

DRAFT

Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, January 15, 2004, 12:00 – 5:00 PM

At the Monterey County Leadership Institute, Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Brian Finegan, Nancy Isakson, Tom Carvey, Mike Caplin, Ron Chesshire, Tim McGregor, Bob Perkins, Christine Gianascol, Jay Brown, Gwen Miller, Kurt Gollnick, Aaron Johnson (12:15), Mike Johnston (12:33), Alfred Diaz-Infante (1:00), Luann Meador (1:19), Chris Bunn (2:07)

Members of the public: Christopher Bunn Jr., Mary Mecartney.

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II) Approval of agenda for January 15, 2004
Public comment: none
Agenda approved as written
- III) Approval of minutes from January 8, 2004
Public comment: none
Minutes approved as written
- IV) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)
No action taken
- V) Land use Element
Public comment: none
Christine Gianascol tracked the changes to the subcommittee document.

LU-3.6: There was discussion of “tiering,” during which it was said that this means a prioritization of which community areas are developed first. In reality, this is market-driven process. Mike Caplin suggested adding language to the introductory paragraph.

There was discussion of the consistency of LU-3.6 with the city/county agreement element. The current GPU wording makes it sound like housing will be created only when there are enough jobs. It was pointed out that if it’s true that the city of Salinas is “over-housed and under-jobbed,” then it would follow that farmland is “over-jobbed and under-housed.”

The group decided to defer action on LU-3.6 until city/county agreements are finalized, and to add a comment saying that this area must be consistent with city/county agreements.

There was discussion of the 20 year planning range of the GPU. Ron Chesshire said that 20 years may be a short-term view and could become a potential obstacle to building housing over the long term. Looking only at the short term could result in areas designated for growth being surrounded by land designations that don't allow growth. Bob Perkins said that Ron's idea is good conceptually, and is something new. Brian Finegan suggested including this language in LU-1.3. Bob Perkins moved that the subcommittee craft language to include Ron's idea. Seconded and carried.

Christine Gianascol handed out another LU document today, dated 1-15-04 (through p. 67). The group used this document in the meeting.

There was discussion of what rural areas would be developed under the GPU.

LU-3.7: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-3.8: Brian Finegan said that although the subcommittee had struck the final sentence, it should be restored. Agreed. Otherwise, as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-3.9: Ron Chesshire mentioned concerns about height restrictions. Nancy Isakson said this is usually a zoning regulation. Christine Gianascol said that higher densities may mean taller buildings. "Eliminate regulatory constraints such as height restrictions that would limit the ability to achieve goal LU 3." There was discussion of the definition of "concurrent" and its relation to the construction of new development. It was decided to use the language "concurrent with the *phasing* of new development."

LU-3.9 (i): The current direction of the plan is not to allow individual water systems. It was decided to delete all of LU-3.9 (i), which would demand that any new development connect to a regional system. Alfred Diaz-Infante noted that mandating connections to a regional system could be very costly.

LU-3.10: Mike Johnston said that LU-3.9 relates to Community Areas, and that LU-3.10 has to do with what to do *until* the community area is developed. If the basic concept is to develop the Community Areas in a dense manner, then LU-3.10 addresses what to do until that happens.

LU-3.11: as per subcommittee recommendation, but add a note clarifying why we're striking this.

LU-4 (goal): continue this until more subcommittee language is forthcoming

LU-5.1. There was discussion about the last 2 sentences in 5.1. Alfred Diaz-Infante said that this section describes rural centers and later on, it talks about how we're going to develop them. There was discussion over the role of rural centers are in the GPU. The County says we won't let them expand until the local people develop a plan to fix their problems.

Accept as per subcommittee recommendation, with today's changes.

LU-5.2: Bob Perkins moved to replicate 3.2 on p. 66 and transfer to this section. Seconded, carried.

LU-5.3: Bob Perkins said that 3.1 had more descriptors than does 5.3. There was discussion about striking all of 5.3 because the descriptors don't match the current rural centers. Mike Caplin moved to send this policy back to the subcommittee for new language. Seconded, carried.

LU-5.4 Rural center expansion: approved as per subcommittee recommendation with today's changes.

Aaron Johnson handed out language for LU-9.9 on clustering.

LU-5.5: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-5.6: Del Monte Forest: no major language changes. Aaron Johnson moved to delete this section. Seconded, carried.

LU-5.7: Infrastructure and financing studies: There was discussion around the topic that a burden being imposed by new subdivision should be borne by the subdivision. There was discussion about the concept that new development should have to pay for existing deficiencies. It was mentioned that the requirement for the community to agree to pay for the repair of the deficiencies closes the circle and practically insures no new development. It was noted that requiring a financial study would be costly, and the developer would have done his part in doing the study. Identifying the deficiencies is one part, and the community would then decide whether or not to fix them. Should a new *standard* subdivision be required to create a financing study so that building of needed infrastructure can occur and the new development pays its fair share? If the local residents choose not to contribute their share, the development can continue by mitigating its own impacts (whatever increased deficiencies there may be), so as not to increase the level of deficiency that exists.

LU-5.7 (a) as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-5.7 (b) a benefit assessment district may be necessary.

LU-5.9: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-5.10: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-5.11: There was discussion about whether or not to remove the sentence referring to Table PS-1. Mike Caplin moved that we include the note concerning Table PS-1. Seconded, carried. The remainder as per subcommittee recommendation.

LU-5.12: strike as per subcommittee recommendation, but include a comment explaining why.

Goal LU-6 – Major Land Groups: next week.

- VI) Reports from sub-committees
- A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME). Continued until next week.
 - B) Water: no change since last meeting
 - C) Transportation: no change since last meeting
 - D) Land Use: will meet before Jan 22, 2004
 - E) City/County Agreements: These policies have been revised after discussion with the Salinas Valley Mayors, and have been approved by the RG subcommittee. The mayors will review the changes.
 - F) Public Service: Mike Caplin reported that the Public Service subcommittee has reviewed the entire element. Luann Meador is typing up the changes.
 - G) Update of GPU process: Brian Finegan reported that the Planning Commission (PC) agenda for Jan. 14, 2004 showed a review of the GPU review schedule. Brian said that Lynn Burgess recommended postponing the scheduling of the review because GPU3 won't be mailed until Friday, Jan. 16, 2004. GPU3 should be available Tuesday for \$45 at the GPU office. There will also be a free CD-ROM. The DEIR is not done, but they hope it will be done by the end of month (January 2004). The PC will have a full roll-out on January 28, 2004, with 2 hours on agenda for this item. Lynn Burgess said that the GPU3 has some new features, including a CIP, appendix, and implementation plan with timeline. The GPU Staff will make a full presentation on January 28, 2004.
- VII) Agenda building for next meeting
Public comment: none
- VIII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, January 22, 2004, at the Monterey County Leadership Institute, Garden Road, Monterey.