

Minutes

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE – REFINEMENT GROUP

Thursday, June 1, 2006, 12:00 to 4:00 p.m.
at Carpenters Local 605
751 Neeson Road, Marina

Those present: Alfred Diaz-Infante, Christine Kemp, Gwen Miller, Christopher Bunn Jr., Bob Perkins, Nancy Isakson, Ron Chesshire, Brian Finegan, Tom Carvey, Mike Caplin, Sheryl McKenzie

Meeting called to order at 12:15 p.m.

- I. Public comment period (for items not on the agenda)
Public comment: none
- II. Approval of agenda for June 1, 2006
Order of agenda changed by Chair Finegan
Under V, schedule for PC review of GPU4.
Under VII, reports
VIII,
“Property owner requests” handout under VII, as response to LandWatch letter
- III. Approval of minutes of April 6 and 20; May 11 and 18, 2006
Tabled
- IV. Review of completed GPU4 matrices
- V. Review of GPU4
The general plan must be internally consistent. Facilities must be in line with population growth. Circulation must be in line with population growth. LW letter said there were no build out numbers.

There was discussion about the schedule for the Planning Commission (PC) review of GPU4. Some PC members didn't want to have workshop until after the response to comments was complete.

Workshops will probably start in August. Staff said they will re-print GPU4 to take care of typos.

Part of the process should be to gather public comments while the public comment period for the DEIR is going on.

Subcommittee responses to LW letter of May 4, 2006

Page 2 of the LW letter and responses.

The LandWatch letter claims that GPU4 provides no build out data.
Subcommittee agrees.

The LandWatch letter claims that GPU4 favors campaign friends with handouts (property owner requests)

Comment: The County initiated a public process to which over 200 property owners responded.

The LandWatch letter claims that GPU4 is a recipe for sprawl, allows Rural Centers (RC's). These areas have over-stressed infrastructure.

GPU4 policies require public planning process, identification of full range of public service, emergency responses, etc. Interim development may proceed in Community Areas.

Rural center needs financing study, approved by County.

RC's are areas that are already developed.

Partial list of problems with GPU4

1. The LandWatch letter claims that allows development in RC's without roads.
 - a. RC's are already developed areas, and infrastructure must be concurrent.
 - b. GPU4 says the existing standards in RC's won't be allowed to deteriorate (see page 42 in GPU4).
2. The LandWatch letter claims that increases emergency response time from 15 to 45 minutes
 - a. 17.4.7 of 1982 plan
 - b. There is no state standard for response time. The fire officials didn't offer a standard.
 - c. The standards in GPU4 are based on the recommendations of the fire agencies. The fire agencies considered and rejected any fixed response time requirement.
 - d. The GPU3 response time was 15 minutes.
3. The LandWatch letter claims that GPU4 allows wells and septic systems on inadequately sized parcels.
 - a. Table PS-1 seems clear that parcels are adequate size. Public Health Department also made comments during the BOS workshops.
4. The LandWatch letter claims that GPU4 allows commercial and industrial development to leapfrog throughout the county.
 - a. B. Perkins distributed a handout entitled, "Unincorporated development benefits everyone."
5. The LandWatch letter claims that GPU4 doesn't protect farmland
 - a. AG-1.3 allows subdivision of farmlands, but only for ag purposes.
 - b. 90% of the land in the County is designated agricultural. May be a greater percentage than before.

VI. Community General Plan Initiative

VII. Plan for the People 5 issues
There was a discussion of the Plan for the People issues.

VIII. Area plan consistency
Copies of M. Caplin's matrix on GPU4 consistency were distributed and discussed.

IX. Promotion of RG work

- X. Other business
- XI. Adjournment to June 8, 2006, location TBA