

May 5, 2006

Office of the Board of Supervisors
Attn: Katcho Achadjian, Board of Supervisors
County Government Center
San Luis Obispo, California 93408-2040

Re: SCAC Recommendations from May 4, 2006 SCAC Special Meeting

The preliminary minutes from the May 4, 2006 SCAC meeting can be found at:
<http://scac.ca.gov/m/scacm2006-5-4.pdf>

Background

The SCAC considered the 2006 amendments to Title 26, the Growth Management Ordinance (GMO), on April 20, April 24, and May 4 with discussions over 11 hours. A Special Meeting was held on May 4 to hear the Planning Department's further definition of Smart Growth, Green Build, Senior Housing and Mixed Use as referenced in the amendments to the GMO. A summary of that meeting and recommendation follows.

1) Smart Growth, Green Build, Senior Housing, Mixed Use

Chuck Stevenson and Kim Murray of the Planning Department explained the categories and answered questions from the SCAC members.

Smart Growth was described as a concept outlined in "Smart Growth Principles" presented to the Board of Supervisors on June 7, 2005. **There is no document specifying Smart Growth details, however the amended GMO proposes granting concessions to projects that satisfy the concept (with no details).** A draft of the Smart Growth document may be sent to the Planning Commission in the fall of 2006.

Green Build is rating system for commercial buildings. Its relation and application to the residential projects covered by the GMO has not been defined.

Senior Housing was described as Deed-Restricted housing for residents 55 and older.

Mixed Use referred to any commercial or retail project including residential units.

2) How are Nipomo's Needs met with Smart Growth, Green Build, Senior Housing, Mixed Use?

The SCAC discussed how these categories could be used or modified to meet Nipomo's needs. They passed a motion recommending the following modifications to the Planning Department preferences for "Smart Growth" as applied to Nipomo:

- Secondary dwellings would be permitted on lots no smaller than 10,000 sqft
- Minimum lots sizes should be kept at 6000 sq. ft.
- Affordable housing should be discouraged until the infrastructure is able to accommodate the growth.
- Old Town should be the preferred site of future mixed use projects as a **pilot** study.
- Strike any reference to minimum allowable road width and requirements that all buildings with street frontage face the street with visible entrances.
- Density should not exceed current zoning.
- Strike requirement that all landscaping be irrigated by drip.

Green Build was not discussed in detail, as it is a commercial standard.
 Senior Housing was deemed beneficial in Nipomo.
 No tailoring for Mixed Use in Nipomo was proposed.

3) Updated recommendations for Title 26 Amendment

The SCAC revisited the proposed amendments to the GMO and made the following motions:

Title 26	Motion	Rationale
Section 3	The SCAC recommends that the growth cap not be increased from 1.8% to 2.3% for any category.	While there may be benefits to increasing Senior Housing, and certain Mixed Use developments limited by the growth cap, there is still no relief from the inadequate infrastructure for water and traffic. The disadvantageous effects of accelerated building in these special categories outweigh the potential benefits to the community. No mitigations to the disadvantages were proposed in the amendment, just increased building.
Section 4	The SCAC motion made in the April 24 meeting stands. "The SCAC objects to an increase of the multi-family dwelling allotment."	That category has been misused in Nipomo to allow Single Family Residences in Residential Multi-family zoning, reducing the potential for true multi-family housing by exhausting multi-family zoning parcels.
Section 9, f. (3) (iii)	The SCAC supports increasing the allowable allocation to any developer from 10% to 20% where such developments will contribute substantially to construction of major road improvements that will measurably improve traffic flow at known congestion points in Nipomo as identified by the traffic model.	The SCAC supports any projects that give <u>real</u> relief from traffic congestion. Simply adding payment to an area traffic fund pool does not provide a direct path to genuine relief. The SCAC supports reallocations where a specific project will give a specific local solution (such as enabling a Mary Ave. extension).

Respectfully submitted,
 Ed Eby
 2006-2007 SCAC Chairman

Cc: Chuck Stevenson, Kim Murry, Brian Pedrotti, Department of Planning and Building
 Dale Ramey, Department of Public Works
 Board of Supervisors (please distribute)