

Catheys Valley Planning Advisory Committee · Approved Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2002

7:00 p.m. · McCay Hall · Catheys Valley

Agenda Item 1: Meeting called to order at 7:12 p.m.

Roll Call:

Committee Members Present: Janet Bibby, Lou Cordero, Tracy Guenthart, James Eppler, Judie Huffman, Joe Simon (Chair) and Mary Ann Visher.

Committee Members Excused: Ken Davis and Robert Mason.

County Representatives: Eric Jay Toll, Planning Department Director; Bob Rudzik, District 3 Planning Commissioner; Bob Stewart, District 3 Supervisor; and Sarah Williams, Planning Department Planning Manager.

Agenda Item 2: Minutes from July 24, 2002 Meeting

Motion by Eppler, seconded by Bibby to approve Minutes of July 24, 2002 meeting with the following corrections:

Correct spelling on Tracy Guenthart's last name

Motion passed: 7 ayes, 2 excused

Agenda Item 3: Public Comments

Cathie Ragghianti reported that she received a telephone call from a Bootjack resident regarding the appearance of the General Plan map and the size of Catheys Valley Planning Area.

The PAC discussed the plan area boundaries and “sphere of influence” concept. Eric Toll, Planning Director stated that if people just look at the map and make conclusions without reading the plan, they will be horribly misinformed.

The General Plan identifies that community plans can be more restrictive than the General Plan.

Toll talked about the “peninsula” of Agriculture/Working Landscape between the Catheys Valley Planning Area and the area near Guadalupe Mountain Road. If this area were removed from the Catheys Valley Planning Area, it would become rural

residential land use in the General Plan. This is based upon the criteria for land uses as established in the General Plan and surrounding land uses.

Toll advised that the Catheys Valley Plan is now moving at a pace, that it could be ready for adoption before the General Plan.

Toll described that there is an interest from some county residents to bring back a Mountain Transition land use in the countywide plan, for more residential growth.

Relative to the issue of agricultural conversion, the strongest General Plan policy is the “no net loss” of Agriculture/Working Landscape Lands.

Agenda Item 4: Community Plan Work

Toll described the State’s “Regional Housing Needs Allocation” or RHNA. The State Department of Housing and Community Development has established that local governments must provide an opportunity for housing development in their General Plans to address the State’s housing crisis. Each local government is given their “fair share” of the number of housing units for which development opportunities must be provided. That doesn’t mean that the housing units must be constructed.

Mariposa County’s “fair share” is approximately 1,600 units:

- 40% must be for above median income households (\$42,000+)
- 20% must be for median income households (\$27,000 – \$42,000)
- 40% must be for below median income households (< \$27,000)

Based upon current percentage of total county population, Catheys Valley’s “fair share” of the total county needs is approximately:

- 42 new residential units within the 5 years
- 400 new residents

With the proposed Catheys Valley land use plan, there are:

- 179 new potential lots
- 143 likely (assuming 75% created)

In Catheys Valley, the “fair share” will be for the median or above median income level because the General Plan says no multifamily residential development will be allowed except in areas where sewer and water services exist.

Planning staff will not support a land use plan which provides opportunity for less than 42 new residential units and 400 new residents, but will help the PAC develop findings if the PAC doesn’t want to provide this. If the PAC agrees to meet this “fair share” requirement, they have two options. The first option is for the PAC to identify 150 acres more land to put in the residential land use classification from

the agriculture/working landscape classification. The second option is for the PAC to identify a “residential reserve” area, which could be eligible for rezoning to the residential land use from the agriculture/working landscape land use as soon as a certain percentage of the residential areas were built-out.

The PAC discussed the areas in the land use plan which were the focus of discussion at the previous meeting. The PAC stated that would prefer to identify 150 acres more land to put in the residential land use classification. They discussed the areas which are currently in the Mountain Home Zone, which the PAC put in the Agriculture/Working Landscape Land Use.

On a motion by Eppler, seconded by Cordero, 167 acres of land off of Cornett's Entrance Road which is currently zoned Mountain Home, APN's 016-170-011, 016-170-015, and 016-170-021 is to be changed from the Agriculture/Working Landscape Classification to the Residential Land Use Classification in the proposed Catheys Valley Land Use Map.

Motion passed: 7 ayes, 2 excused

A discussion followed concerning the current and proposed General Plan policies to protect conversion of agricultural land.

Toll added a notation on the General Plan Land Use Map which is from Section 1.1 - Philosophy of the Catheys Valley Community Plan.

The PAC continued with a discussion on Section 4.3 Managed Growth. The PAC identified area for Commercial land use overflow as APNs 016-140-022, 016-140-026 and 016-140-027.

The PAC discussed provisions for non-conforming use, including time for re-establishment of a non-conforming use after it has been closed or demolished. They discussed expansion provisions, 50% versus none, and if expansion would be allowed for just existing structures or to allow new structures as part of the expansion. The PAC had a discussion on the status of the Oasis – and whether it should be a conforming or a nonconforming use. Toll stated he would work on some language for nonconforming uses.

Public uses were discussed and PAC determined they want a Public Land Use designation in the plan. This designation would apply to the Church, the Fire Station, BLM land, the Park and CDF, and should be added to the map. The process for development of land uses would be established by zoning.

The PAC decided to invite school representatives to the next meeting to discuss school facilities/needs.

The PAC discussed cell tower options. The countywide goal is to restrict the visual impact of new towers, but to encourage more towers for better cell phone service.

The Board is looking at ways to hide the towers, such as putting the transmission/receiving facilities on existing towers or lines.

When discussing rezoning a person's parcel for future school expansion purposes, Toll explained that if we take away all "reasonable economic use" of a person's property, a "taking" has occurred. The school or county would have to purchase that person's property.

The PAC resumed discussion on non-conforming uses, such as Mobile Home Parks. It was agreed that the PAC should review Merced County's standards. Toll stated he would look at options for standards for regulating mobile home parks.

Agenda Item 7: Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.