

SAN MARTIN PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Draft Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2015

Location: Morgan Hill Community Center, El Toro Room

Roll Call:

Chairperson Marc Rauser (Planning Commission)
Bob Cerutti
Ed Stricker
Drake Fenn
Dianne Dean

Staff Attendees:

Colleen Tsuchimoto (SCC Planner III)
Manira Sandhir, AICP (SCC Planner II)
Kirk Girard (SCC Acting Director – Department of Planning and Development)
Roland Velasco (District 1 Land Use Aide)

General Public: Approximately 10 people

Review and approval of Meeting Summary:

SMPAC indicated that the November minutes were not available. Deferred review to next SMPAC meeting.

SMPAC also asked Staff to follow-up with Bill Shoe on updating the current SMPAC roster.

Public Presentations

Bob Cerutti inquired of the County doing a future presentation regarding Solar City project which may impact San Martin. Kirk Girard responded that this is a County Fleets & Facilities project. Staff will forward the request to Fleets & Facilities.

Action Items: Review of proposed amendments to the Santa Clara County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance addressing local serving policy provisions for the rural unincorporated areas of the County and a proposed set of guidelines “Size, Scale and Intensity Guidelines: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Uses in Rural Areas.”

Staff provided a presentation. Presenters were Kirk Girard, Colleen Tsuchimoto, and Manira Sandhir.

SMPAC Commissioners Comments and Discussion:

1. How will code enforcement follow through with tracking the size of development and number of users?

- Staff responded that tracking occurs through mitigation, monitoring and reporting to meet all use permit requirements and conditions. Applicants are required to provide status reports to confirm compliance with conditions and is an appropriate tracking tool.*
2. How are mixed use development projects reviewed? Example – Cordevalle Golf course with restaurant and hotel. Golf course is a primary open space recreational use; but restaurants and hotels are commercial uses.
Staff is evaluating how to address this issue.
 3. Why are wineries exempt from the local serving regulations? Provide a more defined explanation of which type of land uses are exempt from these policies.
Staff responded that wineries are primary agricultural uses.
 4. How are legal non-conforming uses addressed? When an expansion is proposed to a legal non-conforming use – how are local serving regulations applied?
Staff responded that modified and expanded projects must meet the current local serving regulations.
 5. When will staff bring back the finalized version for SMPAC to review? More time to review the staff report is appreciated. The standard review time of 1 week prior to the Planning Commission hearing is inadequate.
Kirk responded that staff will provide staff report 10 days prior to the Planning Commission hearing.
 6. Comments should be submitted to Planning Department for any concerns of the amendments, examples of land uses that have questions on local serving criteria, and examples of legal non-conforming projects that would have problems with expansion to meet the local serving regulations.

Public comments and input:

1. The proposed changes to the ordinance are diluting the standards – changing the original intent of local serving for needs of San Martin residents. Instead of changing policy to be consistent with approach, why is the approach not being changed to be consistent with policy?
Staff responded that the current policy as written is impractical to implement. Discretion has been used by staff and the Board to implement this policy. The current project will establish measurable standards and reconcile the policy with the approach.
2. When will the draft Guidelines be available?
10 days prior to next Planning Commission hearing on the item.
3. Why aren't Visual Resources, Drainage and Flooding being quantified in guidelines?
Staff responded that these are difficult to establish quantifiable standards for.
4. Use only rural residential as the basis for establishing standards in rural residential areas, not all rural districts.
Staff responded that this limits the number of data points, however staff is still working on the data.
5. The process of obtaining early community outreach before SMPAC and Planning Commission review has been very helpful.

6. With removal of the significant traffic standard in the language; how will the significant increase of travel demands be addressed to protect the community?
The guidelines will have thresholds for median trips generated etc. Staff is working on the analysis which will be finalized.
7. Are there any changes to zoning Ordinance Chapter 4.10 section b and c? *No*
8. What are the components of a Rural Impact Study, and how will staff determine a rural impact study is adequate? How different is it from CEQA analysis?
Staff is working on addressing this issue.