1) Call to Order and Roll Call

2) Approval of the Minutes – July 2, 2014

3) Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

4) Standards for maintenance and demolition of historic structures in the Central Business District

5) DISCUSSION: 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update
   a) Comprehensive Plan Design + Layout
   b) Buildable Lands Analysis
   c) Mind-Mixer Community Engagement Tool

6) Project Updates

7) Other Board Member Items Not on the Agenda

8) Adjourn

Next Meeting: September 10, 2014
MINUTES
CITY OF LANGLEY
PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD
July 2, 2014

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM.

ATTENDANCE: Gail Fleming, Dominique Emerson, Aaron Kotz, Roger Gage
Absent: Sue Walsh, Paul Goldfinger
Staff: Jeff Arango, Emily Ritchie.

Motion by Roger to approve the June 18 minutes, second – Gail, approved.

DISCUSSION – Historic Overlay – Demolition of Historical Buildings

Jeff summarized the previous meeting, stating that there is a consensus on the board to move forward with creating standards for the demolition of historic structures. He supports developing a conservation district in the future, but does not recommend this strategy to address the Doghouse dilemma, as it would be difficult to accomplish within the 6 months of the current moratorium. Jeff described the three qualifications that would allow for the demolition of a historic structure: economic hardship, structural integrity or community benefits from the redevelopment of the site. The Historic Preservation Commission would hold the process for reviewing any application for the demolition of a historic structure, instead of the Hearing Examiner. Design standards for the downtown will also be developed and integrated into the update of Langley’s comprehensive plan.

Both Dominique and Gail queried how the case for economic hardship would be determined, expressing concern that the owners of a historic structure would not be able to claim this qualification without having supporting evidence. Jeff reassured that the owners would have to provide documentation that demonstrated they had explored all options to make their building economically viable.

Bob inquired about the possibility of adding historic buildings to a local register, but Jeff warned that this additional qualification may blur the lines too much between the two proposals for implementing standards for the demolition of historic structures and the future creation of a conservation district. Jeff sought assistance from the Historic Preservation Commission to lead outreach to property owners about creating the conservation district.

Aaron demonstrated that the profit the Doghouse owners could receive from the building, figured by average rent gained per square foot, would prevent them from arguing they have to tear down the building due to economic hardship.

Jeff described that the design standards for the downtown can incorporate simple revisions into the code to preserve the human scale of first street. Maintaining the 30’ width that creates visual repetition will preserve the town’s current experiential quality. These are design considerations everyone knows are
intuitively important but aren’t currently reflected in the code. This will protect the visual fabric of the city from being disrupted by mega building projects, like Francisco’s.

Aaron requested that the language surrounding maintenance of historic structures be clarified, asking if the owners have 30 days to fix the structural problem or 30 days to come to an agreement with the city about resolving the issue. Jeff replied as long as the owners are working in good faith to resolve the structural maintenance of the building, the specific issue would not need to be resolved within 30 days.

Gail agreed with Sue’s suggestion to have the first statement of the ordinance concerning the demolition of historic structures pack more of a punch.

Jeff will provide the PAB with a redraft of the ordinance that includes these comments.

**DISCUSSION – Comprehensive Plan Update**

Jeff told the PAB that the comp plan update is beginning and public outreach will be a big piece of the process. He presented three questions to get the conversation going:

1. What are important issues facing Langley over next 20 years?
2. What things do we want to preserve in Langley?
3. What things do we want to change?

These questions were posed to the PAB for discussion but will also be distributed to the community through town meetings and workshops. Roger proposed administering a survey to elderly people through their water bill.

Aaron queried what sort of businesses are viable to support in the upcoming 20 years? He proposed that the comp plan update include economic regulations that are supportive of types of businesses that can actually survive. He wondered how connections between businesses can be supported to increase pedestrian circulation and activity within the central business district. He asked how we would create more space for business and commerce to take place and the possibility of creating a second business district in Langley.

Dominique stated she likes the central core of businesses in Langley and debated that the low projection for population growth within Langley would not justify the cost of infrastructure to create a new business district development. We should instead first fill in any gaps within the existing business district.

The group agreed that having Langley be self-sufficient in the kinds of businesses, goods and services provided here is a priority.

Gail is interested in the comp plan update including provisions for an interconnected trail system.

Bob agreed that having a trail system in place around the city would strengthen resistance against surrounding development. He described the vision for the town’s character being stuck between the
world’s best retirement community or a haven for tourists and that this can be a difficult combination to cater to simultaneously.

Jeff described the difficulty of attracting younger generations and families due to the lack of rentable spaces and housing options.

The current low projection of 100-200 additional people moving to Langley over the next 20 years caused the group to consider shrinking the urban growth area.

Gail voiced interest in creating greenbelts around the current urban areas, but Jeff cautioned this can’t be easily implemented through zoning. Dominique described the unintended consequences of surrounding a city with greenbelts, like Boulder, that renders the space within the greenbelts out of reach to low or middle income families.

Aaron voiced interest in creating a big park for Langley and clustering development close by to it. The group agreed that providing a loop trail that took visitors from the town to the marina would be a great idea.

Dominique asked the group to consider what core services are missing from Langley that could be supported through the comp plan update.

The next meeting will be on August 6, 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 PM.
Memo

To: Planning Advisory Board (PAB)  
From: Jeff Arango, AICP – Director of Community Planning  
Date: August 19, 2014

Re: Standards for Maintenance and Demolition of Historic Buildings + Comprehensive Plan Update

Demolition and Maintenance of Historic Structures

Staff has revised the draft of the standards for the demolition and maintenance of historic structures as follows:

1. Require an engineering estimate that compares restoration versus reconstruction.
2. Require a redevelopment plan to be approved prior to the demolition of any historic structure.
3. Reduced the amount of time between demolition to the start of construction for an approved redevelopment plan from 3 months to 1 month.
4. Revisited the special tax valuation standards for historic structures in LMC 15.10.070 to apply to individually listed buildings on the state or national register.
5. Allow historic structures that exceed the height limitations to be reconstructed to the pre-existing height of the historic structure.
6. Standards for the reconstruction of a historic structure that emphasizes the retention of integral historic features.
7. Added language in Title 2 of the LMC assigning the review of historic building demolition applications to the historic preservation commission.

Recommendation – Staff recommends the PAB schedule a public hearing on the standards for maintenance and demolition of historic structures for September 10, 2014. The proposal may be revised following public input.

Comprehensive Plan Update 2016

Design Layout – Included in the packet is a proposed conceptual design for the comprehensive plan, which is proposed to be primarily electronic. Staff has developed icons for each comprehensive element that will be linked to content pertaining to the individual element. Rather than providing a single .pdf, the proposed format will be more accessible than the existing comprehensive plan. Staff will provide an overview of the proposal in more detail at the PAB meeting.

Build-out Analysis – A critical element of the comprehensive plan is updating the growth projections for the next 20 years and conducting a building out analysis to ensure the city has adequate development capacity to accommodate the anticipated growth. Island County has provided preliminary figures for a building analysis based on the existing city zoning (see...
The county used a household size of 2.3 persons per unit while the existing comprehensive plan is based on a household size of 1.8 persons. Staff will conduct further research to determine the appropriate household size for Langley as the final figure will have a substantial impact on the growth accommodations. Based on the preliminary figures the city has adequate capacity within the city limits and should move forward with reducing the size of the city’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGA). In addition the city may consider amending the zoning to accommodate additional multi-family development that will increase the city’s development capacity.

Mind-Mixer Public Engagement Tool – Mind-mixed is an online public engagement tool that staff is researching for use as part of the comprehensive plan update. Mind-mixer allows people to sign up with an existing social media account or via email. It allows the city to communicate with both residents and non-residents to get ideas, conduct polls, disseminate information and acquire demographic information from users. Staff will provide an overview of mind-mixer at the PAB meeting.
Chapter 2.42

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Sections:
2.42.010 Created.
2.42.020 Purpose.
2.42.030 Members.
2.42.040 Meetings.

2.42.010 Created.
The city of Langley hereby creates a historic preservation commission. (Ord. 905, 2008)

2.42.020 Purpose.
The historic preservation commission is the review and approval body for the city in meeting the city’s historic preservation requirements. The commission shall review and take action on nominations to the Langley Register of Historic Places and on development applications that affect properties or districts on the register or identified historic resources or adjacent properties, serve as the local review board for special valuation, and take on other duties pursuant to Chapter 15.10, Historic Preservation. The commission shall also review and make recommendations on applications for the demolition of structures listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the Washington Heritage Register in accordance with the provisions of 18.16.110. (Ord. 905, 2008)

2.42.030 Members.
A. Number of Members. The commission shall consist of seven voting members.
B. Residency. All members must reside within the city of Langley and/or Island County, Washington. Exceptions to the residency requirement may be granted by the mayor and approved by the city council in order to obtain representatives from the disciplines required in subsection (C) of this section. This exception to a majority residency requirement is allowed due to the specialized expertise required on this commission.
C. Qualifications. All members of the commission must have a demonstrated interest and competence in historic preservation and possess qualities of impartiality and broad judgment. At least four members of the commission must have experience in identifying, evaluating, and protecting historic resources and are selected from among the disciplines of architecture, architectural history, planning, building construction, conservation, landscape architecture, or related disciplines. The mayor shall notify organizations or individuals related to these disciplines when there are commission vacancies. (Ord. 905, 2008)

2.42.040 Meetings.
Meeting Schedule. The board shall meet regularly on at least a monthly basis and shall adopt and publish policies regarding the time, place, and frequency of meetings. If there is no business to conduct a meeting cancellation notice shall be posted in the same manner as all meeting notices. Special meetings may be held as often as the commission deems necessary.
Notice of special meetings must be provided in accord with the Washington State Open Public Meetings Act. (Ord. 905, 2008)

15.10.070  
Review and monitoring of properties for special property tax valuation.

C. Criteria.

1. Historic Property Criteria. The class of historic property eligible to apply for special valuation in the city of Langley means all properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places or certified as contributing to a National Register Historic District which have been substantially rehabilitated at a cost and within a time period which meets the requirements set forth in Chapter 84.26 RCW until Langley becomes a certified local government (CLG). Once a CLG, the class of property eligible to apply for special valuation in Langley means all properties listed on the Langley Register of Historic Places or properties certified as individually or as contributing a contributing building to a local or National Historic District which have been substantially rehabilitated at a cost and within a time period which meet the requirements set forth in Chapter 84.26 RCW.
Chapter 18.16
CB ZONE – CENTRAL BUSINESS

Sections:
18.16.010 Principal uses.
18.16.020 Secondary uses.
18.16.030 Conditional uses.
18.16.040 Minimum lot size.
18.16.050 Maximum density.
18.16.060 Maximum lot coverage.
18.16.070 Maximum height.
18.16.075 Height modification.
18.16.080 Setbacks.
18.16.085 Commercial uses adjacent to residential zoning.
18.16.090 Binding site plan.
18.16.095 Building Width
18.16.100 Requirement to connect to city water and sewer systems.
18.16.110 Maintenance and Demolition of Historic Structures

18.16.070
Maximum height.

A. The maximum height in the CB zone is 30 feet; provided, that the height may
be built to 35 feet with a pitched roof if the lowest part of the pitch begins no
higher than 30 feet; provided further, that the height limit on the north side of
First Street shall be 25 feet with the height measured from the center of the
side(s) of the building fronting on First Street extended to the centerline of
the First Street right-of-way; provided further, that on steeply sloping lots
fronting on First Street, development shall step down the bluff and, thereby,
better fit with the site terrain and be more compatible with the adjacent
Seawall Park. A minimum setback of 5’ per floor is required, but up to two
steps may be combined in a single setback. A larger setback at the ground
level may satisfy part of the required upper level setbacks.

B. The city’s design review process will determine consistency with these
requirements for each development application.

B. The building height governing the two blocks between Second and Fourth
Streets on Cascade Avenue shall be 25 feet. In this area height will be measured from
the center point of the side(s) of the building fronting Cascade Avenue extended to the
centerline of the Cascade Avenue right-of-way. If the building is set back significantly
down-slope (i.e., to the west) the total height may be up to 35 feet, but not to exceed the
above-measured 25-foot elevation over Cascade Avenue. (Ord. 670, 1994; Ord. 650,
1993; Ord. 646, 1993; Ord. 566, 1990; Ord. 527, 1989)

18.16.095
Building Width
On First Street between Second Street and Anthes Avenue buildings shall be designed to be consistent with the original 30’ lots in the original Plat of Langley. For buildings wider than 30’ design elements including building setbacks and modulation, façade materials, window and door placements or other design elements shall be incorporated to maintain consistency with the scale and character of the streetscape.

18.16.110 Maintenance and Demolition of Historic Structures

A. Purpose. The city desires to preserve the most important historic and cultural resources in the community through proper maintenance and limiting demolition unless specific criteria are satisfied. Demolition shall only be authorized when it has been determined that preservation is not reasonable or feasible based on the consideration of the structural integrity of the structure, an economic hardship or community benefits associated with a redevelopment plan. When demolition is the only viable option reconstruction should be considered. The City may require professional assistance in evaluating an application for demolition to determine compliance with the standards of this section.

B. Applicability. The standards and review process for demolishing a historic building shall apply to any structure that is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the Washington Heritage Register. The City may require an analysis by a qualified historic preservation consultant to be paid for by the applicant for any structure that is at least 50 years old to determine eligibility for the historic registers and the applicability of the standards herein.

C. Maintenance. All structures listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the Washington Heritage Register shall be adequately maintained and the lack of proper maintenance shall not be justification for approval of the demolition of a historic structure through demolition by neglect. The City Building Official may inspect properties periodically and as necessary to determine compliance. The property owner shall be promptly notified of any noncompliance issues and given up to 30 days to correct the deficiency or fines in accordance with LMC 1.14 may be levied. Maintenance of historic structures shall be consistent with the following:
   a. Facades, which may fall and injure members of the public or property.
   b. Deteriorated or inadequate foundation, defective or deteriorated flooring or floor supports, deteriorated walls or other vertical structural supports.
   c. Members of ceilings, roofs, ceiling and roof supports or other horizontal members, which sag, split or buckle due to defective material or deterioration.
   d. Deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, foundations or floors, including broken windows or doors.
   e. Defective or insufficient weather protection for exterior wall covering, including lack of paint or weathering due to lack of paint or other protective covering.
   f. Any fault or defect in the building which renders it not properly watertight or structurally unsafe."

D. Application for Demolition. An application for demolition shall be submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission for review at a public hearing and recommendation to the city council. Following a closed record hearing the city
council shall make the final decision on an application for demolition of a historic structure as defined herein.

a. A report from a licensed engineer qualified to assess the structural integrity of historic buildings. The report shall address the ability for rehabilitation and reuse of the existing building as it pertains to the buildings structural integrity.

b. An engineering report and cost estimate that addresses the financial implications for restoration versus reconstruction.

c. A statement from the applicant regarding compliance with the standards for demolition of a historic structure.

d. For sites not listed currently listed on a historic register a report from qualified historic preservation consultant documenting the structures eligibility for a historic register.

e. For applications requesting approval based on the community benefit standard below a plan for redevelopment of the site.

f. For applications based on the economic hardship or structural integrity standard any approval shall be conditioned on receiving all appropriate permits for redevelopment of the site. The structure shall not be demolished until a redevelopment plan has been approved unless the structure presents an imminent safety hazard as determined by the City Building Official.

E. Demolition Review Standards:

a. Economic Hardship. The continued operation of the historic structure is financially infeasible based on existing and reasonable assumed land uses. All options for adaptive reuse, expansion, resale, or relocation shall be considered and addressed in the application. The failure of the property owner(s) to maintain the building shall not be a valid justification for an economic hardship.

b. Structural Integrity. The structure is beyond repair and the cost of repairing and operating the building is not financially feasible or reasonable; or

c. Community Benefit. The redevelopment plan for the site has significant state, regional or community benefits in terms of urban design, ecology, and cultural or economic benefits. The redevelopment proposal shall consider and address impacts on adjacent historic properties and the entire district. The potential of incorporating historic structures into redevelopment plans shall be considered and is encouraged.

d. Reconstruction. The applicant shall consider reconstruction of all or part of the historic building if restoration is not determined to be feasible. The plan for reconstruction shall retain the most integral historic features of the structure. Historic structures that exceed the height limitations of LMC 18.16.070 may be reconstructed to a height equal to the original structure. Demolition may not occur until a plan for reconstruction has been approved.

F. Approval for Demolition. Historic buildings that are approved for demolition require the applicant to comply with the following:

a. Any approval for the demolition of a historic structure shall require the applicant to document the building in accordance with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS)

b. Assurance from the applicant that the redevelopment plan as approved will be implemented if the historic structure demolition is approved based
on the community benefit of the redevelopment plan. In addition, structures approved for demolition based on the community benefit standard shall not be demolished until the entire redevelopment project has received all regulatory permits. The City may require a bond or letter of credit as a condition of approval for the demolition of a historic structure.

c. The time between demolition and the commencement of construction shall not exceed 1 month unless an alternative timeline is specifically approved as part of the demolition approval from the City.

**Definitions:**

“Demolition by Neglect” shall mean: Deterioration of the building to the extent that it creates or permits a hazardous or unsafe condition. Deterioration of exterior walls or other vertical supports, horizontal members, roofs, chimneys, exterior wall elements such as siding, wooden walls, brick, plaster or mortar to the extent that it adversely affects the character of the historic district or could reasonably lead to irreversible damage to the structure.
Comprehensive Planning in the 21st Century
Comp Plan as interactive platform that informs, connects and mobilizes community

We live in a rapidly changing world where the mediums of exchange are becoming digitized. To meaningfully interact with the up and coming generations, we must reimagine how we can digitally inspire and engage people to participate in the places they live. The internet provides a revolutionary space to inform, connect and mobilize people in its flexibility for multimedia experience and platform for local to global exchange.

Guiding Questions for Experimentation:
How can technology help cities organize?
How can a linear document become a multidimensional interface?
What does a city portal look like? How does it function?
How can a web platform be actively used to mobilize citizens around solving problems?

Objective: To reimagine:
Citizen engagement through digital medium
Interactive city process
The internet as a tool for collective organizing and change
## Land Capacity Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Langley</th>
<th>Freeland</th>
<th>Freeland Adjusted UGA</th>
<th>Coupeville</th>
<th>Oak Harbor</th>
<th>RAIDS</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtract Critical Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subtract Land for Public Purposes</strong></td>
<td><strong>People Housed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commercial Jobs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Industrial Jobs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,088 Units</td>
<td>2,687</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Limits only</td>
<td>1,212 Units</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>22.5 Acres</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4,319 Units</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>109 Acres</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeland Adjusted UGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>578 Units</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>98 Acres</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>657 Units</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>784</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>26.3 Acres</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Estimate Residential</td>
<td>1,739 Units</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>2,856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Estimate Residential</td>
<td>4,407 Units</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>7,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>651.8 Acres</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>13,763 Units</td>
<td>10,598</td>
<td>9,008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>594.63 Acres</td>
<td>505.44</td>
<td>429.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>14,641 Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>633.7 Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Determined based on the % of acres in critical areas (Langley 13%, Freeland 16%, Coupeville 39%, Oak Harbor 16%)
2. Assumption of 15%
3. Housing Units multiplied by 2.3
4. 1,329 single family and 410 multifamily units
5. 3,636 single family and 771 multifamily units
## Langley

### Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Potential Buildout (housing units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS5000</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS7200</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS7200-W</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS15000</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Redevelopable Acres</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Commercial Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Business</td>
<td>10.838351</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Business</td>
<td>8.800124</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (RM)</td>
<td>2.830961</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Areas</th>
<th># of Parcels</th>
<th>% of Parcels with critical areas</th>
<th>Area of Parcels (Acres)</th>
<th>Critical Areas (Acres)</th>
<th>% Area in CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>737.99359</td>
<td>95.732317</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>581.57</td>
<td>46.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily 2-4 units</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily 5 or more Units</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>43.49</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Services</td>
<td>86.69</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>145.93</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>307.15</td>
<td>24.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1257.30</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential/commercial split</th>
<th>property_u</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.587794</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.395808</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.25064</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.338227</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.669751</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.251839</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.677706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.216626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.494059</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
