

# DRAFT

## Minutes

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, February 12, 2004, 12:00 – 5:00 PM

At the Monterey County Leadership Institute, 2354 Garden Road, Monterey

Those present: Mike Caplin, Gwen Miller, Bob Perkins, Jim Bogart, Nancy Isakson, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Jay Brown, Christine Kemp, Luann Meador, Aaron Johnson (3:00)  
Tom Rowley (3:00).

Visitors: Mary Mecartney, Christopher Bunn Jr.

- I) Public Comment Period (Public Comment for issues not on the agenda)  
Christopher Bunn Jr. said that he will play his music with a band at Rollick's Café on Friday night.
- II) Approval of agenda for February 12, 2004  
Public comment: none  
Add Land Use to today's agenda. M/S/C
- III) Approval of minutes from February 5, 2004  
Public comment: none  
M/S/C

#### Land Use:

Public comment: none

Christine Kemp led the discussion, using a handout (dated 2/5/04), beginning on page 88. Changes tracked by Christine Kemp.

LU-9.1 (A) principal dwellings

LU-9.1 (B) secondary dwellings. Add explanation of why to promote.

LU-9.1 (C) additional units may be allowed with administrative permit, if adequate water and sewer facilities exist, which may include on-site wells and/or septic.

M/S/C

#### LU-9.6 Lot line adjustments

Mike Caplin: change (f). Add that lot line adjustment can promote resource conservation. E.g. move the developable part of a parcel to an adjacent parcel to get it out of the viewshed.

Add a new (g) saying, "better achieves the policies and goals of the general plan."

#### LU-9.17 Lot mergers

Adopt the existing 1982 General Plan language, as per subcommittee recommendation from 3.2.4, 36.0.4 in the 1982 plan.

Are there any areas that would meet the density requirements? Such as the 100% overlay areas?

Formula: as per 1982 plan: 3.2.4 is existing language for slope density formula

0-19.9 is one building site per each one acre  
20-29.9 is one building site per each two acres  
>30 no building sites

Concerning the language in 9.17 (B) (b), there is a clause that says that “any policy resulting in a decrease in density would be subtracted from the density calculated.” It was decided to eliminate the ERME policies from this section. Jay said that the PC members had given definite direction to the staff *not* to use the “natural plant communities” language, but the language remains, nevertheless. Mike Caplin said that the term “critical habitat” is used in several ways, and can be very limiting. Suggested language: “Actually inhabited by endangered species.” Bob Perkins said you have to either (1) not harm the species or (2) mitigate the intrusion. Jay Brown moved to leave the sentence out that describes lowering densities. Bob 2<sup>nd</sup>. Carried

Bob will e-mail his comment to Christine.

Land use designation: Christine will call Angus Jeffers.

Jay Brown handed out copies of the clustering and TDR language. P. 102: Mike Caplin: under the National Forest land designation, at end of 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, add: “federal land uses within this designation shall be consistent with the coastal policies of the certified LCP.”

Clustering language from Jay’s handout: Mike Caplin expressed a concern that TDR’s might be used to move people out of Big Sur.

Motion to approve the Clustering and TDR language as per Jay’s handout. M/S/C.

Wineries, page 83.

LU-7.15 second to last sentence: strike this sentence.

Luann: on Ag processing, the designations change from “rural mountainside” to “rural land,” etc. There was discussion that the Land use element is not consistent with the definitions section and thus lacks internal consistency.

RDR on 6.5 LDR, HDR are in rural countryside, but on p. 98 it says mixed rural and agricultural *uses*, not *processing*. Ag processing is really not in there. Suggested to add ag processing.

There was discussion about whether the definitions should be spread out throughout the document, or in one area. Luann: under definition of “agriculture,” there’s nothing that says, “ag processing.” Changing the definition would solve the problem.

The Land Use Element was adopted as modified during today’s session.

#### IV) Water Element (a discrete part of the Public Services Element)

Public comment: none

The group began with Nancy Isakson’s handout of Feb. 12, 2004 with a chart as the front page.

The group compared the chart on the handout to GPU3 PS-3, and compared it with the chart on p. 183 of GPU2, p. 205 of GPU3.

Water quality:

GPU3 prohibits the use of wells in areas served by a public water system. The subcommittee changed this to say that you may be served by: (1) a public water system (2) a private well or (3) a mutual water company.

There was discussion of “meeting standards.” It was decided to say “must meet state standards.”

Water quantity: the terms “Alluvial aquifers” and “Over-drafted” were discussed. Instead of saying “No development permit(s) allowed,” the group decided to say “no intensification of water use allowed.”

V) Reports from sub-committees

Public comment: none

A) Environmental Resource Management Element (ERME)

Mike Caplin said that this element is finished and only needs a final draft.

Language from Juan Uranga has been added. Brian will e-mail ERME to Tom Carvey and Mike Caplin. Tom will upload to website

B) Transportation:

Tom Carvey reported that Kurt Gollnick said the subcommittee has finished with 1/3 of the element.

C) Land Use

In order to complete the Land Use element, the group decided to double check the sections on lot lines, slopes, winery corridors, principal and secondary dwelling units and buffer language. 9.1, 9.6 and 9.7 need to be looked at today.

D) City/County Agreements

E) Public Service: Mike Caplin and Luann Meador are working on cleaning up the subcommittee recommendations. They will be ready as soon as the group finishes the Water Element.

F) Update of GPU process:

(1) Bob Perkins said the new version of GPU3 is unlocked, but in order to cut and paste, it must first be copied to the computer’s hard drive.

(2) The Planning Commission will begin their hearings on the GPU on March 3<sup>rd</sup>, with the theme of “Growth Strategy.” The EIR is done and has been sent to OPR clearing house. Public comment commences Feb. 17<sup>th</sup>. Copies of the EIR will likely be available from the County. The PC Subcommittees have been appointed.

(3) Jim Bogart said that the Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce Governmental Review Committee recommended opposing the GPU in its current form and supports the Refinement Group work.

(4) Website:

(a) Tom Carvey said that the membership list needs to be updated. Mike Caplin suggested leaving the old lists, along with dates to indicate the history of the group.

(b) Jay Brown said that the Ag Element on the website needs to be cleaned up.

- (c) A note should be placed on the web page to the effect that our proposed revisions are based on GPU2 (just as are the staff recommendations embodied in GPU3), and we reserve the right to further evaluate and revise our recommendations based on a review of GPU3.
  - G) Strategy: This subcommittee will meet on Wed., Feb. 18<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 AM at the CHISPA office.
  - H) Definitions
  - I) Key Concepts for each element:
    - The key concepts for each element should be combined with the Refinement Group Core values. Each group should develop key concepts.
  - J) Refinement Group Core Values
- VI) Agenda building for next meeting:  
Public comment: none  
The meeting on February 19 will be at the SV Builders' Exchange and will start at 1:00 PM instead of noon, due to the SV Chamber's awards event at noon.
- VII) Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, February 19, 2004, at the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange.