaining to maintaining scenic views of the coast by requiring sufficient separation between buildings and by preventing a continuous façade of buildings that would block scenic views of the coastline.</p> <p><i>Variation:</i> Refine Program LU-4.2.2 to address view corridors on Mill Site through specific plans and identification of "areas where it is practical to implement and preserve visual corridors to the westerly viewshed."</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review necessary. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed. Council direction required.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend clarification of intent of program relative to development on the west side of Main Street in general, and the G-P Mill Site, in particular.</p>
2	Visual Resource Policy	<p>Delete last sentence of Program LC-5.1.2 (p. 44) which states "The forested area north of the Georgia-Pacific nursery and south of Maple Street shall be maintained as a sensitive natural habitat and scenic resource, and it shall not be developed."</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
3	Visual Resource Policy	<p>Refine Program LC-5.1.3 (p. 45) requiring preparation of a Visual Analysis for all projects involving two or more dwelling units and all commercial and industrial development that would impact a significant viewshed of the coast.</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
4	Map LC-3 "Scenic Views in the Coastal Zone"	<p>General Plan needs to identify scenic viewsheds and the City needs to assume responsibility for purchase and maintenance of the views.</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
5	Visual Resource Policy	<p>Delete Program LC-5.2.1 (p. 45) requiring new development north of Pudding Creek and west of Main Street to leave a minimum of 30 percent of the frontage undeveloped.</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>

No.	Type of Amendment	Proposed Change(s)	Comments
6	Visual Resource Policy	Remove reference to views from Program CD-1.5.1 (p. 86) which calls for adoption of additional Design Guidelines for scenic views and resources.	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
7	ESHA Policy and Map LC-2	Modify Program LC-3.1.4 (p. 40) which specifies that the boundaries of special review areas shall be mapped as information becomes available, and Map LC-2 which identifies general location of sensitive resources.	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed. Council direction required.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend that Map LC-2 be modified to combine runoff sensitive areas and special review areas, and to remove special review area designation on properties bordering North Harbor Drive. Add clarifying language on p. 39 to explain that map indicates areas that <u>may</u> contain ESHA or have runoff issues. Also, revise definition of ESHA on page 39 to coincide with Coastal Act definition.</p>
8	ESHA Policy	Delete Program LC-3.2.3 (p. 42) which prohibits the creation of new parcels which are located entirely within an environmentally sensitive habitat area buffer.	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed. Council direction required.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend revision to policy that clarifies that it does not pertain to parcels established for open space, recreation and conservation purposes.</p>
9	ESHA Policy	Delete Policy LC-3.3 <u>Noyo River Wetlands</u> (p. 42) which permits only wetlands restoration and related conservation and habitat restoration projects in the special review areas on the Noyo River.	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed. Council direction required.</p> <p><i>Clarification:</i> This policy was</p>

No.	Type of Amendment	Proposed Change(s)	Comments
			<p>only intended to apply to wetland areas along the Noyo, not to all special review areas. Recommend revising policy to clarify its applicability.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend revising policy to identify <u>all</u> "allowable uses" in wetland areas per Coastal Act Section 30233.</p>
10	ESHA Policy	<p>Modify or delete Policy LC-3.4 <u>Dredging and Filling</u> (p. 42) to ensure that grading and vegetation removal can occur at Pomo Bluffs Park property.</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed. Council direction required.</p> <p><i>Clarification:</i> Policy LC-3.4 would not prevent grading and vegetation removal at Pomo Bluffs Park except in locations where rare plants occur (ESHA).</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend revising policy to separate grading/vegetation removal and dredging/filling requirements in ESHAs. Grading and vegetation removal policy should include (a) and (b), as stated. Dredging and filling policy should allow dredging and filling for all of the uses identified in Coastal Act Section 30233 (i.e., coastal-dependent industrial uses, public recreational piers, aquaculture, etc.)</p>
11	Land Use Policy	<p>Modify Floor Area Ratios in commercial districts to allow for increased FARs when residential units are created above the ground floor.</p>	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
12	Secondary Dwelling Unit	<p>Delete Program CD-1.3.1 and CD 1.3.2 (p. 85) and modify Program H-2.5.1 <u>Secondary Dwelling Unit Design</u> (p. 118) to eliminate the requirement for</p>	<p>Significant policy revision.</p> <p><i>Clarification:</i> Design Review</p>

No.	Type of Amendment	Proposed Change(s)	Comments
	Policy	<p>design review for secondary units.</p> <p><i>Variation:</i> Modify Program CD-1.3.1 to exempt single story conforming second units from Design Review unless staff determines that there is clear evidence of intrusion to a neighbor's privacy.</p>	<p>would be provided administratively (i.e., no hearing required) based on objective standards established in the Land Use & Development Code.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
13	Secondary Dwelling Unit Policy	Change policies to allow secondary units in some cases where the street width is less than 36'.	<p>Significant policy revision.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
14	Open Space Policy	Delete Policy OS-5.1 <u>Forested Areas</u> (p. 53) which calls for maintenance of existing forested areas and reforestation of parks and streetscapes with new trees as needed.	<p>Significant policy revision. CEQA review required.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Council direction required.</p>
15	ESHA Policy and Map LC-2	Perform additional studies to specifically identify environmentally sensitive habitat areas along the coastline to identify locations where new ocean intake and discharge pipelines may be constructed to support coastal-dependent uses on the G-P Mill Site.	<p>Not Recommended. Attempting to specifically identify ESHA resources along coastline would be extremely costly and time-consuming and, therefore, is not recommended. Map LC-2 indicates the location of Special Review and Runoff Sensitive Areas. It does not attempt to identify the specific boundaries of ESHAs, but rather indicates where further assessments are needed.</p>
16	Land Use Policy	Consider changing zoning along Main Street north of Pudding Creek from Industrial to Highway Commercial.	<p>Not Recommended. Significant policy revision. CEQA review required. Coastal Act consistency evaluation needed.</p>
17	Land Use Policy	Amend Policy LU-4.2 to delete the language limiting a new commercial building between the Noyo River and Pudding Creek bridges to a maximum of 50,000 square feet.	<p>Submitted by G-P in 2003. G-P is concerned that this policy might preclude development of a major hotel or destination resort, convention center, aquarium, marine research facility or other beneficial uses.</p>

No.	Type of Amendment	Proposed Change(s)	Comments
			<p><i>Clarification:</i> The discussion when this was formulated centered primarily around scale issues associated with big box retail uses.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend refinement of policy to exempt institutional and other public benefit uses.</p>
18	Land Use Policy	Amend Program LU-4.2.1 to delete the language limiting commercial development west of Highway One between the Noyo River and Pudding Creek bridges to a height of 28 feet.	<p>Submitted by G-P in 2003. G-P is concerned that this policy might preclude development of a major hotel or destination resort, convention center, aquarium, marine research facility or other beneficial uses.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend refinement of policy to exempt institutional and other public benefit uses.</p>
19 (same as 1, above)	Land Use Policy	Delete Program LU-4.2.2 which specifies that commercial development west of Highway One must maintain "scenic views of the coast by requiring sufficient separation between buildings and by preventing a continuous façade of buildings that would block scenic views of the coastline."	<p>Submitted by G-P in 2003. G-P is concerned that this requirement is overly proscriptive and suggests that a similar result could be obtained by language specifying that "scenic views from public roadways to the coast shall be protected."</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Recommend clarification of intent of program relative to development on the west side of Main Street in general, and the G-P Mill Site, in particular.</p>
20	Land Use Policy	Amend Map LC-1 and corresponding text to specify that development of the G-P property may not provide the vertical access specified, so long as	<p>Submitted by G-P in 2003. G-P believes that the final determination of</p>

No.	Type of Amendment	Proposed Change(s)	Comments
		<p>alternative vertical access of equal access value is provided.</p>	<p>appropriate vertical access should be determined when specific development is proposed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i> Staff recommends that the policy language be modified to specify that vertical access points shall be identified in the specific plan for the Mill Site.</p>