

LOS OSOS COMMUNITY PLAN

Focused Meeting: Planning Area Standards

May 18, 2015

1. General Comments

- a. The concept of *sustainability* should appear in the planning area standards. Particularly focusing on a pedestrian and bike-friendly community.
- b. There are concerns over the costs of needed infrastructure, such as sewer, sidewalks, and street lights.
- c. There are no centralized parks or public spaces. Public recreational areas are needed.
- d. Buildout is an exercise in futility.
- e. There is a lack of land for industrial or storage yard uses. Consider expanding industrial areas into underutilized RMF zoning.
- f. The community should take matters into their own hands. Use the community plan as an opportunity to specify what we want on vacant land. This is better than letting the developers decide.
- g. Are we willing to let Los Osos grow? Some seem to have a “no growth” attitude.
- h. The main focus of the plan should be (1) maintain what makes Los Osos special – quirkiness, character, and charm; and (2) reduce vehicle miles travelled.
- i. The night sky is the “thing I love the most about Los Osos.” Street lights in the downtown are okay, but please no street lights in residential areas.

2. Water Resources as it Relates to Growth – Basin Plan

- a. Development depends on water availability. Water is #1 and should drive the ability to develop.
- b. The standard discusses Basin Plan effectiveness. Make the language stronger and evaluate to ensure that there are no loopholes.
- c. The model in the Basin Plan is based on flawed assumptions – such as annual precipitation of 17 inches.
- d. The Basin Plan standard is confusing.
- e. How can you base the Community Plan on the Basin Plan when it is not yet approved, not a certainty, and based on a bad model? Which comes first? The Basin Plan or the Community Plan?
- f. The uncertainty around water management drives a lot of the fear.
- g. Provide additional assurance for Basin Plan effectiveness. More focus on Basin Plan “Program M.” Strengthen the “successful implementation” language in the Basin Plan standard.

3. Central Business District

- a. Section 7.5.A.1 prohibits new drive-through facilities. What about existing facilities? A survey was done and 1,800 people agreed that we don’t want drive-throughs.

4. West of South Bay – Mixed Use Site

- a. Property is adjacent to large acreage horse properties, but is proposed for high density 15-26 units/acre development.
- b. There should be less density to blend in with large-lot properties.
- c. There are concerns with the mixed-use concept, as commercial uses will generate traffic.
- d. The site has maritime chaparral. Cluster or concentrate development to avoid impacts.
- e. Some discussion regarding emergency access.

5. Morro Shores – Mixed Use Site

- a. Is vertical mixed (i.e. ground floor commercial with residential above) use allowed here?
Response: Yes.
- b. This site is ideal for senior and affordable housing.
- c. Some envision this as an area for a mixed-income, mixed-age community, along with services.

6. Midtown (formerly Tri-W) Site

- a. A significant amount of money has been spent in restoring the site, so there are some concerns about the prospect of development occurring here.
- b. The site serves as a drainage catchment basin and prevents urban runoff from contaminating the estuary. New uses should preserve this function.
- c. Some visualize the site as an extension of the community park.
- d. Some development along the edges may be okay, but efforts should be made to preserve habitat.
- e. This would be a good site for east-west and north-south circulation for bikes/pedestrians.
- f. The site should remain recreational.

7. Los Osos Ecosystem Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)

- a. The County's concept is to designate areas outside of the Urban Services Line (USL) as ESHA. Does the Coastal Commission support this approach?
- b. If the Coastal Commission won't support this approach, the discussion on new development is fairly moot.

8. Wetland Setbacks

- a. The County should consider sea level rise when determining wetland setbacks. There may need to be a larger setback to account for changing wetlands.

9. Roadways and Circulation

- a. Consider safe mobility and "complete streets" when planning roadways.
- b. A connection between Baywood and the community park is needed.

- c. Class I bike paths are better than Class II bike lanes.

10. Specific Standards

- a. Figure 7-34: Subarea B requires 60% open space, but Subarea A has no open space requirement. Why is that?