

DRAFT
Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, June 2, 2005, from 12:00 to 4:00 p.m.

at the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange

20 Quail Run Circle, Salinas

Those present:

- | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Tina Trujillo | 6. Christopher Bunn Jr. | 11. Ron Chesshire |
| 2. Alfred Diaz-Infante | 7. Gwen Miller | 12. Nancy Isakson |
| 3. Mike Caplin | 8. Bob Perkins | |
| 4. Tom Carvey | 9. Tom Rowley | |
| 5. Brian Finegan | 10. Chris Steinbruner | |

Visitors:

John Bridges, Peter Kasavan

- I. Public comment period (for items not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II. Approval of agenda for June 2, 2005
Public comment: none
Include the Housing and Economic Element under IV. Otherwise, approved as e-mailed.
- III. Approval of minutes of May 19 and May 26, 2005
Public comment: none
Minutes not available
- IV. Economic Element (Housing added as an addition to the agenda)
Public comment: none
P. Kasavan from the Salinas Valley Chamber of Commerce distributed copies of a letter submitted by the SVCC to the board of supervisors advocating market-based solutions to the housing problem. P. Kasavan said that the problem is with zoning, permit approval and process. We should provide incentives for builders to build. Remove artificial barriers and building will take place.

At SVCC GRC meeting this morning, Jennifer briefed the GRC on code enforcement.

B. Finegan asked A. Diaz-Infante to report on the staff report on the Housing Element.
Staff report #3: Employee contribution: change to "the county will support," instead of "encourage." County has a critical role in this. RG H-5.1: and RG H-5.3
A. A. Diaz-Infante said that the subcommittee modified RG goal H-5. This applies to #3 above.
Staff report #4: There is no RG position related to this.
Staff report #5: directly contrary to the RG policy. Would remove the 100% Affordable Housing Overlay.

Staff report #6: staff recommends not having a housing allocation system. This gives one supervisor the opportunity to bring this up.

Staff report #7: RG doesn't have a position yet.

Staff report #8: Okay, but use RG definition of "concurrent."

Staff report #9: RG LU-9.1 covers granny units and secondary units in a broader way than the staff report. M. Caplin: previous staff report had a typo.

Need to discuss 2, 4, 6, 7 for which we don't have positions. Some of our positions are contrary to the staff report, but are defined.

J. Bridges said that he opposes the staff report Housing #5. He said there are 2 fundamental problems: (1) staff report says "minimum" when state says "maximum." Old rule: at least 25%. New rule: maximum of 35%. Legislative intent is to make it more expansive. (2) How could a density bonus exceed 100%? Need to get into 12 – 14 units per acre to make it pencil.

B. Perkins said that if we're concerned about housing, then zoning should be at the maximum supportable density.

RG policy is the 100% Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO), which applies in all unincorporated lands in CV, Peninsula, Big Sur, all Rural Centers, but not in North County. Min density 6, max 30, avg 10. Max lot size 5,000 sq. ft. RG policy includes incentives such as modified development standards, etc. BOS should review 100% exemption cap.

Discussion of Staff #2: up to 100% median. If the board mandates the additional amount, why would the developers want to offer this?

RG H-5.4 called "Workforce Housing Program." 20%, plus an additional 20%.

Staff #4: RG H-5.3 is our policy, which is already voluntary.

Staff #6: staff says don't include, and we agree.

Staff #7: There was agreement with the staff report, but needs to be broader. The staff report says that the Housing Element will have to be amended to conform to the Land Use Element. But the General Plan may have the same land use designations as the 1982 plan.

Staff #8: Staff says RG doesn't have a position, which is incorrect. It was pointed out that "concurrency" is in several places in the RG plan.

Staff #9: Our LU-9.1. RG plan covers all kinds of secondary units, not just a few. See 9.1(b) and RG definition of "secondary." A second home is 9.1 (a). Staff report of March 31, 2005 and April 1, 2005 (but dated March 31).

Economic Element:

C. Steinbruner distributed copies of the RG redline version of the Economic Element. This did not yet include the "Preferred Project Policy language."

Discussion of inclusion of "clustering" and the definition of industry clusters. Does this mean geographic or like industry clusters?

There was discussion over the necessity of having an Economic Element. M/s/c to put on Economic Element on next week's agenda.

V. Promotion of RG work

Public comment: none

B. Finegan reported that C. Bunn Jr. produced a color document with photos that was distributed at the RG panel discussion in King City this morning. There was a good turn out in King City.

There will be another RG presentation on June 22, 2005 at the MCAR office at 8:30 a.m.

VI. Preparation for Board hearings

Public comment: none

VII. Other business

VIII. Adjournment to meeting of Thursday, June 9, 2005, 12:00 to 4:00 p.m., at Carpenters' Local 605, 751 Neeson Road, Marina.