



Half Moon Bay General Plan and LCP Update

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #10

537 Kelly Avenue, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

June 2, 2016 | 6:30pm

Meeting Notes

Materials for this meeting can be found at www.planhmb.org/general-plan-library.html.

Project Overview: Project Status and Schedule

- Reviewed schedule and project status.
- Reviewed notification and agenda availability and format:
 - Notification for this session was similar to previous sessions and included: Half Moon Bay ENews (multiple notifications), Plan Half Moon Bay email (multiple notifications), Next Door website posting, Half Moon Bay Review color display ad, press notifications, www.planHMB.org project web page, and multiple announcements at City Council, Planning Commission and previous GPAC session.
 - Agenda Availability: Electronic version of agenda posted to City of Half Moon Bay web page calendar and www.planHMB.org May 14, 2016; revised agenda posted May 26, 2016 electronically and hard copy at City Hall.
 - Agenda Format: The agenda was revised and reformatted to clarify that public comment would be held before the GPAC's discussion to confirm that GPAC members will have been informed by community input before any recommendations are brought forth.

GPAC Consensus Process

- Referred to the GPAC mission statement and their two primary focus areas: 1.) supporting diverse community representation; and, 2.) engaging in collaborative problem solving (e.g. the term "solution-focused" was discussed as the characterization for this expectation).
- Reviewed GPAC membership, alternates, and quorum details.
- Reviewed intent for and definition of consensus that the GPAC will use for their policy review process of the draft LUP and forthcoming draft General Plan elements.
- Introduced a scale of five levels of agreement to be used in future sessions for determining the extent of consensus.

Draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan:

Presentation covered the following:

- Section 2.1: Introduction – Overview of the Introduction noted that this section includes context sections pertaining to the purpose of the LUP and plan administration. The method for collecting, cataloguing, and responding to comments on the Draft LUP was also described.
- Section 2.2: Land Use – The following topics were highlighted from the Land Use chapter of the LUP:
 - Density and Intensity
 - Water Supply and Sewer Treatment Capacity
 - PUD Topics:
 - Built PUDs
 - Public Facilities PUD (Note: GPAC Member Benjamin recused himself for this portion of the presentation)
 - Guerrero PUD – deed restriction
 - PUDs without “PUD” Land Use Designations
 - Core Area:
 - Ground floor residential
 - Andreotti PUD access requirements
- Section 2.3: Coastal Access and Recreation – It was noted that a more comprehensive review of Section 2.3 will be possible in the future when the forthcoming General Plan elements for circulation and recreation are available. Highlighted topics include:
 - Kelly and Poplar: Downtown – Beach Links
 - Improved Coastal Access at Poplar and Redondo Beach
 - Long Term California Coastal Trail Alignment pursuant to erosion and sea level rise impacts

GPAC Clarifying Questions:

- Guerrero PUD – Discussed need for additional research to confirm that the deed restriction for open space/wetlands was recorded. The City has not provided the trail access and this may have been a contingency.
 - Response: Staff will continue to research this property’s status.
- Input from Biologists – Question about how input from biologists will be documented and responded to.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #10 Summary

- Response: Comments submitted regarding the draft LUP are being catalogued and will be provided to the GPAC with responses over time as staff and the consultants are able to consider and conduct research on the various input.
- PUD vs. PD – Question about the distinction between Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Planned Development (PD).
 - Response: PUD is the term used in the LUP for the planned unit development land use designations. The associated zoning code also uses the PUD terminology; however, it also includes references to “Planned Development.” The two terms are somewhat interchangeable; however, for future revision to the draft LUP, the PUD terminology will be consistently applied.
- Matteucci PUD – Some of this property may have been set aside as a buffer.
 - Response: Similar to Guerrero, staff will conduct further research on the status of these parcels.

Public Comment:

- Previously, there was a concept including transfer of development rights in the Wavecrest area. How were the sending and receiving areas defined?
- Likes the idea of more development rights in Wavecrest. This area has been shackled by the PUD designation; don’t keep it like that for another 20 years. Engage the property owners and make the area something of value to everyone.
- Congestion is a big concern and was a stated goal for the plan update. Need to be honest that cannot fix the traffic problem. It is incumbent upon us to not make the problem worse. The concept of jobs : housing balance is concerning. Build out to the 2040 projections will result in new residents commuting out and employees of new commercial development commute into Half Moon Bay. Want to see the percentage of in- and out- commute.
- A point by point matrix of how and why things changed between the 1993 LUP and the first draft LUP is needed.
- Build out limit beyond the projections needs to be provided.
- Concerned that the requirement for specific plans for PUDs was dropped. (Response: requirements for specific plans as described in the 1993 LUP for each PUD were brought forward into the draft LUP consistently for each PUD.)
- With respect to transparency provide the following: provide recordings of the GPAC sessions and a comparison of 1993 and the first draft LUP.
- Provide Coastal Act references to indicate why various pieces of the LUP would be implemented.
- Foothill Boulevard should not be mentioned. (Response: There was no intention to include any reference to the previously considered Foothill Boulevard; a search of the document by City staff did not find any references to Foothill Boulevard in the

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #10 Summary

first draft LUP. Two references to “parallel routes” to HWY 1 are included in narrative on page 1.7; this terminology was previously associated with Foothill Boulevard in old and now-outdated planning documents. For this LUP update, and in the specific section in which this language occurs, the reference is meant to acknowledge the communities interest in a non-auto route (multi-use trail or pathway for bicycles and pedestrians) allowing for improved access for Half Moon Bay’s neighborhoods east of HWY 1 and north of HWY 92. This will be further clarified in future drafts.)

- Commenter asked if written comments will be provided to GPAC members and also requested a “crosswalk” between the 1993 LUP and the draft LUP. (Response: as previously noted about comments, they will be catalogued and provided to the GPAC as the review progresses.)
- Provide strike through and italics to indicate changes between the 1993 and first draft LUP.
- For the Pacific Ridge PUD (Dykstra Ranch) would like the plan to refer to the court settlement.
- Specific plans are of great value when Coastal Commission certified. They protect property rights.
- Plan language should say “shall” and not “may.”
- Traffic obviously won’t get significantly better. Need PUDs to have policy to mitigate traffic impacts caused by their development.
- Strike out developed PUDs.
- Concern expressed about the document organization with a preference specified for more sections and policies regarding each topic presented following the narrative (not separated as in the formatting of the first draft LUP).
- Need to present build out, not just 2040 projections. This needs to be related to the roadway capacity.
- Create a separate category for completed PUDs.
- Use “shall” where it belongs.
- Increase the emphasis on and support for open field agriculture.
- Need complete Coastal Act policies in each section, not just the summaries.
- Link back to the guiding principles.
- Provide regulatory frameworks; e.g. AB 32 and SB 375. (Response: both of these requirements will be included in the forthcoming Conservation Element.)
- Provide a definition for open space consistent with State of California Government Code. (Response: a definition for open space is provided in the glossary pursuant to the Office of Planning and Research, General Plan Guidelines, 2003 which is consistent with Government Code Section 65560.(b). Further note that there are six distinct open space types/purposes defined in 65560.(b), several but not all are applicable to the City of Half Moon Bay. References to open space within the LUP are

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #10 Summary

provided that pertain specifically to PUDs and are not meant to serve any purpose beyond that scope. This will be further clarified in the next draft LUP.)

GPAC Discussion:

GPAC members focused their discussion items on topics most essential to the good of the group and will submit more detailed comments about document format, specific language, etc. to staff.

- The longevity of the SAM plant needs to be addressed.
- Need a large scale map for use in the GPAC sessions.
- Document changes that have taken place since 1993. For example, the area north of the Pacific Ridge development is subject to a habitat management plan.
- There are land use designations called “reserves;” however, these are really “delays” and not protected. Need a new land use designation for open space conservation (as opposed to open space reserve).
- Special status species (California red legged frog and San Francisco garter snake) were not documented as present in the 1993 LUP; however, that condition has changed and should be documented.
- Public wants policies with teeth that defend the community’s values.
- Want to ensure that the public understands the document and its purpose.
- Speed is the by-product of accuracy. This process needs to take time and not be rushed.
- The GPAC wants to discuss land use.
- Map quality is significantly improved. Additional information needs to be mapped: prime soils pursuant to Coastal Act definition, all greenbelt/stream corridors.
- Be proactive about the key community issue: where we can and cannot develop.
- Describe the authority of other agencies; e.g. US Fish and Wildlife Services, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, etc.
- Build out needs to be carefully presented because it has significant relationship to infrastructure; e.g. sewer capacity has already been increased and is adequate to accommodate build out.
- Policies that refer out to other agencies that do not have authority is like a blank check; e.g. San Mateo County Congestion Management Plan.
- Infrastructure rarely gets enough coverage: e.g. development right up to Roosevelt and Pullman drainages; consideration of more aspects of erosion – especially inland related to drainages.
- Consider storm water as a resource – for recharging the aquifer, supporting habitat, and providing recreational opportunities.
- Storm water is an example of a geological feature that connects the community.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #10 Summary

- Need policies that support analysis of development in or near drainage corridors.
- There is a conflict with respect to promoting tourism but not considering how tourists get to Half Moon Bay.
- The plan suggests that the economic future of Half Moon Bay is tourism; however, why not also encourage local industries. For example, agriculture is cited, however the fishing industry is not discussed. (Response: Maritime land uses are acknowledged in Policy 2.2-1.7; additional policy could be developed.)
- Traffic is not being adequately addressed. As the City continues to grow, how will Half Moon Bay deal with traffic when it is a regional focal point? Why aren't we discussing mass transit (e.g. a train or tram)? Would self-driving cars resolve traffic issues? The plan needs to consider future innovations.
- Look into bike and walking areas, safe routes and connectivity are needed.
- New trails proposed are ok; however, existing trails have deficiencies and need improvement.
- Poplar, Kelly and the underpass of HWY 1 are very challenging for cycling.
- Use storm water as a resource to support wild life.
- Look at ecosystem level and identify key habitat areas and protected areas (e.g. if any grant deeds, etc.).
- Consider PUD areas as a priority for acquisition.
- Need coastal recreation and protected lands map.
- Link development impact fees to transportation improvement for existing facilities.
- Would like closer linkage between the text/narrative and the policies.
- Keep reference to Poplar and Kelly as linkages between Downtown and the beach more general; e.g. concern about provision of sidewalks, etc.
- More focus is needed on existing problems and issues.
- Address erosion much more explicitly.
- Traffic is unavoidable and only going to get worse. The best solution is to improve active transportation options – make bike and pedestrian modes more useful.
- Page 1-2 makes reference to “thriving” Downtown; suggest another description.
- A Kehoe crosswalk could help other neighborhoods. High visibility crosswalks design with lights built into road is a possible solution.

Next Steps in the Process:

June 30, 2016: GPAC work session on first draft LUP - 2.4 Coastal Resources and 2.5 Coastal Hazards

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #10 Summary

Future GPAC sessions will be scheduled over summer to continue review of the LUP and the forthcoming General Plan elements. City staff will also present a briefing on the 2016-2017 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) at a future session.

Attendance

GPAC Members

Jo Chamberlain
Thomas Conroy, Planning Commission representative
Hugh Dougherty
Brian Holt
Greg Jamison
Cameron Jeffs
Diane Johnson
James Benjamin
Edward Love, alternate for absent member
Dan McMillan
Sara Polgar
Marcia Reilly, Parks and Recreation Committee Alternate representative

Note: Three GPAC Members were absent.

City Staff

John Doughty, Community Development Director
Jill Ekas, Senior Management Analyst
Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst