



PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL REPORT

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Nelda Martinez, Mayor

Thru: Ron Olson, City Manager
Gustavo Gonzalez, P.E., Assistant City Manager of Public Works and Utilities
Mark Van Vleck, P.E., Executive Director of Utilities

From: Philip Ramirez, A.I.A., Chairman, Planning Commission *PR*

Date: September 23, 2015

Subject: Planning Commission Recommendations on Plan CC

The City Charter requires the Planning Commission to review the proposed comprehensive plan and make a recommendation to the City Council before the City Council can adopt it.

On August 12, City staff and the planning consultant presented the draft comprehensive plan, Plan CC, to the Planning Commission and public. A public hearing was conducted, affording the public an opportunity to provide additional input beyond written comments submitted previously. After the public hearing, each Planning Commissioner submitted his/her individual proposed changes to Plan CC in writing to City staff. Staff compiled the commissioners' proposed changes and presented them for review and consideration amongst all Planning Commissioners at the subsequent regular meetings on August 26 and September 9. The Planning Commission discussed each commissioner's proposed change and then voted on whether or not to recommend that the change be incorporated into Plan CC. The Planning Commission also voted on whether or not to incorporate changes recommended by the public. Recommended changes resulting from public comments are identified and the public comment ID number is referenced.

Enclosed is a spreadsheet listing all of the changes to Plan CC that the Planning Commission discussed and recommended for incorporation into Plan CC. This report serves as the official recommendation of the Planning Commission.

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
		Element 2 – Natural Systems, Parks & Recreation:		
1	Braselton	Page 13, Goal 1 – eliminate Oso Bay and Oso Creek as “swimmable.”	Replace "fishable and swimmable" with "meet EPA Water Quality Standards for their specific designated uses." The source of Oso Bay and Oso Creek bacteria has not been determined. Currently there is a TMDL/I-Plan underway for Oso Bay/Oso Creek for bacteria. This process will determine the source of contamination and include activities to address and restore the designated use for Oso Bay/Oso Creek which is “Contact Recreation.” The language regarding these natural systems should not include that they are fishable/swimmable but that they meet EPA Water Quality Standards for their specific designated uses.	Concur with Staff Recommendation. It was questioned whether the Oso Bay and Oso Creek will ever meet EPA standards for "contact recreation."
2	Baugh	Page 14 - Supporting a fitness program to incorporate bike and walk trails into the park systems.	No change. Plan CC includes policy to implement the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. Goal #3 of the PRMP calls for introducing new recreation facilities and opportunities that reflect evolving demographic and recreation trends, such as: trails, off-road biking, fitness programs, among others.	No change
3	Baugh	Page 14 - Include the upgrade and addition of activity/sports complexes throughout the city districts to attract tournaments to our area.	No Change. This would be more of a strategy for Goal 1, policy point 2, in Element 5 "Diversifying the Economy...", which says to "Support market diversification by the tourism industry." The first draft of Plan CC identified sports tourism as a strategy.	No change. It was noted that the Convention & Visitors Bureau is now working on expanding sports tourism.

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
4	Ramirez	Page 13, Goal 1 under Natural Systems -- 2nd Bullet Point reads "Support initiatives to improve water quality so that shellfish beds are open throughout the city and can thrive throughout the Bay." This does not read clearly; not sure this is what was intended.	Amend the statement as follows: "Support initiatives to improve water quality so that shellfish beds are open throughout the city and can thrive throughout the Bay."	Concur with Staff Recommendation
5	Ramirez	Goal 8 under Open Space, Parks & Recreation (Page 14) – Consider adding bullet point to suggest a reduction of the total number of parks that aligns with Parks & Recreations plan to downsize the inventory of underutilized parks.	No change. This concept is already in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which Plan CC suggests to implement as one of the policies of Goal 7.	No change
Element 3 – Resilience & Resource-Efficiency				
6	Braselton	Page 17, Goal 4 – Less emphasis on Governments subsidized "renewable energy" and more on fossil fuel energy (i.e. natural gas) so abundant in our area.	Upon PC's request, staff edited the Goal as follows: "...." Edit the 1st policy: "Make renewable- <u>and clean-energy</u> options available to homes and businesses." Add a 2nd Policy - "Ensure residents and businesses are aware of the <u>energy options available to them.</u>" Plan CC does not recommend "subsidized" renewable energy. Plan CC's goal is that renewable energy be an option for residents/businesses wanting to use it. For example, in 2010, the City created a zoning regulation to allow wind energy units at businesses and dwellings so that they can be permitted in the city while not creating nuisances.	Concur with Staff recommendation
7	Ramirez	Page 17, Goal 3 under Resource Efficiency, 3rd Bullet Point – Consider adding language for the City to consider adding a line item in the project budgets of public facilities for energy efficient systems, similar to that of the 1.25% Arts requirement.	No change. This is more of an action item for the Implementation Plan rather than a goal/policy for the Comprehensive Plan. But, the comment will noted for consideration in the Implementation Plan.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
8	Ramirez	Goal 6 under Resource Efficiency (Page 17), Third Bullet Point – Consider adding community gardens as an option in lieu of dedicated park land for new subdivisions and developments	No change. This is more of an action item for the Implementation Plan rather than a goal/policy for the Comprehensive Plan. But, the comment will noted for consideration in the Implementation Plan.	No change
9	Lippincott	Add to Items 5, 7, or 8 – Expand enforcement and maintenance plans to ensure our beaches & parks are kept clean.	Staff feels Plan CC already covers maintenance if beaches and parks. Beaches are managed by the Parks and Recreation Department. The Parks & Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) also identifies maintenance as an issue. However, under Goal 8 -- Add "beaches" in the goal and policy bullet point #1. Goal: "Parks, <u>beaches</u> ..." Under the policy, amend as follows: "Provide adequate resources for basic maintenance and operation of all parks, <u>beaches</u> , recreational facilities, and other green public spaces, as discussed in the PRMP, <u>and for enforcement of City regulations that protect the quality of these public spaces.</u> "	Concur with Staff recommendation
		Element 4 – Housing & Neighborhoods		
10	Braselton	Page 20, Goal 1 – "... housing policy to guide..." we have zoning ordinances that do this already. I would want a better explanation of the limits of "guide" and "policy".	Recommend changing the statement to read as follows: "Corpus Christi has a comprehensive housing policy to guide <u>advise the City on</u> development of quality neighborhoods." "Housing Policy" is about making sure everyone has good/decent housing. This is not meant to be a zoning ordinance. Housing policy can provide a set of approaches to achieve more affordable housing and efforts to create housing policy should include the public and private sectors in developing the policies.	Concur with Staff recommendation

PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
11	Braselton	Goal 7 – Eliminate references to “Urban Village.” Our area is not conducive to walkable neighborhoods for climate and for retail availability. I hate to see money invested in a program that could easily not meet wide spread community support after a few fruitless years.	No change. 1. The plan provides for a relatively small number of mixed-use, walkable centers—the mixed-use land use designation amounts to 4% of the existing city acreage. 2. Participants in the planning process generally supported the idea of having more choice in housing and transportation. 3. Over the course of 20 years, providing more diversity and choice in Corpus Christi will make the city more competitive. 4. Other Texas cities are establishing this kind of diversity and choice and attracting new residents. 5. Urban villages—which are simply modern versions of traditional neighborhoods that existed in Corpus Christi many years ago—would provide a choice that is increasingly desired by a portion of the housing market. 6. Both urban villages and downtown revitalization have to be supported by housing—tourism and office traffic is not sufficient. Access to nearby employment (such as the Christus Spohn Hospital complex) or colleges (such as the future southside campus of Del Mar) also attract people to urban villages. 7. There are many examples of successful walkable urban village style developments in Texas, as well as in other parts of the country.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
12	Braselton	Goal 8 – “mixed” neighborhoods are not acceptable to most city residents as it relates to apartments and single family – some degree of separation should be maintained such as in our present zoning ordinances.	Upon PC's request, staff rephrased the policy as follows: "The design of new developments promotes a <u>broader sense of neighborhood and community</u> rather than creating isolated <u>developments with a lack of interconnections</u>subdivisions or apartment complexes." Regarding mixed-use development: New design approaches, including transitions in height and density, are needed to create compatibility between single family and multi-family housing, as well as provision of amenities and walk-to neighborhood retail.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
13	Baugh	The plan should support the creation of local committees for each district. Committees made up of residence, developers and local leaders that can help coordinate the future plans and development. This will help determine what the end users wants or needs. This will allow the residence to buy-in to the future plan/development within their communities. It will create a sense of pride and involvement for the various districts.	No change. Stakeholders will be involved in the updates of the various Area Development Plans. Also, see Goal 6, which calls for promoting the organization of neighborhood associations as part of helping to sustain and maintain established neighborhoods. Planning Boards by district are often found in cities much larger than Corpus Christi, but Plan CC suggests beginning to identify neighborhood associations. Corpus Christi currently does not maintain a list of homeowners or property owners associations, which could be valuable list of stakeholders to include in notifications or for input or to assist in implementing Plan CC.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
14	Ramirez	Page 20, Community Identify (think this should read “Identity”) and Sense of Place.	Fix typo.	Concur with Staff's recommendation

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
15	Ramirez	Page 20, Goal 8 under Community Identity and Sense of Place, Second Bullet Point – Suggest defining more clearly what is meant by “Facilities.”	Rephrase the statement as follows: "Ensure that <u>safe</u> pedestrian and bicycle facilities <u>routes</u> are available in new and redeveloped areas." "Facilities" was technical language for sidewalks, bike lanes, bike routes, etc. -- any type of feature intended to aid the pedestrian or bicyclist.	Concur with Staff recommendation
16	Crull	There needs to be more emphasis on affordable housing.	Concur with Planning Commission's recommendation. The Implementation Plan will have more detail on how to provide affordable housing. However, Goal #2 addresses affordable housing and so does Goal #1 in speaking about creating "housing policy."	Add "including affordable housing" to the end of Goal 2 so that it reads: "Quality housing meets the diverse needs of households at all income levels and all stages of the life cycle, <u>including affordable housing.</u> "
17	Lippincott	Page 20, Add to Goal 6, 3rd Bullet Point – To keep them safe and free from crime.	Staff recommends adding this phrase as suggested to read: "Promote the organization of neighborhood associations and community initiative to maintain neighborhoods <u>and to keep them safe and free from crime.</u> "	Concur with Staff recommendation
		Element 5 – Diversifying the Economy & Strengthening the Workforce		
18	Villarreal	Page 23, Goal #3 – Develop partnerships with local colleges/universities and industry to promote and utilize existing and new entrepreneurial programs.	Add this as a policy under Goal #3. Staff suggests the word "use" instead of "utilize."	Concur with Staff recommendation, but include business organizations , such as Young Business Professionals, not just colleges/universities and industry. "Develop partnerships with local colleges/universities, and industry <u>and business organizations</u> to promote and utilize existing and new entrepreneurial programs."

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
19	Ramirez	Page 24, Goals 5 – Consider adding a bullet point that speaks to promoting a drug-free labor force.	2nd policy under Goal #5, add examples of the type of essential support services that could be offered. Rephrase the statement to read: "Promote the provision of essential support services, <u>such as childcare, transportation, and substance abuse counseling</u> , that enable workers to seek and maintain employment."	Concur with Staff recommendation. It was noted that a drug-free labor force is especially important for industrial sector jobs where safety is important.
20	Ramirez	Page 23, Goal 23, 5th Bullet Point – Corpus Christi is able to attract..., – Suggest creating a new position to act as a Community Liaison for Development who can act as a single point of contact for developers looking to develop a project within the city and direct them to the proper programs and or agencies to make the development process more efficient.	No change. This suggestion is more of an action item for the Implementation Plan rather than a goal/policy for the Comprehensive Plan. But, the comment will be noted for consideration in the Implementation Plan.	No change
21	Lippincott	Page 23, Add to Goal 5 – Develop partnership between industry and local education systems to develop programs that provide training necessary to meet the demands.	No change. Staff feels that Goal 6, 4th bullet point covers this topic.	No change
		Element 6 – Transportation & Mobility		
22	Ramirez	Page 27, Goal 5 -- Consider adding a bullet point that seeks to provide additional flight destinations and perhaps incentivize them if necessary to get them established and profitable for the airlines.	No change. Goal 5 calls for implementing the Airport Master Plan. This comment is more appropriate for consideration in the Airport Master Plan developed by Corpus Christi International Airport (CCIA). Note that smaller airports have a difficult time getting more flights. Corpus Christi may have to pay an airline to provide more flights out of CCIA.	Add a policy that says, "Support enhancements to airline service."

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
23	Braselton	Page 27, Goal 1 - I do not support bicycle lanes across the city but only in areas for recreational riding and downtown area. Too many \$\$\$ for a very small percentage of population now and future. It is too hot and humid 10 months of the year to bicycle to work or shopping.	No change. Plan CC does not recommend bike lanes or routes belong on every city street. Additionally, the Metropolitan Planning Organization is undertaking a data-driven study called the "Strategic Plan for Active Mobility" to identify the best locations for bike routes/lanes and the most effective type of facility needed in an area. The MPO's plan could later be adopted the City Council in order to implement it's recommendations.	No change
24	Braselton	Page 27, Goal 3 – No need to lower speed limits on neighborhood streets nor fit them for bicycles. We have sidewalks for pedestrian traffic as part of our street requirements.	No change. 1. Not all neighborhoods have sidewalks. 2. At neighborhoods' requests, speed bumps have been installed on local and even collector streets. 3. Citizens will not want to walk or bike if our street systems make them feel unsafe. Lower traffic speeds on neighborhood streets by design is one way to make citizens feel safer walking/biking.	No change
25	Baugh	The bike and walk mobility should be focused in new developments. Adding a bike lane to already congested street traffic (Staples) is not the best use of this space. Adding additional lanes (drive or turn) would be more beneficial.	No change. The City recognizes that bike lanes need to be installed in strategic locations where they will be used more regularly. See response to Comment #20.	No change
26	Baugh	Lower vehicle speeds in the neighborhoods is only good if there are officers there to enforce it. Speed humps would be a more feasible solution for slowing down traffic to allow for biking, walking and children safety.	No change. Lowering speeds can be accomplished through street design . For example, the wider the street, the faster people feel comfortable driving. The Unified Development Code already provides some alternatives for street designs that might lower speeds on <i>neighborhood</i> streets. MobilityCC also offers thoughts on street design alternatives.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
27	Villarreal	Page 27, Goal #1 – support and coordinate with CC MPO projects, plans, and initiatives.	Add this as a policy under Goal #1: <u>"Support and coordinate with the Corpus Christi Metropolitan Planning Organization's projects, plans and initiatives."</u>	Concur with Staff recommendation
28	Lippincott	Page 27, Change Goal 2, 1st & 2nd bullet points: "Support a long-term program to repair existing streets and regularly maintain the system to minimize life-cycle costs." and "Support adequate and balanced funding sources for long-term operation and maintenance of the street network." – Change “support” to "develop."	No change. Strategies and actions will develop the policies/programs. Efforts are underway.	No change
29 [2nd Round Public Comment #13]	Public	8. Page 27: Goals -- a. Change the wording of the third bullet point under 2. to – “Integrate transportation planning with utility infrastructure and neighborhood development planning.” b. Second bullet point under 3. – Change the word “Consider” to “Create”	The following changes are recommended: 8. Page 27, Element 6 -- a) Goal 2 – street system; policy three – “integrate transportation planning with utility infrastructure planning.” Adding “neighborhood planning” after “transportation planning” is a good idea. b) Goal 3 – reconstruction program for local streets – change “consider” to “create.”	Concur with Staff recommendation
30 [2nd Round Public Comment #27]	Public	Page 27, Add Item 7. Goals-Promote and Support a Plan for a second access on and off Padre Island; policy – maximize evacuation; diminish risks in traffic congestion; enhance safety; promote safe growth	Add a 7th goal to the Transportation and Mobility Element as suggested in the public comment that supports a second access to Padre Island.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
		Element 7 – Community Infrastructure, Facilities & Services		
31	Braselton	I support all of these goals. My concern is who will pay for all these? Are they all realistic?	No change. Staff needs more direction on any proposed changes to this element.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
32	Villarreal	Page 30, Goal #2 – add innovative and cost effective technologies	Second policy -- Restate as "maintain and improve existing water infrastructure, including the incorporation of new <u>innovative and cost effective</u> technologies where appropriate."	Concur with Staff recommendation
33	Ramirez	Page 29, What is that picture of??? Consider replacing it, not clear as to what it is or what it is trying to communicate.	Replace the photo with a more communicative photo.	Concur with Staff recommendation
34	Crull	Regarding the growth south of Oso Creek, I don't know if this goes in the Comprehensive Plan or Implementation Documents. A decision needs to be made as to whether core services (Wastewater and Drainage) in addition to water are going to be provided. Without wastewater and drainage, the large tract development will continue. Master plans for these facilities have been prepared but never adopted. The land use plan for the area shows a large area designated as Planned Development but this doesn't spell out any categories. The same comment is applicable to the Northwest area south of FM 624.	No change. This kind of decision would need to be made after further study, beyond the scope of the Comprehensive Plan. Storm Water and Wastewater Master Plan updates would also be needed. While Plan CC identifies these areas for future annexation and areas of growth, the City needs to study in more detail the annexation of these areas, service plans, and the cost of allowing development in these areas. The Planned Development land use category for the areas south of the Oso Creek and in the Northwest indicated a need for further planning through the Area Development Plan updates. There is concern about the cost of growth on tax payers and impacts on infill and taking care of current neighborhoods.	Concur with Staff recommendation
35	Braselton	Page 30, Goal 7 - Reword to read “ verify that all buildings that are required to comply to ADA standards do comply."	Staff recommends rewording as follows: "Buildings, facilities and open spaces, both public and private, comply with <u>all laws and regulations regarding accessibility as required</u> ADA- (Americans with Disabilities Act) standards."	Concur with Staff recommendation

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
		Element 8 – Future Land Use, Zoning & Urban Design		
36	Ramirez	Page 32, From the Vision, Need to somehow work the South Side Development in here, I think we have all established that it is going to continue and that the infill development and South Side growth do not have to be at the expense of one another.	Revise the first phrase to read: "Corpus Christi's growth has revitalized older parts of the city <u>and established new neighborhoods in the south side and northwest areas;</u> ..."	Concur with Staff recommendation
37	Ramirez	Page 37, Future Land Use Definitions -- Transition District: I think there has to be a better term than "Transition District." Remember these are still existing neighborhoods. Also, "leave this area" needs to be toned down, suggest "relocate to another area."	Recommend rephrasing as "relocate to another area."	Concur with Staff recommendation
38	Braselton	Page 33, Goal 1, 2nd Bullet Point – Realize "infill" and "revitalization" are hampered by high redevelopment costs and by availability of suitable lots and infrastructure. Also new or revitalized streets in these areas have to be maintained by the city just as do new suburban streets.	No change	No change
39	Braselton	Page 33, Goal 2 – "urban village" – see previous comments.	No change	No change
40	Braselton	Page 33, Goal 3 – omit "design standards" for private developments.	No change. Design standards are for impacts on the public realm and primarily affect commercial development. They are less about architectural style than about creating attractive and functional public environments.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
41	Braselton	Page 33, Goal 6 – annexation policies cannot include “1 lot/20 acres” zoning for newly annexed areas as previously mentioned. To wait on city to provide basic water and sewer services to proposed annexation areas in Plan CC 2035 will likely prevent their annexation and thereby they will not in city control. Not good.	No change. This comment is related to the strategies and actions of the first draft of Plan CC.	No change
42	Crull	The issue of the transition zones north of IH 37 needs to be resolved. On one hand, Lamont Taylor and his group are advocating revitalization of Hillcrest. On the other hand Susie Saldaña and her group are raising money to move people out of there.	No change. A specific plan for this transition with community participation would be needed. A planned transition for the whole neighborhood is more likely to provide a better outcome than the continuation of incremental incursion by non-residential uses and declining values.	No change
43	Braselton	Page 32, From The Principles -- about High Quality Development delete “...and establish high-quality design standards for private development”. “High Quality” is a very subjective term. The current building code covers private design standards adequately.	No change. Design standards are for impacts on the public realm and primarily affect commercial development. They are less about architectural style than about creating attractive and functional public environments. Once a building is constructed, the public doesn’t have an opportunity to do anything about it. "High quality" will be defined by Corpus Christians when they give input on the establishment of design standards.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
44	Braselton	Page 33, Land Use Principles, under Housing & Neighborhoods -- Delete 3rd bullet point. Multifamily location is sufficiently guided by zoning ordinances. Additional guidance is not needed and counterproductive to providing for adequate volume of housing.	Recommend a change: " Promote the location of Locate multifamily development where there is nearby access to retail, services, and public transportation...." [Staff's recommendation concurs with a recommendation made by Public Commenter #13 in the 2nd Round Public Comment Summary and with stakeholders of the Builders/Realtors Associations that staff met with.] Note: The location of multifamily uses is guided by the current City Zoning Map, the Future Land Use Map, and decisions on rezonings. For clarification, the zoning ordinance does not guide the location of multifamily uses. The zoning ordinance only dictates setbacks, height, open space, and buffering.	Concur with Staff recommendation
45	Braselton	Page 33, Land Use Principles, under Mixed-Use Centers -- Change "provide...mixed-use...." to "accept...mixed-use...."	Change "provide" to "promote" rather than to "accept."	Concur with Staff recommendation
46	Braselton	Page 33, Land Use Principles, under Efficient Development Patterns -- Eliminate 1st & 2nd bullet points. Subdivisions are often not able to be adjacent due to existing zoning, land availability, geographic concerns, etc. thus making "leap-frogging" the only alternative.	No change. The Plan says to <i>avoid</i> leapfrog development so that subdivisions are not <i>far</i> from each other.	Amend the 2nd Bullet Point as follows - " <u>Where applicable, Avoid 'leapfrog' scattered site</u> development that locates subdivisions far from other residential areas."
47	Braselton	Page 33, Land Use Principles, under Efficient Development Patterns - 4th Bullet Point – "Use annexation powers combined with minimum lot size in zoning and infrastructure policy to promote orderly and efficient development in the ETJ."	No change. <u>Zoning regulations on lot size and infrastructure policy</u> are two of the City's primary tools for ensuring orderly growth. Staff does not recommend eliminating this phrase.	Recommend change as presented by Commissioner Braselton.

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
48	Braselton	Page 33, Land Use Principles, under Environment & Resilience -- Second bullet point: insert “public land” after "Preserve" at start of sentence. "Preserve <u>public</u> land around creeks and drainage corridors to achieve a green network of interconnected parks, multi-use paths, passive and active recreational spaces, and conservation land."	No change. A public entity or a private entity can help preserve land. The land often starts as being private. Some City ordinances, specifically the Cluster Housing Development Overlay, give private developers incentives in the form of increased density if they help to preserve sensitive lands or created recreational spaces on sensitive lands. Also, the adopted Oso Parkway Plan calls for creating ordinances such as the Cluster Housing Development Overlay so that private developers can help contribute to this effort.	No change
49	Braselton	Page 36, Future Land Use Definitions - Single Family is 1 house per lot. All others are variations of Multi-Family i.e. low density (2 -4 units) medium density (8 -20) etc.	Same response to Public Comment #13 from the 2nd Round Comment Summary: Rename the residential land use categories in this way: • Low Density Residential – up to 4 Dwelling Units Per Acre, color code is Light Yellow • Medium Density Residential – 4 to 13 Dwelling Units Per Acre, color code is Bright Yellow • High Density Residential – greater than 13 Dwelling Units Per Acre, color code is brown This eliminates the category of “High Density Single Family Residential.” The names of the categories would no longer reference single- or multi-family, rather just “residential” with an associated density.	Concur with Staff recommendation

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
		Element 9 – Stewardship & Implementation of the Plan		
50	Braselton	Plan CC 2035 has lofty goals and is very ambitious. My concern is without any reference to cost/benefit we find that some of these goals are really unattainable. I think there must be \$\$\$ associated with these goals and a clearer picture of who will pay for this through taxes, assessments, user fees, impact fees, etc.	No change. These issues will be worked out in the implementation plan and prioritization of action items.	No change
51	Braselton	Page 50 -- Add some specific language with regard to the periodic review by city leaders. Establish a goal to review and update the plan on an annual basis, identifying short term (annual), mid-term (5 years) and long-term goals with specific objectives.	Add a policy to Goal #2: "Review and update the plan on an annual basis, identifying short term, medium-term and long-term goals with specific objectives."	Concur with Staff recommendation
52	Hovda	Goals 1-6 -- How can a Plan that has 50 goals within 8 elements and 120 policies associated with those 50 goals be implemented with only 6 goals and 10 policies?	No change. An implementation plan will be developed once the goals/policies of Plan CC are adopted.	No change
53	Hovda	Goal 1 - "Establish a comprehensive plan system based on a twenty-year time horizon" What specifically does this mean? Does this have a deadline attached to it? Who is in charge of this? Is this just actually Plan CC? If this is reflecting Plan CC, then I don't understand why it's a bullet or a policy... seems redundant.	No change	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
54	Hovda	Goal 1 - “Require that Area Development Plans and Specific Plans reflect the vision and goals of the overall comprehensive plan” - Which department is tasked with all the area and specific plans (i.e., the Parks Master Plan, the Airport Master Plan) and comparing it to Plan CC to make sure that they’re in line with each other? If that has already been done through the process of Plan CC, then why is it a bullet on the implementation list - seems redundant.	No change. The Parks & Recreation Dept. is responsible for the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. The Airport is responsible for the Airport Master Plan. A Planning Dept. or city planning staff are responsible for Area Plans or Specific Plans for a neighborhood. These Master Plans (the "sub-plans") are created or updated. During creation or updating, staff needs to make sure these "sub-plans" are on target with the Comprehensive Plan.	No change
55	Hovda	Page 50, Goal 1, 3rd Bullet Point -- “Amend planning ordinances to reflect the new type of comprehensive planning system” - Which department will oversee existing ordinances and amend them? What is the deadline to achieve this goal? Will City Staff proactively change the ordinances or will they be amended when it’s ascertained reactively that the ordinance does not match the 20 year plan?	No change. A re-established Planning Department (or planning group) will proactively amend ordinances to implement Plan CC. Deadlines for achieving the goal will be identified in the implementation plan.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
56	Hovda	Page 50, Goal 2, 1st Bullet Point -- “Establish public review of progress in implementing the plan.” Does this happen during Planning Commission meetings? Will there be an agenda item on Planning Commission meetings to review progress? Will this take the form of public meetings, much like the public input process for Plan CC?	No change. See response to comment 51. This will be addressed in the implementation plan. <i>Ideas</i> for action can include reviewing progress annually before the Planning Commission and City Council in a joint <i>public</i> hearing, creating a Plan CC Advisory Committee to be stewards of the plan and monitor progress, and scheduling a public process every five years to confirm or revise the plan and review progress.	No change
57	Hovda	Page 50, Goal 3, 1st Bullet Point -- “Give the Planning Department a proactive role in coordinating initiatives to implement comprehensive and other plans” Is there a word missing? Also - is this new Planning Department funded in FY 2015-2016? If not, when will this Planning Department be funded to implement Plan CC? It does not make sense to have this as a goal or policy if there is not a plan to fund it.	No change. The Planning Department is currently funded. Where funding is not already in place for items identified in Plan CC, getting funding is part of the City Council's budget approval process.	No change
58	Hovda	Page 50, Goal 4 -- 1st Bullet Point: “Make City programs and resources consistent with implementation of Plan CC” - this is vague? What specific resources are you referring to? What department will oversee that this consistency policy sets the standards and metrics to measure this goal?	No change. See comment below.	No change

PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
59	Hovda	Page 50, Goal 4, 2nd Bullet Point-- “Use incentives strategically to create a critical mass of improvements in designated areas.” Are there existing incentives in place that this policy is referring to? If so, which department will coordinate with the other departments or governing bodies to implement these strategic incentive initiatives?	No change. Some incentives options are in place, such as 380 Agreements, Public Improvement Districts, Tax Increment Financing, property-tax abatement, HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Programs, streamlined permitting, Municipal Management Districts, Sales Tax for economic development (Type A funds), development fee exemptions or waivers, water and sewer capital improvement, and Municipal Housing Finance Corporation, while the City could still adopt the use of new incentives, such as Neighborhood Empowerment Zones, and Local Government Corporations. Planning staff would likely be responsible for coordinating efforts so that the City gets more "bang for its buck" -- meaning be strategic in investments to achieve a visible difference.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
60	Hovda	Page 50, Goal 5, 1st Bullet Point-- “Use the plan in preparing and approving other planning and implementation activities by City agencies.” Will Plan CC become the guiding policy? I am imagining everyone in every department meeting carrying a copy of Draft 2 to a meeting and refer to it as they make all decisions... what is the practical, real meaning of this policy? Is this something that all developers and business partners of the City need to follow as well? This policy seems to have a strong education component to it. Will there be continuing education (bi-monthly, quarterly, yearly?) and training for City Staff to review and be an extensive knowledge base of this Plan? It seems to be that this policy requires that many levels of employees in all departments become subject matter experts on Plan CC. If this is true, what will be done to ensure that this knowledge base is part of staff development?	No change. The implementation plan will address this further. The implementation plan may discuss designating a person to coordinate and oversee implementation. The implementation plan may also discuss how to support staff, whether by training or providing resources, so that they can work together to implement the plan and achieve its goals.	No change
61	Hovda	Funding - have we already identified these funding mechanisms? Without funding, this plan cannot be implemented. I am very interested in the funding model that is currently recommended to implement this plan.	No change. Plan CC's strategies in the implementation plan address ideas for outside funding and being strategic in using funds. Strategies for funding mechanisms are in the implementation plan, but the selection of how to fund an idea or project requires department level business planning and sometimes City Council approval.	No change

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
62	2nd Round Public Comment #1	Concerns about a statement in the Future Land Use Definitions, section Transition Districts, under Special I-37 Transition District and Special Aviation Transition District that states, “The transition should take place over time within a framework that provides fair compensation and assistance to residents in moving to other part of the city”. (Page 37) This is more like a policy than a definition and should be removed.	Remove the statement in the definition section.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
63	2nd Round Public Comment #4	Our land is highly impacted and devalued by this land use plan which designates our 400 acre Tufts Cove property on Mustang Island as "Open Space". This is the property which provided access to Wilson's Cut and goes north on the Bay Side. Our land use plan is attached. We have not submitted to the City as we have been working on grading permits. We realize this plan attached may not be close to the final but is a good example of the mix of homes, commercial and cluster residential that we believe will draw well in the market, provide a good tax base for the City and a unique experience for the residence. Please let me know the steps I need to take to insure that our property can be developed in a manner consistent or similar to that attached.	Change this property’s future land use designation to Planned Development while retaining a small portion on the bay as Flood Plain Conservation , similar to today’s adopted Future Land Use Map. The area on Mustang Island between the Fire Station on the south and the City limit line on the north end should be designated as Planned Development in the Future Land Use Plan.	Concur with Staff Recommendation

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
64	2nd Round Public Comment #13	4. Pg. 17 Element 3, Goal 5, a. Resource Efficiency – Add a bullet point under 5. – “...and adopt the Coastal Bend Green Built as the official Green residential program of the City of Corpus Christi.”	4. Pg. 17 -- Element 3, Goal 5, potential additional policy: potential language could be: “Support the Coastal Bend Green Built program or any equivalent program as the green building standard for residential development and promote LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards or the equivalent for non-residential building.”	Concur with Staff Recommendation
65	2nd Round Public Comment #19	On page 44 of the second draft tract; 16.35 acres of Lot 19, Section 40, Flour Bluff & Encinal Farm & Garden tracts is classified as Flood Plain Conservation. A significant portion of this acreage is not located in the flood plain. I request that the map only classify the portion of this tract that is in the flood plain as Flood Plain Conservation and the remainder be classified the same as the surrounding tracts	Plan CC Future Land Use Map has a category called Flood Plain Conservation, which indicates property located within the 100-year flood plain. This category is similar to the today’s land use category called Conservation/Preservation. Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Plan CC Flood Plain Conservation designation in the Future Land Use Map match the areas designated in today’s Future Land Use Map as Conservation/Preservation, which would reduce the amount of land categorized as Floodplain Conservation in both the South Side and Padre/Mustang Island areas. However, following adoption of new FEMA maps, the City should review the boundaries of the Flood Plain Conservation designation in the Future Land Use Map.	Concur with Staff Recommendation

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
66	2nd Round Public Comment #25	In 2014, I bought 227 acres on Mustang Island. It is in CC on the west side of 361 & just north of the Island Construction site. The area is zoned rural farm. Besides farm/ranch use, I understood that this designation is sort of a holding zone. Once an owner has a use plan, the owner can present it and request a zoning change which may or may not be granted. I have several ideas for development of a portion of the tract. Under the proposed development plan, this tract is to remain open space. I strongly oppose this proposal. It seems the rules are being changed in the middle of the game. Thank you for your consideration of my input.	Change the Future Land Use Map designation to Planned Development in the area on Mustang Island north of Fire Station 16 and south of the City Limit Line.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
67	2nd Round Public Comment #28	Cape Summer on Padre Island is already platted and planned for commercial, mixed, resort uses.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Planned Development not Flood Plain Conservation.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
68	2nd Round Public Comment #29	The color-coding of the Future Land Use categories Flood Plain Conservation and Permanent Open Space are too similar.	Find a way to better distinguish the two categories. Consider adding cross-hatching in thin black line to the Flood Plain Conservation layer.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
69	2nd Round Public Comment #30	The property around Island in the Son Church is planned for development.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Planned Development.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
70	2nd Round Public Comment #31	The southwest corner of Whitecap and SPID is private property planned for development not permanent open space.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Mixed Use to fit in with the Neighborhood Village concept proposed by Plan CC on the east side of SPID.	Concur with Staff Recommendation

**PLANNING COMMISSION'S FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE SECOND DRAFT OF PLAN CC**

No.	By	Comment	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
71	2nd Round Public Comment #32	The north side of Packery Channel is anticipated for commercial development.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Planned Development.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
72	2nd Round Public Comment #33	The areas between the Seawall and Leeward Drive are in need of commercial uses within walking distance of residential uses/tourist accommodations and the beach.	Change this area's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Mixed Use.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
73	2nd Round Public Comment #34	Two "fingers" of land are missing north of Whitecap, east of SPID.	Update the maps in Plan CC to show these land masses, and designate them in the Future Land Use Map as Medium Density Residential (4-13 units per acre).	Concur with Staff Recommendation
74	2nd Round Public Comment #35	Padre Isles Golf Course should not be planned for commercial development.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Permanent Open Space. Only the area of the golf course developed by Schlitterbahn should be designated as commercial.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
75	2nd Round Public Comment #36	The property just northwest of the Schlitterbahn property should not be designated as commercial in the Future Land Use Map.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Planned Development.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
76	2nd Round Public Comment #37	The triangular piece of private property on Aquarius Drive across from the City park and Fire Station should not be designated as Flood Plain Conservation in the Future Land Use Map.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Planned Development.	Concur with Staff Recommendation
77	2nd Round Public Comment #38	Though outside city limits, the Port/Ship Channel (Industrial District) should be Heavy Industrial in the Future Land Use Map.	Change this property's designation in the Future Land Use Map to Heavy Industrial.	Concur with Staff Recommendation