

# Mount Vernon 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update

## Land Use Goals and Policies CAC Comments

### CAC Comments

Comments on goals and policies included below are direct copies from commentors. Other general comments are summaries of the comments received.

Only the goals policies that had comments associated with them are included in this document. Goals and policies are shown in *italics*, and comments are shown as sub-bullets below the goal/policy language.

### Specific Goal and Policy Comments

- ***Goal 1: Direct future growth by identifying the location and intensity of land uses consistent with the community's vision.***
  - Market demand changes over time. It would be helpful if the City had a process to regularly review land use designations based on changing needs. For example, if a new elementary school is built, surrounding land use should be adjusted to allow for more affordable/attainable homes for the intended demographic. This has to be through middle housing and smaller sqft lots.
- ***Policy 1.0: Ensure adequate land is designated in appropriate locations for existing and projected population, housing, jobs, commerce, commercial floorspace, recreation, open spaces, utilities and facilities, and other needed land uses.***
  - how do we move forward with this very goal if we do not have an updated available lands inventory. The 2018 inventory was significantly flawed in a number of areas.
  - The previous update failed to provide adequate capacity for the City's residential growth; this update must acknowledge that the City plans to address pent-up existing demand for housing (plus projected demand), if it wants be taken seriously.
  - Providing an accurate and detailed map to show exactly how the city will meet its residential land targets to improve transparency for developers to plan ahead.
- ***Policy 1.1: Facilitate infill development and encourage redevelopment of underutilized land.***
  - Not strong enough; past infill development has been more difficult in the City than greenfield development and was thus rare. There must be a positive preference or incentive for infill—otherwise it will remain rare.
  - Could add density bonuses for infill sites to make them more attractive to the developer. Right now there is a hurdle in the process of redevelopment in underutilized lands.

- Require a minimum housing density in underutilized land? Remove the CUP process?
- **Policy 1.2:** *Locate the highest intensity residential areas close to and near shops and services, employment centers, transportation hubs, and in areas of the City where infrastructure is adequate to handle impacts from higher intensity development.*
  - I believe this is a good ideal, and that a great first policy step would be expansion of the C-1 zoning designation to all parcels within a ½ mile walk of Skagit Station.
  - this can only be accomplished if multifamily is allowed in the C-1 and C-2 zones.
  - Will require NEW mixed-use comp plan designations (e.g. not enough to just make C2-type commercial zones mixed-use).
  - Will there be new zonings to help enable this goal?
  - This policy should flat out allow multi-family in C-1 and C-2 zones with no conditional use process.
- **Policy 1.3:** *Integrate non-residential uses such as parks, social and religious uses, or corner stores, into residential neighborhoods to create communities that have a full range of public facilities and services.*
  - Again, I believe that this is a good ideal. However, if the previous iteration of the comprehensive plan is anything to go by, this will require follow-up with an actual change in ordinances to allow limited commercial use of residential parcels (or full mixed-use zoning).
  - This can be accomplished through allowing neighborhood commercial in residential zones through use of a Conditional Use Permit or as part of a PUD.
  - Adding corner stores here is good; consider adopting Anacortes' existing code allowing small stores in residential areas with a conditional use permit.
- **Policy 1.4:** *Coordinate land use and transportation planning to create walkable, connected, and inclusive communities. Ensure all residents have safe, convenient access to housing, jobs, schools, parks, services, and gathering places. Align decisions to reduce congestion, improve safety for walking and biking, and support public health and quality of life.*
  - This is such a good ideal, but it needs more specifics. While a planning document like this isn't supposed to be as concrete as an ordinance, it should, at a minimum, have language about increasing implementation of bike lanes, street narrowing, dedicated bike/pedestrian pathways, and transit stops that are sheltered and accessible. These are all measures that aren't too specific, but are proven to be the best way of accomplishing the intent of Policy 1.4.
  - Sounds great—let's create this!

- **Policy 1.5:** *Maintain and implement the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Ensure yearly updates to the Comprehensive Plan map and/or text are accompanied by changes to the zoning map and development regulations to maintain consistency between these documents and maps.*
  - Map does not currently provide for enough future housing (or previous pent-up demand) and must be dramatically improved, if this update is to be taken seriously.
- **Policy 1.6:** *Maintain criteria, development regulations, and procedures allowing for the appropriate siting of essential public facilities. Update existing essential public facility development regulations to include the siting of organic materials management facilities.*
  - What is “organic materials management facilities”?
- **Policy 2.1:** *Maintain and promote land uses that support and enhance access to close, safe and convenient areas for physical activity, social connectivity, goods, services, and other daily needs of city residents.*
  - Without upzoning/redesignating areas around the downtown core, access to all this will be more difficult. Need to update the Comprehensive Plan map.
- **Proposed replacement for deleted policy LU-P-1.3.1**
  - Policy 2.4: Support local business through the support of workforce housing project, which creates affordable housing for residents and housing for local business team members.
- **Policy 3.0:** *Continue to review existing development regulations on a regular basis to remove unnecessary requirements that hinder the development process.*
  - Add after the word “basis”: “to eliminate redundant, overlapping” requirements that hinder the development process.
  - Not strong enough—no practical effect after previous plan. Suggest we annually compare our requirements to neighboring cities and have staff either defend or remove unique regulations.
  - This is a good idea but maybe we can take it a step further and look at what SUCCESSFUL nearby jurisdictions are doing. There is no reason for Mount Vernon to be lacking the development as per Burlington, Bellingham, Ferndale etc. That way areas in the codes can be pointed out that don’t really make sense anymore which could be holding things up here in Mount Vernon.
- **Policy 3.2:** *Continue to regularly review and update permitting procedures to identify inefficiencies, remove unnecessary steps, and reflect best practices and community goals.*
  - Not strong enough—what does “best practices” mean? Suggest we again compare our permitting procedures to neighboring cities.
- **Goal 4:** *Ensure inclusive, transparent, and meaningful public participation and regional coordination in all aspects of the planning process.*

- Correct “reginal” to “regional”.
- Lofty goal—will require cultural changes! (Also, spell check on “regional”)
- **Policy 4.0:** *Ensure that planning processes are accessible and inclusive, particularly for historically underrepresented communities, by addressing language, cultural, technological, and physical barriers.*
  - Lofty goal—will require cultural changes!
- **Policy 4.4:** *Coordinate and engage with public agencies, tribes, and other organization on matters of future growth and development.*
  - Doesn't this already happen through SEPA process?
- **Goal 5:** *Update development regulations to prioritize and create streamlined processes to approve the siting of housing for vulnerable populations such as those experiencing or at risk of homelessness, living with disabilities and chronic health conditions, recovering from disasters, or facing behavioral health or substance abuse challenges.*
  - Current land use map and regulations work to prevent new multifamily housing; this goal will not be met by simple tweaks and will require dramatic improvements to zoning, land use designations, and development regulations.
- **Policy 5.0:** *Ensure land use and zoning designations are sufficient to provide housing affordable to all income levels, prioritizing those for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-incomes.*
  - Current land use map and regulations work to prevent new multifamily housing; this goal will not be met by simple tweaks and will require dramatic improvements to zoning, land use designations, and development regulations.
- **Proposed new Policy 5.1:**
  - Policy 5.1: Ensure all levels of housing are built to accommodate all income levels. The adequate supply of housing options creates affordability.
- **Policy 7.0:** *Maintain a minimum density in residential subdivisions to use land efficiently and support compact growth, except in areas with physical limits like flood zones or poor access that reduce the number of homes that can be built.*
  - The new policy should still specify a minimum net density like the previous policy did, to ensure that the intent of the comprehensive plan isn't watered down by rule-making later.
- **Policy 7.1:** *Support the development of multiple housing units on a single lot in residential zones to expand housing choice, promote efficient land use, and improve housing affordability. Establish a minimum density of at least two units per lot, with higher densities—such as four units—encouraged in areas zoned for increased residential capacity and when affordable housing is incorporated. This approach supports compact, adaptable residential patterns that respond to the needs of a growing and diverse population.*

- I'll give Mount Vernon credit for doing a good thing like upzoning to 2-unit-per-lot zoning citywide, even when it was only done because the state government said that we had to. However, I think there's a great argument to be made that this policy should be amended (or that another policy should be added) to increase the areas around the city zoned for even higher density. The best areas to do this would be near downtown, the Skagit Valley Hospital main campus, or SVC, to be consistent with Policy 1.2.
- Have to get this right! If "higher densities" are only allowed in higher-density areas "and when affordable housing is incorporated", this policy will be less effective. Provide incentives for smaller units, such as cottages. Cluster developments over multiple lots when common space is shared?
- **Policy 7.2:** *Promote the development of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as a means to increase housing diversity, support intergenerational living, and improve housing affordability. Revise zoning regulations to allow up to two ADUs per residential lot to make more efficient use of existing residential properties. Encouraging ADUs provides flexible, lower-cost housing options that integrate well into established neighborhoods while meeting the needs of a changing population.*
  - How does this interact with middle housing/Policy 7.1? Must be clear that ADUs do not count against units-per-lot limits.
  - City should clarify if ADUs are counted as part of the total density per lot or treated as separate.
- **Policy 7.3:** *Encourage compatible non-residential uses in residential neighborhoods. Prioritize the creation of "third places" that offer informal, welcoming spaces for social interaction beyond home and work, strengthening community ties and supporting daily life needs.*
  - I couldn't agree more with the intent of this policy. However, it should at least mention changes to the zoning code to accomplish this, without fully specifying what the code changes would be (i.e. amending residential zoning to allow compatible non-residential use, or combining multiple zoning designations into a mixed-use designation).
  - Need a definition for "third place".
  - Consider adopting Anacortes' existing code allowing small stores in residential areas with a conditional use permit.
  - Community centers that are publicly owned? Or HOA buildings? And commune areas in multifamily?
- **Policy 7.4:** *Support the creation of a variety of housing opportunities near employment locations.*
  - expand language: "to promote walking or biking to work".
  - Will require NEW mixed-use comp plan designations (e.g. not enough to just make C2-type commercial zones mixed-use).
  - C-1 and C-2 zones should have multifamily as outright permitted.

- **Policy 7.5:** *Establish clear and objective development standards for infill residential development that reflect the community's design priorities, including:*
  - *Providing distinct entries and safe, walkable connections between buildings and streets;*
  - *Minimizing the disruption of privacy on adjacent properties;*
  - *Minimizing the negative impacts of parking;*
  - *Using design techniques and architectural elements like building modulation, window size and patterns, and balconies and bay windows to help new development blend into existing neighborhoods; and*
  - *Integrating landscape and open space features to enhance livability and visual character.*
  - promote the cross utilization of residential and commercial use parking through parking use studies and mixed use parking easements. Allow the use of on street parking to meet parking standards. Promote housing that does not depend on automobile ownership.
  - Design guidelines will apply only to infill now?
  - Parking requirements can make it hard to add more units to a site, especially for infill or mixed-use buildings. When fewer units are allowed but have an increasingly large sqft - the cost to build gets split between fewer homes — which pushes rents way up and makes it harder to offer anything affordable. Some flexibility with parking standards could really help make these kinds of projects pencil out.
- **Policy 7.6:** *Encourage the reinvestment in and rehabilitation of existing housing stock to extend its useful life and maintain it as an affordable housing option for a range of income levels.*
  - this can only be accomplished if we have an accurate inventory of existing affordable housing.
  - How? I don't feel like this is a city regulation or policy.
- **Policy 7.7:** *Provide innovative housing regulations to promote housing diversity and home ownership, through methods such as small-lot subdivisions, zero-lot-line developments, middle housing, and accessory dwelling units.*
  - Consider supporting condo plats in middle housing.
- **Policy 7.8:** *Modernize residential zoning standards—such as setbacks, lot coverage, and parking— to enable a wider range of housing types, facilitate the development of middle housing, and promote equitable access to housing opportunities for all residents.*
  - I think this policy is badly needed. The intent of this policy could benefit from breaking it into multiple policies for each of the standards (setbacks, lot coverage, abolition of parking minimums). Otherwise this policy risks being too vague.
  - This can only be accomplished if there is a complete reset of the existing allowed densities in all residential zones. Condo plats should be considered as one way to accomplish this goal.

- Good: this update must acknowledge that the City plans to address past over-emphasis on high parking mandates, low lot coverage, and large setbacks, if it wants be taken seriously.
- **Deleted Policy LU-P-5.1.4:**
  - TDRs should be promoted as a way to allow the set aside of critical areas that should not be developed. Move back to gross versus net density mindset.
- **Policy 7.9: Identify opportunities to simplify development standards in zoning districts by completing actions including, but not limited to:**
  - Consolidating the number of individual zones into related and simplified groups based on existing conditions and planning objectives;
  - Renaming zones to better describe the allowed mix of uses;
  - Eliminating or combining zones that only apply to a limited number of parcels; and
  - Standardizing development standards across similar zones.
  - So....we need to get the comprehensive plan map designations right, to avoid sabotaging this policy!
  - This is a good goal. Will the city engage the development community directly when simplifying zones?
- **Policy 7.10: Continue to promote regulations that allow incentives such as bonus densities and flexible design standards that support and promote the construction of affordable housing.**
  - The City's affordable housing/bonus density code is only useful if it continues to cap density in high-demand areas. Neighboring cities allow unlimited density in high-demand areas—we should do the same, even if it moots the affordable housing code.
  - We must start this more aggressively. I think we should remove the “continue to” and just say “promote”. We should put a deadline on the implementation of code changes.
- **Policy 7.11: Adopt development regulations encouraging housing diversity and home ownership through regulations such as unit lot subdivisions, zero lot line development, middle housing, and accessory dwelling units.**
  - condo plats should be included as a tool to promote diverse and affordable home ownership.
- **Policy 7.12: Support existing, lower-density neighborhoods while guiding gradual change to meet diverse housing needs. Ensure new housing:**
  - Fits neighborhood scale and supports livability;
  - Includes gentle infill—such as ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhomes, and stacked flats— to expand options;
  - Contributes positively to neighborhood quality and identity.
  - Devil is in the details—what is “gradual change”? What “contributes positively to neighborhood quality and identity”? Seems like this is a way to sabotage increased density on the east side of the City.

- **Policy 7.13:** *Due to increased impacts to privacy and personal living space inherent to higher-density residential development to support high-quality living environment by providing adequate private and shared open spaces in a walkable urban setting.*
  - Remove “adequate”.
- **Policy 7.14:** *Maintain development regulations, such as increased setbacks, reduced building heights, and enhanced landscape buffers, that promote context-sensitive development and smooth transitions between properties with differing abutting land uses.*
  - This policy is inconsistent with Policy 3.0 and Goal 5, and should be removed.
  - Remove – this should not be a policy. It is exactly the opposite of the current need.
- **Policy 7.15:** *Ensure multifamily dwelling units developed through infill—particularly on former parking lots, vacant parcels, or underutilized land—are designed to promote high livability standards, safety, connectivity, and integration into the existing urban fabric.*
  - what does this mean?
- **Policy 7.16:** *Allow the R-A zoning to continue only if the parcel has a comprehensive plan designation of agricultural (AG).*

*Restrict the application of the R-A (Residential-Agricultural) zoning district to parcels that have a Comprehensive Plan designation of Agricultural (AG), to ensure consistency between zoning and long-range land use policy.*

  - If we keep this in the Plan, will it happen this time?
- **Goal 8:** *Support existing businesses and provide a dynamic business environment for new commercial and industrial activities that strengthen the city’s employment and tax base, while providing well-planned and attractive facilities.*
  - Will we have commercial-only zones in the future? We probably shouldn’t, so call this “mixed-use commercial” if that’s what we intend. We should also define which areas will not allow housing: industrial, commercial/light-industrial, etc.
- **Policy 8.0:** *Promote the development and adaptive reuse of buildings for live-work use, supporting economic development, reducing commutes, increasing housing availability, and fostering vibrant, mixed-use communities.*
  - Will require NEW mixed-use comp plan designations (e.g. not enough to just make C2-type commercial zones mixed-use).
- **Policy 8.1:** *Increase accessibility to commercially zoned areas for both automobiles, transit, pedestrians, and cyclists.*
  - Commercially zoned areas throughout the city are already sufficiently accessible to automobiles. The city’s current need is for increased access by transit, pedestrians, and cyclists, which would help fulfill the climate planning element of the comprehensive plan.

The state's directive is to decrease vehicle miles traveled, and including automobiles in this policy runs counter to that.

- Will we have commercial-only zones in the future? We probably shouldn't, so call this "mixed-use commercial" if that's what we intend.
- **Policy 8.3:** *Ensure that office, retail, commercial or industrial development is attractive and blends with the surrounding areas.*
  - This implies mixed-use development without saying it; the City should be specific if it wants mixed-use.
- **Policy 8.4:** *Support development plans that incorporate the following features:*
  - *Shared access points and fewer curb cuts;*
  - *Internal circulation among adjacent parcels;*
  - *Shared parking facilities;*
  - *Centralized signage; and*
  - *Unified development concepts.*
  - This implies mixed-use development without saying it; the City should be specific if it wants mixed-use.
- **Policy 8.5:** *Ensure commercial and office developments provide safe, direct, and convenient internal pedestrian networks that connect buildings, parking areas, public sidewalks, and nearby transit stops. Support site designs that:*
  - *Include clearly defined walkways between building entrances, parking areas, and public streets;*
  - *Provide shaded, accessible, and well-lit pedestrian routes throughout the site;*
  - *Integrate pedestrian paths with adjacent sidewalks, trails, and transit infrastructure;*
  - *Enhance the pedestrian experience through landscaping, seating, and other human-scale design elements.*
  - I couldn't agree more
  - This implies mixed-use development without saying it; the City should be specific if it wants mixed-use.
- **Policy 8.6:** *Development should be designed to mitigate potential adverse impacts on adjacent properties with different uses. Careful consideration of impacts from lighting, landscaping, and setbacks should all be evaluated during site design.*
  - Seems like this could prevent legal development in existing neighborhoods, neutralizing the effect of upzoning.
- **Policy 8.7:** *Site design for office uses, commercial, and mixed-use developments should consider ways of improving transit ridership through siting, locating of pedestrian amenities, walkways, parking, etc.*
  - I couldn't agree more

- **Policy 8.8:** *Provide a network of logical, safe, convenient, attractive, and comfortable pedestrian networks on sidewalks and trails, to and from access points, through parking lots to planned building entrances or other site amenities such as public open spaces to reinforce pedestrian activity between the commercial development and the surrounding residential neighborhoods.*
  - I couldn't agree more
  - Mixed use?
- **Goal 9 and Policies:**
  - All of Goal 9 and the associated policies sound good, if they are eventually acted on through ordinances.
- **Goal 9:** *Create new and encourage the revitalization of mixed-use areas into connected, walkable, and community- focused environments that strengthen ties to nature and local identity.*
  - Will require NEW mixed-use comp plan designations (e.g. not enough to just make C2-type commercial zones mixed-use).
  - Heavy residential near downtown existing business and no new commercial.
- **Policy 9.0:** *Support development in mixed-use districts that:*
  - *Revitalizes vacant or underused sites like large parking lots and aging centers;*
  - *Supports a mix of retail, office, and residential uses in multistory structures; or mixed uses in a horizontal orientation;*
  - *Integrates parks, greenways, and natural features;*
  - *Improves walking, hiking, and access to public spaces;*
  - *Encourages placemaking with quality design.*
  - New mixed use village areas, much like the UVMU at Woolley. Should have new Commercial uses.
- **Goal 10:** *Retain and enhance the existing natural features and sensitive areas that are essential to a high quality of life in the community of Mount Vernon.*
  - Should we name the features? Explain A big reason why CA's stimulate growth.
- **Policy 10.2:** *With development regulations, support retention of natural areas and include design criteria to achieve subdivision and site layouts which will be sensitive to the environmental constraints and optimize open space and views. Key areas of consideration and emphasis for development include:*
  - *Steep slopes;*
  - *Streams with associated wetlands;*
  - *Habitat areas; and*
  - *Natural vegetation.*
  - Encourage the use of mitigation banks to remove category IV wetlands in order to increase the density throughout the city of Mount Vernon.

- **Goal 11:** *Identify critical areas as defined in RCW 36.70A.030 that include: floodways of 100 year floodplains; landslide, erosion, and seismic hazards, including steep slopes over 40 percent; wetlands and their protective buffers; streams and their protective buffers; Critical aquifer recharge areas; and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.*
  - We need language that promotes the use of critical area mitigation banks as a preferred alternative to piecemeal on-site critical area enhancement / wetland fill mitigation.
  - These areas should be considered undevelopable in the land analysis.
- **Policy 11.0:** *Maintain an up-to-date inventory of environmentally sensitive areas including descriptions of criteria for designation and maps.*
  - Do we have this now?
- **Policy 11.1:** *Use best available science to determine critical area buffers and maintain achievable ecological functions of those buffers.*
  - Encourage the use of mitigation banks to remove category IV wetlands in order to increase the density throughout the city of Mount Vernon.
- **Policy 11.2:** *Use easements or equivalent protective measures to protect critical areas and critical area buffers that are not protected through public ownership, and to prevent encroachment of incompatible uses.*
  - Allow for the preservation of critical areas through the clustering of development on useable portion of parcels. Allowing multifamily on single-family zoned land when significant critical areas are being preserved.
- **Policy 11.3:** *Use acquisition, enhancement, regulations, and incentive programs independently or in combination with one another to protect and enhance critical area functions.*
  - By revising the TDR ordinance, critical areas can be preserved and their functions enhanced. Assigning transferable development rights to critical areas will incentivize their preservation.
- **Policy 11.4:** *Consider allowing alterations to critical areas, after all ecological functions are evaluated, the least harmful and reasonable alternatives are identified, and affected significant functions are appropriately mitigated, to:*
  - *Maintain and improve a critical area; or,*
  - *Avoid denial of reasonable use of the property; or*
  - *Meet other priority growth management goals and programs consistent with GMA and the City Comprehensive Plan.*
  - Mitigation Bank use needs to be promoted as a preferred method of mitigating the impacts on Class III and IV wetlands.
- **Policy 11.5:** *Establish critical area mitigation priorities to strategically minimize habitat fragmentation, including impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation.*

- What is this for the City? Isn't this a state issue?
- **Policy 11.7:** *Ensure clearing and grading regulations set seasonal restrictions to limit land disturbing activities during the rainy seasons.*
  - Developers already have enough regulations that limit what we can do during the rainy season. DOE regulations are adequate to cover this issue.
  - Remove or the city should prioritize the projects that need this.
- **Policy 14.2:** *Adopt portions of, or all of, the wildland urban interface (WUI) code to reduce wildfire risk, separate human development from wildfire prone landscapes, and to protect existing residential development and infrastructure.*
  - Yes! A much-needed policy with a specified method (the WUI code) of how it will be implemented.
- **Policy 14.3:** *Identify environmental health disparities and work to reduce the burden on communities most affected by natural hazards and climate change.*
  - Without a specific definition of environmental justice or some method of how it will be measured or achieved, I fear this policy will be toothless. That being said, environmental justice is a tricky ideal to implement and measure, and I don't have a suggestion for how to change this policy's wording.
- **Policy 15.2:** *Consider the presence of potential threatened or endangered wildlife when evaluating commercial, industrial, or residential development.*
  - What exactly would it mean to "consider" the presence of potential threatened or endangered wildlife?
  - Remove the word "potential".
- **Goal 16:** *Preserve and protect, where possible, identified wetlands within the city.*
  - Add the word critical.
- **Policy 16.2:** *Promote mitigation projects that create or restore wetland areas or enhance existing wetland areas.*
  - Promote the use of existing Wetland Mitigation Banks as an alternative to onsite mitigation.
- **Policy 16.3:** *Preserve land used for wetland mitigation in perpetuity.*
  - The City of Mount Vernon has within its jurisdiction that Nookachamp Mitigation bank. The existence of this enhanced habitat area should be acknowledged and its use promoted.
- **Goal 17:** *Preserve and protect, where possible, identified priority habitat areas within the city.*

- I feel like goal 17 and 16 are the same and should be combined.
- **Policy 18.3:** *Promote the establishment of regional surface water management facilities to support infill development and preclude the need for individual on-site ponds and facilities, provide development incentives, encourage efficient use of land, and reduce overall facility maintenance costs.*
  - Regional surface water areas cannot be vested why would we do this?

### **General Goal and Policy Feedback/General Comments**

- Goals: none of the goals meet the definition of goals – “they must be attainable, specific, measurable and in writing”, followed by an action plan of how to meet these goals. None of the goals have measurable numbers to be held accountable to.
  - General goals and policies – Describes/notes the difficulties with expanding the city limits. States that spreading out (with subdivision development) isn’t going to be enough – density must be increased, and development must go up. Provides areas prime for infill developments and/or annexation areas:
    1. East of Moores Garden Road
    2. East of Sunset Drive
    3. East of Burlingame Road
    4. North of Skyridge Drive
    5. The general West Mount Vernon area
    6. Swan Road area
    7. Under utilized land owned by Mount Vernon School District (i.e. entire city block where existing administration building housed at 4<sup>th</sup> and Lawrence, half a city block of Lincon Elementary is sited, several acres adjacent on North of Madison Elementary).
    8. South of the post office – provides massive opportunity for creative master plan community.
  - Quality of life goals and policies – States that we can’t plan for 2,000 square foot houses on 10,1000 square foot lots.
  - Process Improvement goals and policies – many process improvements needed.
  - Public Participation and Regional Coordination goals and policies – noes that public participation is necessary, but should not be given too much credence.

- Equitable Housing, Health, and Community Stability goals and policies – states that the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance is well intentioned but regulations prevent is from happening.
- Residential Development and Housing goals and policies – states that a variety of housing is needed.
- Annexation goals and policies – states the City needs to establish a true buildable land inventory. "We need an inventory of land that is developable not a buildable land inventory". School district boundaries should be considered/redesignated.