

## Minutes

### GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, May 18, 2006, 12:00 to 4:00 p.m.

at Laguna Seca Golf Ranch

10520 York Road, Monterey

Those present: Christine Kemp, Bob Perkins, Nancy Isakson, Mike Caplin, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Shari Damon,

Visitors: Kristina Wyatt

I. Public comment period (for items not on the agenda)

Public comment: none

II. Approval of agenda for May 18, 2006

Public comment: none

III. Approval of minutes of April 6 and 20; May 11, 2006

IV. Review of completed GPU4 matrices

It was determined that all the matrices have been completed except Circulation and Housing. Chair Finegan said that the purpose of preparing the matrices was not whether the RG agreed or disagreed with a particular part of GPU4, but to determine whether GPU4 reflects the decisions made by the Supervisors during the GPU4 study sessions.

Ag matrix: Bob Perkins distributed copies of the Ag matrix.

Discussion about policies in which GPU4 deviated from BOS direction.

p. 139, AG-1.5: the list should have been deleted, as per AAC and BOS direction

P. 140, AG-1.11: GPU4 language reads: "Permits for agriculture activities will be integrated with applicable resource conservation district permit coordination (streamlining) programs.

P. 141, AG-2.7: Has to do with compatible uses of recreational uses. GPU4 language says, "Recreational uses...*shall* be considered compatible uses in Farmlands...."

Discussion about the Oct. 31, 2005 approved language, which is "Recreational uses...*are* compatible uses in Farmlands...."

V. Review of GPU4

Area plan versus General Plan

E-mail from John Bridges distributed

E-mail from Mike Caplin distributed

Mike raised the issue because the Big Sur LUP might be less restrictive than the General Plan. GPU4 has a 25% slope policy, while the BSLUP has a 30% slope policy.

Area plans are more detailed than GPU4.

Area Plans should be substantially consistent with General Plan, but 100% consistency is not required if local circumstances and conditions justify the difference.

A word search was conducted on the government code section that defines consistency in regard to the general plan.

M. Caplin will write on the relationship of “consistency” regarding the area plans and GPU4.

## VI. Community General Plan Initiative

Discussion of LandWatch letter, critical of GPU4. Tasks were assigned the previous week.

#1: The LandWatch letter claims that “GPU4 provides no build-out data. This is the most fundamental part of a General Plan.”

B. Finegan: This is a very complex issue. The statute doesn’t require build-out data, but the case law does. This may be a shortfall in GPU4 and should be addressed in the DEIR.

#2: The LandWatch letter claims that “favors campaign friends, allowing special arrangements to CG, RG, and other names in the ‘radical, pro-growth movement’.”

C. Kemp: The County originally requested property owner requests. This was publically advertised. LUAC, Planning Commission meetings looked at this. It was a very public and open process. Because this is a new plan, changes had to be looked at. 271 property owner requests were received, and 60 were approved. This is not a give-away to property owners.

#3: The LandWatch letter claims that “a recipe for unbridled urban sprawl—7 Community Areas (CA’s) and 14 Rural Centers (RC’s), including Carmel Valley. These areas are already stressed.”

N. Isakson: GPU4 says that Rural Centers (RC’s) have to have infrastructure and financing plans in place before new subdivision can take place. The LandWatch Initiative doesn’t include RC’s.

#4: The LandWatch letter claims that discourages public wells and septic systems.

N. Isakson: GPU4 requires a long-term water supply. GPU4 says 2.5 acres minimum. Initiative provides *no* regulation (is silent concerning parcel sizes). GPU4 encourages hooking up to public sewer systems.

#5: The LandWatch letter claims that “GPU4 raises response time to 45 minutes”

M. Caplin: GPU4 recognizes the reality of response times in the County. A 15 minute response time is not realistic. The initiative is silent on this, and has no minimum response time, nor does the existing 1982 plan. In addition, the fire agencies recommended that there be no response time requirement.

#6: The LandWatch letter claims that “GPU4 allows commercial and industrial development to leapfrog, to the detriment of cities, where this type of development belongs.” RG response: the initiative allows *no* new industrial or commercial land. Some development needs space: e.g. a cooler needs a 2 mile notification radius. If produce plants are located in the cities, truck traffic will be going through the cities.

#7: The LandWatch letter claims that “GPU4 does not protect farmland.” AG-1.3 allows subdivisions on farm land.

B. Finegan: AG-1.3 allows subdivisions *exclusively* for farm use.

- VII. Plan for the People polling information  
Public comment: none  
Kristina Wyatt presented polling information

Task assigned to RG from P4P was to find 5 key positive issues in GPU4. Discussion about 5 key issues from GPU4.

- Must have adequate water to develop. Adequacy of water.
- Affordable housing. This is addressed in the current Housing Element and GPU4.
- Protect farm land by keeping ag viable
  - Protecting rural life style
- Controlled Growth
- Traffic
- Product of public process and compromise
- Environment
- Impact fees for development (traffic fees, fair share, etc.)

Decided to e-mail these 7 issues to RG members.

- VIII. Promotion of RG work

- IX. Other business

- X. Adjournment to May 25, 2006, at the Salinas Valley Builders' Exchange, 20 Quail Run Circle, Salinas