

**[Draft] Minutes of the 17 July 2002 Midcoast Community Council meeting**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Chuck Kozak at 7:40 p.m.

Members present: Sandy Emerson, Chuck Kozak, Ric Lohman, Paul Perkovic, Kathryn Slater-Carter, and Karen Wilson. April Vargas arrived at 10:00 p.m. (following the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District meeting in Half Moon Bay).

Member absent: none.

**Public Comment**

Julianna Conlon announced a "Spirit of Service" event to honor and celebrate the Seton Medical Center Coastside, its staff, volunteers, and donors. The proceeds from this event will support emergency services at Seton Medical Center Coastside, the only emergency room on the coast, from Daly City to Santa Cruz. "The Spirit of Service" will be held at Cameron's in Half Moon Bay on Wednesday, August 7 at 5:30 p.m. For further information, contact her at 563-7185.

John Quinlan (Sheriff's Coastside Commander) announced that the Sheriff's Office has started a Little Trooper Basket for the little El Granada girl who was hit by a stray bullet at the Fourth of July fireworks festivities. The basket will be presented to her tomorrow (Thursday) at 3:00 p.m. at the Sheriff's Substation in Moss Beach.

Karen Wilson (Montara) asked the Council to address the school bus issue on the Midcoast. She is concerned that there will be a tremendous impact on the community – especially additional cars as students drive to the High School without busing. The most important thing for schools is to get our students there.

Kathryn Slater-Carter (Montara) noticed that the Half Moon Bay Review has an article or editorial on the North Wavecrest project meeting that is scheduled for next Wednesday, July 24 at 7:30 p.m. at the Ted Adcock Center. Everything seems to have been relocated in the revised project proposal. She urged Midcoast residents to attend and express their ideas about the plan.

Sandy Emerson showed off the final Mid-Coast Recreational Needs Assessment report completed by the County. There is a clear need for more active recreational activities. There will be a final public workshop next Monday, July 22, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at the El Granada School. There is a significant amount of money available from the \$2.6 billion Proposition 40 bond issue.

Chuck Kozak (Montara) announced that the next LCP Update Workshop will be Monday, July 22, from 7:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. at the Harbor House Conference Center in

Princeton. The topics for this meeting include possible increases to permitted land uses in the Princeton zoning districts and possible changes to the Airport Overlay zone.

### **Board of Supervisors Report**

PK Diffenbaugh was unable to attend the meeting, so there was no report.

### **Committee Reports**

Deferred to next meeting.

### **Consent Agenda**

Approval of meeting minutes from June 12, 2002 and June 26, 2002. Sandy Emerson moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Seconded by Karen Wilson. Approved by unanimous consent.

### **Regular Agenda**

#### **1. Midcoast Local Coastal Program Review Update**

George Bergman wants to resume the Data Working Group meetings.

Ric Lohman introduced Task 4: Annual Growth Rate, and gave a brief review of the discussion from the workshop on growth rate held about two months ago. There were essentially two polarized positions: One that supported the Half Moon Bay approach, approximately 1% per year; the other position supported the status quo, nothing less than the 125 units per year in the current Local Coastal Program (LCP).

Ric would recommend going with the 1% growth rate, so that planning is coordinated across the entire coast (e.g., Mid-Coast and Half Moon Bay). This would continue to allow growth close to the recent past, while minimizing impacts on traffic, schools, and other infrastructure.

Kathryn Slater-Carter asked whether there isn't a problem with vacant parcels that are burdened with taxes and assessments to build local infrastructure. The carrying costs of a vacant parcel – for example, sewer and water assessments – often drive development, so that parcel owners can recover their costs. Secondly, she asked how to allocate the proposed 1% growth rate. Finally, she is concerned about the mismatch between the LCP language that refers to dwelling units in many places, but to building permits in the section that specifies the growth rate limits.

Karen Wilson thinks it is premature to make this determination now. We need to look at all aspects of the LCP before we can make a recommendation. We also should consider how many projects the County can feasibly manage, given their staffing cutbacks.

Paul Perkovic commented that it is almost impossible to foresee the situation 20 years down the road. Setting a numeric limit is almost meaningless. What is important are performance characteristics: Has the Level of Service for traffic improved, or degraded? Do the schools have classroom capacity for additional students? Are there adequate parks to serve the population? If specific goals are met, then additional growth could be supported; if those performance goals are not met, then additional construction would merely exacerbate an already difficult community situation.

Kathryn Slater-Carter gave some statistics on growth in the various regions of the Mid-Coast. She believes that the proposed 1% rate is fairly close to the historical patterns. For example, El Granada has had 72% of all new residences, whereas Miramar has had 17% and Montara / Moss Beach had only 11%.

Sandy Emerson prefers the lower rate – somewhere between a 1% limit (which would be about 38 units per year) and the recent historical rate (about 56 units per year).

Chuck Kozak wondered how the distribution of new units throughout the Mid-Coast would be handled – regardless of the rate. He prefers to see a percentage allocated to each community, rather than allowing one community to be overburdened with development. He also seconded the comment by Karen about the capability of the County to cope with a larger number of Coastal Development Permit applications.

Cornelia Gould (Montara) came to educate herself about what is happening on the Coast. She didn't have any specific opinions on the growth rate issue.

Chuck quoted from the June 3 handout from George Bergman that shows 3008 remaining residential units (taking all other assumptions into account, including a comprehensive lot merger program).

Paul also commented on the "supply panic" concept that was advanced by some in the real estate community. If it looks like there may be a reduced annual limit, property owners will rush to get developments approved while the current 125 per year limit is being revised and certified.

Kathryn observed that in "built-out" communities, there is tremendous pressure to rezone existing single-family districts to allow higher densities, etc. Kathryn also suggested the possibility of treating different categories of construction differently, e.g., giving preference to affordable developments.

Karen moved that the Council take all these comments and considering the infrastructure situation as we know it, that we recommend a growth rate similar to Half Moon Bay's, possibly as a percentage of the number of remaining vacant parcels; and that, as always, we are concerned about making decisions of this sort without having all the necessary data available. Seconded by Ric Lohman. Approved by unanimous consent.

Kathryn Slater-Carter introduced the second task for discussion, Task 5: Development Controls for Non-Conforming Parcels. The County's attempts to merge substandard lots have been inadequate, at best. There have been many proposals in the Miramar area, which has a 10,000 square foot lot size, for development on parcels of 4,400 square feet or smaller. She thinks it is important for the Council to stand behind the position opposing exemptions to development standards. She also discussed briefly the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) type of program that some other environmentally sensitive areas have used to discourage or prohibit development on substantially substandard parcels. Half Moon Bay has adopted strong disincentives for development on substandard parcels. She recommends that we ask the County to pursue all four options.

Karen Wilson noted that smaller houses consistently sell, whether the economy is good or bad. Smaller homes also encourage a wider range of economic backgrounds to be represented in the community.

Sandy Emerson thinks that Half Moon Bay's proportionality rule is overly restrictive. She favors lot merger. She completely agrees that we need more smaller houses to encourage diversity in our community. We have enough 4000 square foot houses already.

Ric Lohman likes the TDR approach. He is concerned that if a program is not set up carefully, there may be an unintended market in substandard lot equivalent rights from existing developments that cover several lots (but are not formally merged). He doesn't like the separate rules for house size plus garage - that encourages playing games with the garages, for instance. Just pick the square foot limit, and make everything fit within it.

Paul Perkovic wants the buildout projections to show both the "best case" and "worst case" situations - with successful merger of substandard lots, and with no mergers occurring. This will emphasize to the Board of Supervisors and the Coastal Commission how critical the comprehensive lot merger program is to controlling population impacts on the Mid-Coast. Finally, the current Board of Supervisors policy that requires lot merger as part of a development, demolition, or remodeling application must be adopted into the Zoning Ordinances and certified by the Coastal Commission as a part of the LCP, to prevent it from being dropped by a future Board of Supervisors.

George Bergman's handout from the June 3 workshop shows that a comprehensive lot merger program could reduce the total number of separate parcels significantly.



Kathryn observed another worst case scenario, which involves lots that have not been legally merged in the Rural Residential Area.

Chuck Kozak reminded everyone that the Task Force process that resulted in the revised residential standards explicitly did NOT attempt to cover the substandard lot problem.

Paul Perkovic moved that we forward our comments to the County. Seconded by Kathryn Slater-Carter. Approved by unanimous consent.

Sandy Emerson presented a discussion of Task 6: Traffic Mitigation Requirements, including a write-up and proposed recommendations. Mark Duino from County Planning had presented how monies are received to mitigate traffic conditions during the recent workshop. The City / County Association of Governments (C/CAG) implementation guidelines for the Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires that traffic mitigation fees be collected for any project that requires California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, or that generates 100 or more peak-hour trips.

Sandy also reviewed various funding sources for road mitigation.

Kathryn suggested that some of the mitigations might be used to ameliorate the school busing problems.

Ric Lohman asked about how the Traffic Demand Mitigations (TDM) were tied to the CEQA process. Could the same process be used for individual residential parcels? For example, could you consider the impacts of all remaining residential development (e.g., about 3000 parcels) as if it were a single project, and determine the appropriate TDMs; then apportion those among each of the 3000 existing parcels. Possibly this would mean impact fees based on number of bedrooms or floor area of the structure.

Sandy Emerson discussed the possibility of having a multi-modal trail parallel to Highway 1 as an improvement to Highway 1, so that traffic mitigation fees could be used to build such a trail.

Kathryn emphasized how important it is to get some shuttle service for students in place for this fall.

Chuck Kozak would like to get a clarification on the issue of projects that require CEQA review – is this only project that require traffic studies, or any CEQA review (including a negative declaration after an initial study). He thinks the TDM should be tied to project size, not whether or not there is a CEQA review involved.

April Vargas wants to work out a way to treat remaining buildout as a subdivision – that explains why it is important to even do this. She suggested having a 1500 square foot

cutoff before fees begin. April also suggested that we make sure that drafts of proposals go through County Counsel, to make sure they are legal policies.

Paul Perkovic moved that we adopt the recommendations in Sandy's write-up, as modified by our discussions. Seconded by Ric Lohman. Approved by unanimous consent.

Paul Perkovic commented on Tasks 8 and 9. He is particularly concerned that, under the guise of providing greater Mid-Coast job opportunities, changes to the zoning districts in the Princeton area might allow additional uses that gradually preclude any viable marine-related uses – thus strangling Pillar Point Harbor economically. Secondly, the Airport Overlay should NOT be reduced at this time; instead, the potential expansion of the protection zones using California 2002 standards and the Preferred Alternative in the Half Moon Bay Master Plan should be used.

The next LCP Update Workshop will be July 22, discussing Task 8, Increasing Midcoast Job Opportunities, and Task 9, Airport Overlay Zone. Both are expected to carry over to the August 5. As noted earlier, the July 22 workshop will be held at the Harbor House Conference Center beginning at 7:30 p.m.

#### **Update on Continuing Council Projects**

April Vargas reported briefly on the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District meeting held this evening. She has heard that a Pescadero resident would like a separate local vote on the annexation proposal. The public comment period on the annexation plan closes on August 2.

April Vargas wants to schedule August 14 and September 11 for CalTrans liaison committee agenda items.

#### **Future Agenda**

July 24, 2002

1. Presentation by Sam Herzberg on Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment
2. Discussion of Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District annexation proposal
3. School busing
4. Ric wanted a (consent?) item on the advisory committee on the Route 35 project

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Paul Perkovic, Secretary.