

Summary of Comments Received on General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

These comments were reviewed as part of a special meeting with the Planning and Zoning Commission on April 29, 2015. Recommendations reflect the Planning and Zoning Commission’s discussion and preferred direction on each of these items, as reflected in the May 2015 General Plan Adoption Draft.

Comments	How is this addressed in the current draft?	Recommendation
CHAPTER 2: VISION		
<p>Has been mostly reduced to a single page and many of the earlier wordage has been omitted. (??)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The March draft includes the same vision statement that was included in earlier drafts; the longer vision statement was proposed as part of the March hearings before the Planning Commission (based on comments received.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry forward longer vision statement as requested by the Planning Commission.
CHAPTER 3: GROWTH MANAGEMENT		
<p>Urban Containment Boundary- consider adding text identifying this as the limit line for City financed infrastructure that any development outside of this boundary will be at the developers’ sole expense. (Rationale provided by State Land Department: This clarifies that development can occur beyond the boundary but the developer will be responsible for all costs associated with the extension and sizing of City infrastructure for supporting the development.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy GM.1.1a and GM.1.1b (page 15) – intent of the suggested language is implied, but could be stated more directly. Discussion of Growth Management Plan on page 18 provides similar language as proposed for the Water Service Boundary, but does not specifically address the distinction between City financed infrastructure and private as it relates to the Urban Containment Boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add language as proposed within GM.1.1a and GM.1.1b on page 15 and at the end of the Urban Containment Boundary paragraph on page 18 (first bullet) for clarity.
CHAPTER 4: LAND USE		
<p>Resort island concepts fly in the face of the actual potential uses (e.g., land use category states that RV/manufactured home parks are not permitted within the Resort-Related classification, but State Land Department leases allow)</p>	<p>See existing Resort categories on pages 34-35.</p>	<p>See below.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

Comments	How is this addressed in the current draft?	Recommendation
<p>Combine Resort Related Mainland and Resort Related Island extending this over the Trust land for the entire island (except for the existing RV parks and Nautical Inn which remain resort related) into a single Resort District with the following primary and secondary uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary uses: resort related commercial and retail uses, medium to high-density resort residential uses, such as condominiums, townhouses, apartments, patio homes, and extended stay timeshares/hotels. • Secondary uses: incidental services, commercial and retail uses such as boat rentals, sales and repairs, hotels, motels, restaurants, retail, accessory recreational uses such as marinas, golf courses, parks and recreational trails; accessory structures. <p>(Rationale provided by the State Land Department: the island plan for Pittsburg Point has been in place since the late 80's with very little development activity outside of the existing concession agreements. By expanding the list of approved uses there is a stronger likelihood of attracting new development to the island. The long held community vision of restricting residential development is not effective and the reuse of the airport property validates the residential demand for the undeveloped parts of the island. Secondly, the remaining parcels are not large enough to support a large resort but rather smaller casita oriented development anchored by a central activity center.)</p>	<p>See existing Resort categories on pages 34-35.</p>	<p>Apply the Resort Related Island category to State Land Department land on the Island.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

Comments	How is this addressed in the current draft?	Recommendation
<p>For the tables contained in the Growth Projections and Capacity section (page 38-42) -would like to see specific ratios to our market instead of general assumptions (population growth, retail and office needs, etc.)</p>	<p>General assumptions were made based on an updated HH size and rule of thumb estimates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add average densities used for residential and non-residential calculations for clarity • Remove references to potential population served in all non-residential tables—estimates were provided in 2003 plan and were updated based on draft plan.
<p>How do the R/UDAT plan, Bridgewater Overlay District plan, and the Swagger report effect the General Plan and what may or may not be implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft plan references supporting plans and studies at the end of each chapter. The R/UDAT and Bridgewater Overlay District are most applicable to Chapter 4: Land Use. Their recommendations are generally reflected by Guiding Principle LU.2: Distinct character areas to reinforce Lake Havasu City’s vitality and sense of place and the supporting goals and policies. • The Land Use Classifications on pages 33-37 (Resort and Commercial/Mixed-Use/Employment) have been updated to reflect recommendations by the R/UDAT and Bridgewater Overlay District that had previously been implemented through the Development Code. 	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Keep the shoreline accessible to the public for free</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable land use category descriptions on pages 34 and 35 address the need to incorporate public access easements along the shoreline consistent with state and federal laws. • Goal OS 2.2.and supporting policies OS.2.2a – Public Lake Access and OS.2.2b-Shoreline 	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

Comments	How is this addressed in the current draft?	Recommendation
	<p>Acquisition also reinforce the community’s objectives surrounding the shoreline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The third recommended action under Guiding Principle OS.2 addresses high priority areas for shoreline acquisition. 	
<p>In discussing public lands, I would encourage the City to explore potential reassignment or transfer of State or Federal land to City-owned land for public or private use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This issue is framed by the discussion on page 14 (Public land leases) and page 50 (Public land leases) and is supported by policy EC.1.3.d-Public Lands on page 53 and the last recommended action under Guiding Principle EC.1 on page 90. 	<p>No change.</p>
<p>I am encouraged to see that ADOT is finally making my earlier thoughts come about by working on the roadside landscaping on Hwy 95 as they have done in Phoenix and other cities. Mention should be made, however, of the large amount of improper commercial use of the State land alongside the upper portion of our Hwy. 95, mostly by automobile and boat businesses. This land use avoids City and County property tax on that land and is not an attractive appearance</p>		<p>No change.</p>
<p>LU GOAL 2.5. The ASU promotion is very good, but more needs to be added regarding MCC.</p>	<p>(page 51) EC.1.1c: Continuing Education/Workforce Development—Support the efforts of ASU, MCC, and NAU to expand educational and employment opportunities for the residents of Lake Havasu City and workforce development opportunities for existing and future employers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. The ASU campus has some very distinct land use considerations that the MCC campus does not. The importance of MCC is clearly addressed by EC.1.1c.
<p>Remove zoning designations from Table 3-1. Land Use Classifications to avoid confusion and maintain a clear distinction between the General Plan and Development Code.</p>	<p>See page 33.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove ‘zoning district(s)’ column and associated language from the discussion above.

Comments	How is this addressed in the current draft?	Recommendation
CHAPTER 5: HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS		
<p>City-owned parcels in originally platted neighborhoods should be retained as informal open space consistent with McCulloch’s vision</p>	<p><u>HN.2.1.f – Remnant Parcels</u>: Consider the sale of individual City-owned remnant parcels in the originally platted areas for conversion to residential uses or private open space based on an evaluation of access, site size, and other considerations as opportunities arise. (See page 46)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed language is based on current City policy with regard to these parcels; a change in policy would require input from the City Council. In addition, the vast majority of the parcels referenced are not suitable for development, due to access, grade differences, or other constraints. Therefore, it is anticipated that the overall number of remnant parcels that would be converted to a more intensive use would be limited. Keeping language as is pending further guidance from City Council; however, add the following statement: Maintain ownership of parcels needed to support existing or planned City-facilities.
<p>Proposed plan seems to promote a “mix of housing types” and “planned neighborhoods.” I do not think our residents want to see a conglomeration of various housing types. Residents depend on the zoning regulations for their neighborhood and I feel this is a worthwhile, positive concern. A large number of residents that I have communicated with feel that a very strong asset of our housing is the diversity of each residence from its neighbors so we do not look like blocks of identical looking homes like</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 5: Housing and Neighborhoods does encourage a mix of housing types to support the City’s changing needs (in targeted areas). Recognizing the community’s concern about maintaining the single family feel of the originally platted neighborhoods, Policy HN.1.1a-describes specifically where a greater mix of housing types will be encouraged (in areas designated for Medium or High Density Residential on the Future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify HN.1.2.a – Location efficient development to say “<u>Ensure new</u> residential development <u>occurs</u> in locations...” rather than “encourage” Modify HN 1.2.b- Neighborhood Identities to say, “<u>Ensure new</u> planned neighborhoods have a distinct

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

Comments	How is this addressed in the current draft?	Recommendation
<p>in many cities.</p>	<p>Land Use Plan map or as part of a larger planned development in accordance with City Standards and Ordinances).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, the current draft distinguishes between the desired characteristics for <u>new</u> residential neighborhoods (see Goal HN 1.2 and supporting policies) and the need to protect established neighborhoods (see Guiding Principle HN.2. and supporting goals and policies). Planned neighborhoods are addressed with the understanding that new developments will likely be proposed within the planning area at some point in the future. These policies confirm the City’s expectations for such developments if and when they are proposed. 	<p>identity...and that <u>new</u> developments relate positively to adjacent existing development.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Switch the order of Guiding Principles HN.1 and HN.2 to reinforce considerations for established neighborhoods first.
<p>HN1.2g School Capacity. I do not think this is a Municipal Government function.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See page 46: HN.1.2g.-School Capacity- Coordinate with the Lake Havasu Unified School District to ensure schools have the current or potential capacity to support the increased enrollment generated by new planned developments. 	<p>No change. Ongoing communication and coordination with the school district is essential and a routine practice for cities as they plan for the future. The policy is intended to trigger discussions at the appropriate time so that school capacity is considered (along with a range of other issues) when large new developments are presented to the City for consideration. It also ensures the school district can weigh in on any concerns they may have regarding school capacity at the appropriate time.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

CHAPTER 6: ECONOMY		
More attention to the economic role of the mall.	EC-1.1f Regional Retail (page 51) generally addresses the issue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add reference to the need to prioritize support for existing retail centers, such as the mall.
The restoration of the English Village should be discussed with an emphasis on helping our tourism business as well as making the area once again inviting to our residents.	Goal LU2.4 (page 26) and the supporting policies below address this area building on prior recommendations for the Bridgewater Channel area.	No change.
Tourism- on the island and in town. How the city will continue to promote, and manage these events?	Chapter 6 focuses extensively on tourism issues and the City’s many partners in this area. (pg. 49)	No change.
“Wayfinding” is a very controversial item among our residents. It should be carefully treated.	EC.1.1e-Wayfinding Signage (pg. 52) supports ongoing efforts related to this issue as a key component of promoting tourism.	No change.
CHAPTER 7: CIRCULATION		
2nd bridge not saying that it has to happen, but including it into the general plan and describing ways to accumulate funds to accomplish it and being transparent with the public of the actual location and the impact it will have on the immediate surroundings.	CC.2.1c—Access to the Island: Expand McCulloch Boulevard to four lanes on the Island and encourage the development of the second bridge to the Island area (that includes pedestrian and bicycle access) to promote the Island’s development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add “and address safety considerations” to the end of CC.2.1c. Continue to work with the MPO on the development of the Regional Transportation Plan and update this chapter as needed.
I have not read in detail about traffic, but the traffic on McCulloch, Swanson, and Mesquite, we should be thinking about.	Guiding Principle CC.1 (page 57) and supporting goals and policies address considerations related to the efficiency of the transportation system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change. The City’s Small Area Transportation Plan and the forthcoming RTP address (or will address) specific transportation needs in more detail.
Definitely need to address the need for a second bridge. This could even be added to Chapter 10.	CC.2.1c—Access to the Island: Expand McCulloch Boulevard to four lanes on the Island and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add “and address safety considerations” to the end of

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

Community Safety.	encourage the development of the second bridge to the Island area (that includes pedestrian and bicycle access) to promote the Island’s development.	CC.2.1c. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to work with the MPO on the development of the Regional Transportation Plan and update this chapter as needed.
CHAPTER 8: OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION		
New public facilities and parks. The emphasis is on ball fields, we also need to consider more indoor facilities like a second community pool.	The principles, goals and policies in Chapter 8: Open Space and Recreation support a wide range of facilities, but defer to Parks and Recreation Department plans and the needs assessment that is currently underway to define specific types of facilities that will be needed. They are supported by the recommended actions for Chapter 8 (see page 91).	No change.
Dick Samp Park is still missing.	Dick Samp Park is identified in the list of parks facilities on page 10 of the Community Data and Trends report in Appendix C.	Add Dick Samp Park to the list of example Community Parks on page 68-69 of the plan.
CHAPTER 9: PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Create a map showing available fiber optic internet capability in the City.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies PF1.3a-Telecommunications (pg. 76) and EC.1.3c (pg. 53) both address the broader issue of communications infrastructure. Data needed to create the map requested is not readily available as this infrastructure is not owned/maintained by the City 	No change.
CHAPTER 10: COMMUNITY SAFETY		
CHAPTER 11: IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM		
None.		

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS		
<p>Please include the following explanation of the Department’s mission within the text Glossary of Terms:</p> <p>The State Land Department and the system by which the lands were to be managed were established in 1915 by the State Land Code. In compliance with the Enabling Act and State Constitution, the State Land Code gave the Department authority over all Trust lands and the natural products from these lands. The creation of the State Land Trust in 1915 identified 13 beneficiaries. The Common Schools is the largest beneficiary receiving 8.4 million acres while the other beneficiaries received 2.5 million acres.</p> <p>Since the State Land Department’s inception, its mission has been to manage the Land Trust and to maximize its revenues for the beneficiaries. All uses of the land must benefit the Trust, a fact that distinguishes it from the way public land, such as parks or national forests, may be used. While the public use of the land is not prohibited, it is regulated to ensure protection of the land and compensation to the beneficiaries for its use. (Rationale provided by the Arizona State Land Department): The mission of the Arizona State Land Department “ASLD” is frequently misunderstood. This passage clarifies our mission and the basis for managing Trust lands.)</p>	<p>Explanation not currently included.</p>	<p>Add explanation as proposed.</p>

Summary of Comments Received on draft General Plan Adoption Draft dated March 2015 (updated 5.6.15)

GENERAL		
<p>Change public land references in the text to read “Public lands and State Trust land”. (Rationale, as noted by State Land Department: as noted above the ASLD mission is different from other public agencies and separating State Trust lands from Public lands clarifies the difference.)</p>	<p>Current reference throughout plan is to “Public Lands” generally. This reference occurs in the Growth Management and Economy sections.</p>	<p>Revise references as proposed.</p>