

# DRAFT

## Minutes

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, February 5, 2004, 12:00 – 5:00 PM  
At the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange, Salinas

Those present: Gwen Miller, Tom Carvey, Jay Brown, Chris Steinbruner, Ralph Riva, Bob Perkins, Brian Finegan, Christine Kemp, Mike Caplin, Pete Scudder, and Tom Rowley

Visitors: Christopher Bunn, Jr., Mary Mecartney

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Public comment: Christopher Bunn Jr., announced that his musical group will play at Rollick's Internet Coffee House on Friday, Feb. 13<sup>th</sup>
- II) Approval of agenda for February 5, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Nancy Isakson moved that Item VI (H) on the February 5, 2004 agenda should read "formation of a subcommittee to discuss strategy and manner of presentation of the Refinement Group products to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors" rather than "formation of a political action subcommittee." M/S/C
- III) Approval of minutes from January 29, 2004  
Public comment: none  
M/S/C approve minutes as written
- IV) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)  
Public comment: none  
The ERME element is nearly complete. Mike Caplin mentioned language having to do with setbacks and policies ER-2.8 and ER-2.9. There was discussion about the relationship between these two policies.
- V) Land use Element  
Public comment: none  
There was discussion about LU-5.7 "e" and "f." How much of the existing deficiencies should a developer have to pay for? I was suggested that "e" should say, "There are community-wide (or regional) funding sources to which all property owners should contribute."

LU-9.1: Secondary Dwellings: Rename this "Additional Dwellings."

	Current	Proposal
Residence	Up to 3	Up to 3 additional (total of 4)
Guest house	Just 1	
Caretaker	Just 1	
Senior	Just 1	
Ministerial Second unit	none	
		Just 1

Add new policy 9.1 (a) principal dwellings; 9.1 (b) secondary dwellings and 9.1 (c) for “senior” and “caretaker” units.

Tom Rowley said that secondary housing is a great way to provide affordable housing. It’s economical and doesn’t stress the infrastructure.

LU-9.3: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-9.4: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-9.6: Lot line adjustments. In GPU2 these are very strict and could be broader.

There was discussion of lot line adjustments being a valuable tool for land owners. The state law now requires lot line adjustments to conform to the General Plan.

Mike Caplin said that this policy affects Big Sur. If lot line adjustments are allowed, people can use their land and build in an area that is out of the critical viewshed, and agencies can avoid the expense of acquiring property, making this a good situation for all involved.

Brian Finegan said that reducing the non-conformity should be a guiding factor when considering lot line adjustments.

Mike Caplin’s language was adopted with some modifications, changes tracked by Christine Kemp.

LU-9.9: Aaron Johnson has worked on language for Clustering.

LU-9.13: Residential Development Adjacent to Agricultural Operations: (right to farm). as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-9.14: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-9.15: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-9.16: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-9.17: slope restrictions

There was discussion on the origination of the slope policy and its pros and cons. The 1982 General Plan contained a slope/density formula, while GPU3 does not. Policy 26.1.10 in the 1982 plan prohibited building on slopes over 30%. In 1989, the Board of Supervisors adopted procedures for slopes and amended the general plan, requiring a waiver for building on slopes, but not a public hearing.

It was decided to break this policy up into several policies:

Title: Development on slopes over 30%

1. First paragraph: use the subcommittee paragraph.
2. Slope/density formula: use Policy 36.0.4 from the 1982 General Plan.
3. Conversion of previously uncultivated farmland to cultivation. The group decided that Bob Perkins should comment on this.
4. Lot line adjustments are not subject to slope requirements.

LU-9.18: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-10: Tom Carvey will e-mail the 100% Affordable Housing Overlay to Christine Kemp.

LU-11: as per subcommittee recommendation

LU-12: as per subcommittee recommendation

Part 3: Land use designations and maps

Primary Land Use Designations: as per subcommittee recommendation

**Residential:** p. 98: discussion of allowable densities in the various designations. as per subcommittee recommendation with today's modifications.

**Commercial:** as per subcommittee recommendation

**Industrial:** as per subcommittee recommendation

At 4:45 PM, the group stopped at p. 101 on the RG Land Use document.

VI) Reports from sub-committees

A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME): see item IV above

B) Water: No one was present from this subcommittee

C) Transportation: No one was present from this subcommittee

D) Land Use: see item V

E) City/County Agreements: Brian Finegan handed out copies of Goal LU-4, the City/County element produced by the subcommittee, which dictates to the cities what their growth policies will be: when they can annex, what their densities are, etc.

The RG decided to emphasize the underlying principle, saying that the General Plan should encourage the cities and County to work together. The County can't afford to implement the GPU, so they need the cooperation of the cities. Today's handout doesn't dictate to the cities, but suggests cooperation. The RG subcommittee had spoken to the Salinas Valley Mayors about this, and they have approved of this language.

M/S/C as per subcommittee recommendation

F) Public Service: no discussion took place

G) Update of GPU process

There was discussion of the process that the Planning Commission will use to review the GPU. The first PC hearing will be March 3, 2004 with the theme of "Growth Strategy."

Christine Kemp moved that the RG agendas, minutes, and finished elements be produced in a bound format to be submitted to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Christine amended her motion to include an executive summary along with the other work. M/S/C

Tom Carvey will contact Gary DeAmaral about the RG website that could be used to distribute the group's work.

Brian Finegan reminded the group that each subcommittee should focus on their element of GPU3 and be prepared to comment on changes from GPU2.

Brian Finegan handed out a page of 8 "Refinement Group Core Values."

H) ~~Formation of political action subcommittee.~~ Formation of a subcommittee to discuss strategy and manner of presentation of the Refinement Group products to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors

M/S/C To form a “Strategy Committee”: (1) how to make presentations to individual Planning Commissioners and (2) how to make a presentation to the Planning Commission. The committee will consist of Kurt Gollnick, Juan Uranga, Alfred Diaz-Infante, Tom Carvey, and Nancy Isakson.

VII) Agenda building for next meeting:

- Add the “definitions subcommittee” to the subcommittee reports.
- “Water” will be the main topic of discussion at the next meeting

VIII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, February 12, 2004 at the Leadership Institute