

The General Plan is getting a little 'Musty'

Lee Campbell 7 2407

Bill Anderson's June 15 response to an email from Tom Mullaney states the following;

"The Draft General Plan **Policy LU-C.3** states that the City **should** "maintain or increase" the City's supply of land designated for various residential densities as community plans are prepared and updated, or amended."

The actual text of LU-C.3 is as follows:

"Maintain or increase the City's supply of land designated for various residential densities as community plans are prepared, updated, or amended."

Note that it does not say 'should' maintain or increase...

This is the interpretation of Bill Anderson for the policy.

should	infers obligation, but not absolute necessity
--------	--

- thanks Bill.

The lead in para to LU-C3 Page LU-21 states;

"As community plans designate land uses and assign densities, they **must** preserve or (**must**) increase planned density of residential land uses to ensure compliance with the City's regional share goal. Implementation of community-based goals may cause a shift in densities within or between community planning areas, but together they **must** maintain or (**must**) increase overall density and housing capacity."

must	imposes obligation, indicates a necessity to act -
------	---

So the "**must**" in this sentence means that 'maintain or increase' is **not an absolute requirement** because it is not part of a policy----[but it is stronger than the Bill Anderson interpretation].

Or is it a requirement?

I had thought that when reviewing the general plan drafts that we were “encouraged” to focus on the policy numbered paragraphs and not the lead in “discussion” paragraphs.

Nancy Bragado was asked this regarding the issue;

“One of the planning staff mentioned to Lee Campbell that only the bulleted or numbered policies and goals will be regarded as official, actionable items, and that the introductory and explanatory language will not.

Is that correct?”

Nancy’s response was;

‘All language in the General Plan is "official" and will work together to communicate the City's goals and policies the "Discussion" text in the General Plan primarily offers context and background, and the policy text is designed to be what is typically cited to influence project reviews and other implementation actions.’

Could the **“must”** in the **‘discussion’** paragraph on LU-21 be where Bill Anderson formed his opinion that communities **“should”**

And is this a sign of things to come as each planner who is assigned to work community plans will ‘dictate’ his/her interpretation of the gospel?

And where is the consistency???
