

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

List of Workshop Issues to Revisit

The following is a list of policies flagged during the initial review by the Planning Commission. Staff will address the comments and respond with recommended language when we revisit the elements, which are scheduled to begin September 21, 2006.

There were generic comments throughout the discussion regarding ensuring that there was an exception noted regarding the coastal zone for a number of policies. County Counsel will work with GPU staff to either develop a single statement in the GP that addresses this issue or a phrase that can be inserted into each of the policies that might be problematic.

There were also generic comments regarding consistency of Definitions that will be revisited.

LAND USE ELEMENT

Introduction, Section 1.5.a, Page v

“Area Plan policies *may provide more specific detail...*”

COMMENT(S): Refine language

Policy LU-1.6

COMMENT(S): How does Routine and Ongoing Ag affect this policy relative to scenic qualities? What is impact on Coastal Plans?

Policy LU-1.11

COMMENT(S): Review for consistency with LU-2.14

Policy LU-1.18

COMMENT(S): Flagged to return

Policy LU-1.21

COMMENT(S): What does this mean?

Policy LU-2.8

COMMENT(S): Subsection “d” and “g” are duplicative language with intro of policy.

Policy LU-2.17

COMMENT(S): Subsection “b” should be stated in a more positive tone. Return after talking to cities. Buffer language in LU-2.8 is more flexible

Policy LU-2.22

COMMENT(S): Staff has noted that this policy needs clarification

Policy LU-2.24

COMMENT(S): Clarify “interested party” as 1st developer or property owner and that the Plan may be initiated at their expense. Community Plan is required for “entire Community Area”, but East Garrison only covered part. Need to adjust for consistency.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

List of Workshop Issues to Revisit

Policy LU-2.27 (Glossary)

COMMENT(S): Define “urban development”

Policy LU-2.29

COMMENT(S): How does Del Monte Forest affect Coastal LUP? Return with property owner requests to be excluded from Rural Center(s).

Policy LU-2.31 (Glossary)

COMMENT(S): Define “new development”

Policy LU-5.1

COMMENT(S): Why are research institutions and administrative facilities in this policy?

Policy LU-6.1

COMMENT(S): use versus ownership is governing. Coastal conflict (Big Sur LUP)?

Policy LU-8.1

COMMENT(S): What was basis (1982 GP) for designating lands Resource Conservation? What is primary purpose (e.g. preserve habitat)? Compare with existing RC. Clarify “low intensity uses”.

Goal 9

COMMENT(S): Return with Curtis for clarification. Revisit and correct to be consistent with definition.

Policy LU-10.1

COMMENT(S): Question on timing (3 months). Addendum language does not match original language. Clarify last sentence.

Policy LU-10.4

COMMENT(S): Reformat to place exceptions at end of policy. Add language to exclude coastal areas.

AGRICULTURAL ELEMENT

Policy AG-1.1 Address exception in the coastal zone.

Policy AG-1.2

COMMENT(S): Similar redundancy issue as LU-2.8. Reformat where LU-1.2 addresses AB designation and refers to AG-1.2 for buffer language.

Policy AG-1.3

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. Question of including Rural Grazing. Question of EIR Impacts. Include “Community Plan or Specific Plan” in last sentence.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

List of Workshop Issues to Revisit

Policy AG-1.5

COMMENT(S): Delete list of examples. Defer list to be developed at ordinance level.

Policies AG-1.6 and 1.7 (Glossary)

COMMENT(S): Define housing for farmworker vs farm employee

Policy AG-1.9

COMMENT(S): Re-write to clarify intent of “Right to Farm” notice.

Policy AG-1.11

COMMENT(S): Amend to delete “resource conservation district”.

Policy AG-2.1

COMMENT(S): Amend “shops” to “workshops”. Amend “shall be allowed” to “shall be considered appropriate uses” (ministerial vs discretionary – CEQA review) and add language that County shall determine discretionary permits required in an implementing ordinance.

Policy AG-3.3

COMMENT(S): Subsection “b” change “or” to “to”. FLAGGED. Inconsistent to say it is not development, but then say it would be subject to County permits. Issue of CEQA (discretionary) vs no CEQA review (ministerial). Keep general rather than a specific list. Return with Title 21 allowed uses. Request Ag Advisory Committee to evaluate policy relative to activity compatible under Williamson Act.

Public noted there was no intent to avoid discretionary permits.

Direction to work with County Counsel regarding consistency issues raised.

Policy AG-4.3 Questions re whether the list is needed in the GP or only in the Plan itself.

Goal AG-5

COMMENT(S): Coastal concern unless we can address as part of GP intro.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Policy ED-4.1 (Glossary?)

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. What does “key industry cluster” mean? (GPU3?) Clarify or define.

Generic comment by the Planning Commission to “beef up” this element.

CONSERVATION/OPEN SPACE

Intro, Page C/OS-1

COMMENT(S): Paragraph 4, look at OS-2.1 and OS-2.4 for consistency. Paragraph 5, reword.

GENERAL COMMENT THROUGHOUT: “preserve” vs “protect” – Check Board direction

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

List of Workshop Issues to Revisit

Policy OS-1.3

COMMENT(S): Need to look at Routing and Ongoing Ag exception list and how it affects ridgeline policy (cooler buildings vs barns and equipment)

Policy OS-1.8 (Glossary)

COMMENT(S): define “visually sensitive” and “critical habitat”. Add “designated” before critical habitat.

Policy OS-1.9

COMMENT(S): Make sure it is clear how R-O exemption does/does not apply to ridgeline development, or which parts of R-O area exempt and which are not.

Policy OS-1.10

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. Issue with voluntary requirement and “proposed” (from 1982 GP) trails on Trails Maps. Question to drop subsection “b” or not. Removes option to require as a condition of approval. Clarify trails as those used by the general public. Amend to require a maintenance and operation plan for new trails. Address exemption of trails in Coastal zone. Is there an (h)- i.e. other coastal trails to be added.

Policy OS-1.12

COMMENT(S): Review against R-O Ag exemptions.

Policies OS-2.1 & 2.4

COMMENT(S): Compare with intro that seems to say the opposite.

Policy OS-3.5 (Glossary)

COMMENT(S): Clarify that the policy does not apply to portions of a property that are not greater than 25%. In problem areas, we should not replace the problem (e.g. strawberries). Need to define “previously uncultivated lands”. Address routine and ongoing exceptions especially in North County.

Policy OS-3.6

COMMENT(S): Clarify where portion of a lot contains hazards. PS-2.8 is actually 2.7. Where are areas of prime groundwater recharge?

Policy OS-3.7

COMMENT(S): Coastal exception

Policy OS-4.1

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. Research community vs species vs habitat. Are animal “communities” listed (intent of protection limits)?

Policies OS-4.6, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10

COMMENT(S): Move to Economic Development Element

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
List of Workshop Issues to Revisit

Policy OS_4.7- Comment re possible deletion

Goal OS-5 (Glossary)

COMMENT(S): Define “designated critical habitat” and “listed plant and animal species”.

Policy OS-5.3

COMMENT(S): “listed” should not be deleted. Link with 5.10 and 5.11

Policy OS-5.11

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. Refer to list (OS-5.3)

Policy OS-5.14

COMMENT(S): Change “animals” to “pests”. See page 8 of Farm Bureau letter submitted at ___ meeting. Add policy to discourage sale of unwanted plants, etc..

Policy OS-6.3

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. 3 miles is a lot considering most of County already required to do arch report. What do Phase I, II and II entail? Amend to read “moderate or high”. Provide map of high and moderate sensitive zones.

Policy OS-6.4

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. Need to understand why tribe making suggested changes.

Policy OS-7.1

COMMENT(S): “sole source of info” limits preservation.- suggestion to delete.

Policy OS-8.3

COMMENT(S): FLAGGED. Need to clarify tribe basis for 12-18” threshold. Have Ag Advisory Committee review and comment. Provide State requirement.

Policy OS-9.1 and 9.9

COMMENT(S): Add wind energy to Policy 9.1, include agriculture as a land use and then delete 9.9

Policy OS-9.6

COMMENT(S): Define development. Review for consistency with trail policy (Policy OS-1.10)