

Kerry Brown

From: Alice Welchert <alicewelchert@ymail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 20, 2016 4:19 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Community Plan, Los Osos

Dear Kerry --

As the Los Osos Community Plan is being revised I would like to share with you my support for a significant increase in affordable housing. County land use plans tend to favor large houses on large lots. These parameters make truly affordable housing beyond the reach of all but the affluent. To accommodate working families, those on fixed income, and those living below the poverty level, there needs to be higher density housing rather than sprawl. I believe that good planning must achieve several goals -- open space, care for the environment, good traffic flow and housing that is truly affordable.

Thank you for your consideration.
Alice Welchert

Kerry Brown

From: Anne Norment <mex2011@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2015 3:50 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Re: Meeting Reminder

Hi Kerry,

I've tried copied and pasting into the text below. The comment indicators (what section of text the comments apply to) are indicated in blue, and then comments are listed at the end. Please confirm that this worked and let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,

Anne Norment

D. Los Osos Groundwater Basin^[AN1]^[AN1].

1. Basin Plan compliance. Development of land uses that use water from the Los Osos Groundwater Basin shall be prohibited until the Board of Supervisors determines that successful completion and implementation of specific programs identified in the Los Osos Basin Plan ("Basin Plan") have occurred. The following programs from the Basin Plan must be successfully completed and implemented to address existing resource constraints prior to development of new dwelling units or commercial uses:

- a. Program "M" – Groundwater Monitoring
- b. Program "E" – Urban Efficiency
- c. Program "U" – Urban Water Reinvestment
- d. Program "A" – Infrastructure Program A
- e. Program "P" – Wellhead Protection
- f. At least one of the following additional programs:
 - Program "B" – Infrastructure Program B
 - Program "C" – Infrastructure Program C
 - Program "S" – Supplemental Water Program

2. Amendments to Title 26. Development of new dwelling units that use water from the Los Osos Groundwater basin shall be prohibited until 1) a growth limitation for the Los Osos Groundwater Basin is established in Section 26.01.070.k of the Growth Management Ordinance to reflect current basin conditions and the successful completion of the programs identified in the Basin Plan and 2) the Board of Supervisors determines that the specific programs identified in the Basin Plan and required by these standards as a prerequisite for additional development have been successfully completed and implemented and are effective, as follows.

- a. The Basin Plan program(s) shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works, in consultation with the Los Osos Groundwater Basin Watermaster.
- b. As part of the review for Basin Plan effectiveness, the County shall consider data collected as part of the Groundwater Monitoring program (Program "M"). If the data indicate that completed programs have not been effective in reducing groundwater demand, increasing the perennial safe yield ^{or}^[AN2]^[AN2] ^{facilitating}^[AN3]^[AN3] seawater ^{retreat}^[AN4]^[AN4] as predicted in the Basin Plan, then the development of new residential units shall be limited accordingly.
- c. As part of the review for Basin Plan effectiveness, the Board of Supervisors shall consider trends in commercial development and commercial water demand to ensure that such demand is not growing beyond a proportional relationship with the community's population.

3. Growth limitation standards. Development of new residential units that use water

from the Los Osos Groundwater Basin shall be prohibited until successful implementation of all programs identified in Subsection D.1. Once this has been achieved, Section 26.01.070.k of the Growth Management Ordinance may be modified to allow development of new residential units as follows:

a. Implementation of one additional program.

(i) **Implementation of Program “B”.** Upon successful implementation of Program “B,” an additional 1,230 residential units may be constructed within the Los Osos Groundwater Basin.

(ii) **Implementation of Program “C”.** Upon successful implementation of Program “C,” an additional 680 residential units may be constructed within the Los Osos Groundwater Basin.

(iii) **Implementation of Program “S”.** Upon successful implementation of Program “S,” assuming groundwater desalination producing 250 acrefeet per year, 550 residential units may be constructed within the Los Osos Groundwater Basin.

2[AN5][AN5]. Implementation of more than one additional program. In the event that more than one additional Basin Plan program is pursued, additional residential dwelling units may be constructed within the Los Osos Basin. The number of additional units allowed shall be as indicated in the following table, which are in addition to those indicated in Subsection **3a[AN6][AN6][AN7][AN7]:**

From: "kbrown@co.slo.ca.us" <kbrown@co.slo.ca.us>
To: Anne Norment <mex2011@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 10:52 AM
Subject: Re: Meeting Reminder

Hi Annem

Thank you for you comments.

I can't open the Word document (the dialogue box states that the there are problems with the contents). Can you send it again or try to save it differently?

Thanks,

Kerry Brown
Department of Planning and Building
County of San Luis Obispo
805-781-5713
kbrown@co.slo.ca.us

From: Anne Norment <mex2011@yahoo.com>

To: "Kerry Brown, Planner" <kbrown@co.slo.ca.us>

Date: 05/19/2015 03:52 PM

Subject: Re: Meeting Reminder

Hi Kerry,

As follow up to my verbal comments at the meeting in Los Osos yesterday, here are some written comments on the draft Los Osos community plan for your consideration:

- 1) Regarding the Basin plan I've attached a word document with specific comments on the text. Please confirm that you can read this OK.
- 2) Section 7-32, regarding Sea Pines Golf Course. They have a music event in the summer on most Saturdays which is great for the community. Should music event be added to the listed activities?
- 3) Section 7-49, regarding the Redfield Woods area. This area and for some homes backs up to open recreational space where people value stars/night sky. Please add a line that street lights would not be installed or required for any new structures.
- 4) I agree with comments at the meeting last night that any development in the Morro Shores area should include walking/bike paths that connect the community to Baywood. This is particularly important for people to walk to restaurants and events in that area, especially the Farmer's market which is very well supported by the community.

I may send more later but that's it for now. Please let me know if you have questions.

Also at the meeting yesterday I thought it was very helpful to have someone there who controlled the microphone for public comment. Please do this at the next meeting.

Sincerely,
Anne Norment

From: "Kerry Brown, Planner" <kbrown@co.slo.ca.us>

To: Anne <mex2011@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 1:43 PM

Subject: Meeting Reminder

Hello Everyone!
Friendly Reminder

Monday, May 18th at 6:00 pm we will be discussing Chapter 7, Planning Area Standards. Our main areas of focus will be on the community wide standards, combining designations and significant new standards affecting the community. Please read up on these topics and bring your ideas to the meeting. Chapter 7 can be found at the link below.

Thanks,
Kerry Brown

http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/PL/Area+Plans/LosOsos/9_Chapter+7_KB.pdf

Copyright © 2015 San Luis Obispo County
Planning and Building Department, All rights reserved.

You requested to be part of the Los Osos
Community Plan Update notification list.

Our mailing address is:
San Luis Obispo County Planning and Building
Department
976 Osos Street
Room 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Add us to your address book

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update
subscription preferences](#)

[attachment "~\$s Osos Comm Plan AN Comments 051915.docx" deleted by Kerry
Brown/Planning/COSLO]

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

Kerry Brown

From: Anne Norment <mex2011@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 3:52 PM
To: Kerry Brown, Planner
Subject: Re: Meeting Reminder
Attachments: ~\$s Osos Comm Plan AN Comments 051915.docx

Hi Kerry,

As follow up to my verbal comments at the meeting in Los Osos yesterday, here are some written comments on the draft Los Osos community plan for your consideration:

- 1) Regarding the Basin plan I've attached a word document with specific comments on the text. Please confirm that you can read this OK.
- 2) Section 7-32, regarding Sea Pines Golf Course. They have a music event in the summer on most Saturdays which is great for the community. Should music event be added to the listed activities?
- 3) Section 7-49, regarding the Redfield Woods area. This area and for some homes backs up to open recreational space where people value stars/night sky. Please add a line that street lights would not be installed or required for any new structures.
- 4) I agree with comments at the meeting last night that any development in the Morro Shores area should include walking/bike paths that connect the community to Baywood. This is particularly important for people to walk to restaurants and events in that area, especially the Farmer's market which is very well supported by the community.

I may send more later but that's it for now. Please let me know if you have questions.

Also at the meeting yesterday I thought it was very helpful to have someone there who controlled the microphone for public comment. Please do this at the next meeting.

Sincerely,
Anne Norment

From: "Kerry Brown, Planner" <kbrown@co.slo.ca.us>
To: Anne <mex2011@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 1:43 PM
Subject: Meeting Reminder



Hello Everyone!

Friendly Reminder

Monday, May 18th at 6:00 pm we will be discussing Chapter 7, Planning Area Standards. Our main areas of focus will be on the community wide standards, combining designations and significant new standards affecting the community. Please read up on these topics and bring your ideas to the meeting. Chapter 7 can be found at the link below.

Thanks,
Kerry Brown

http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Assets/PL/Area+Plans/LosOsos/9_Chapter+7_KB.pdf

Copyright © 2015 San Luis Obispo County Planning and Building Department, All rights reserved.
You requested to be part of the Los Osos Community Plan Update notification list.

Our mailing address is:

San Luis Obispo County Planning and Building Department
976 Osos Street
Room 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

[Add us to your address book](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)



Kerry Brown

From: Barbara Rosenthal <barbara@rosenthalart.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 10:33 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Lo community plan April 13 meeting

- >
- > Kerry,
- > Here a few ideas for mitigation of water loss and habitat preservation, and other concerns that I hope are relevant. It seems that all of this needs to include existing as well as whatever limited new construction will be allowed.
- > WATER
- > Capturing as much water as possible to return to aquifer or to water soil stabilizing plants:
- > Look at numbered street north of Santa ysabel for runoff directly into Bay.
- > Plan meetings and offer assistance for water capture from roofs (even condensation adds up out here) Are metal roofs an advantage here? If so, can county offset part of the cost?
- > Encourage graywater for gardening
- > Encourage recirculating pumps for hot water ALLOW second or third
- > bathrooms in older homes for convenience of residents. Restrict water use per occupant , not number of facilities. It gets harder To wait as we get older.
- > Is there a maximum occupancy?

- > GENERAL
- >
- > Allow additions before totally new construction to preserve open space and allow multigenerational housing. This will lessen many impacts.
- >
- > CIRCULATION
- >
- > Make more through walk/bicycle paths where we have dead end streets. For vehicles, finish Palisades. The library and community center are now very poorly connected with Baywood. This would save gas and make Pine Street safer. I dont see the type of street/ bike path in use in SLO being very useful here, but maybe. Which streets would it be used on?
- >
- > SAFETY
- >
- > Can the fire department tell us if illuminating intersections or street signs on LOVR would be safer? While I dont like street lights in residential areas, finding streets off LOVR at night can be tricky and it may not be safe to go too slow. This is true both east and west of "town."

- One more: reward native plant landscaping, esp near open spaces.
- >
- > Thank you for listening.
- > Barbara Rosenthal
- >
- > RosenthalArt.com

Kerry Brown

From: Bryan Brown <grownhere@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 9:40 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Community Plan for Los Osos - opinion from resident of 25 years

Dear Kerry,

Thank you for publishing the community plan draft document and for holding public meetings in Los Osos. Your website and the document are easy to read and follow. Thank you.

As a resident of 25 years I value the current Los Osos character - the absolutely **minimal lighting** for enjoyment of the night sky, the safe streets for evening and weekend **walks**, the **environmental stewardship** this town affords and the ever so slightly developing **commerce** around 2nd Street.

With the connection of the sewer system I recognize that development pressure will be on. I empathize with those that bought lots in the 70s and earlier and still hold interest in building homes for themselves. Those should be the first to be permitted. But above all else however, Los Osos should take a serious assessment of its available groundwater and hold development at a sustainable level based on water, infrastructure and maintenance of the Los Osos character. I do not support bringing water in from outside the county. I do believe the 19,000 build-out figure for Los Osos is significantly beyond a truly sustainable level.

Areas of improvement: Los Osos should pursue further development of walking/biking **paths** (examples being: between Cuesta-by-the-Sea and the town center; and the south end of 4th Street to town center); Los Osos needs to improve on capturing "human-caused" **run-off** (one example being rainwater picking up sediment then flowing over paved streets and finally settling on a level street close to the bay).

Thank you for the work you do. I will continue to follow the progress on the EIR.

- Bryan Brown

Kerry Brown

From: Crow White <crowsfeather@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2015 2:10 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Los Osos Community Plan

Dear Kerry,

As requested, I am a Los Osos resident submitting written comments on the Los Osos Community Plan. Please see below:

Comment: Cap Los Osos at its current population size. Don't use finance needs as an excuse to permit new development.

Reasoning: The community already is unable to sustainably rely on its water supply. Adding more people will further exacerbate the problem. We can not rely on a "tech" fix. Reducing per capita water consumption is needed and will help, but will be a long-term and difficult-to-attain goal.

Outcome: A self-sustaining local community.

Comment: Turn LOVR between South Bay Blvd and Palisades Ave into "downtown center" with slow-moving single-lane auto traffic, pedestrian and bicycle friendly walkways and paths, trees and landscaping, and storefront courtyard areas.

Reasoning: This area is a natural physical center of Los Osos, but currently has no heart. LOVR is unnecessarily wide (too many lanes) and fast. Bicycling here is dangerous and unenjoyable. Walking also is not pleasant. With few trees and no landscaping the area is desolate and concrete-filled.

Outcome: A community with a community center. Los Osos will develop its own character beyond just being a bedroom community for SLO with highway-size roads. Also, less traffic as more people walk and bike to errands.

Comment: Preserve all in-town open spaces. Do not allow infill development

Reasoning: Within town (urban) parks are increasingly being appreciated for their critical importance in connecting people with nature and providing the community with easily-accessible outdoor experiences and community gathering places. Once developed, in-town parks are lost forever. The "economic" value added from infill will be less than the cultural and natural value from protecting the in-town open spaces.

Outcome: A community that lives with and uses its natural environment, generating both a livable and beautiful town character with open spaces for its members to enjoy.

Comment: Preserve all perimeter and beyond open spaces.

Reasoning: Preserving the green belt will prevent urban sprawl, promote Los Osos being a sustainable population size, and provide an extensive natural environment for the community to access and for the benefit of central CA flora and fauna.

Outcome: A small community that is well balanced with its tremendously beautiful and diverse ecosystem.

Los Osos is special. The community also is at a cross-roads. We could easily allow for more development, more people, more cars and less open spaces - the result will be Los Osos turning into anytown USA. Instead, we have the opportunity now to recognize that "progress" means cleaning up our community so that it becomes more beautiful, sustainable, usable, safe and friendly. I believe that these are the characteristics that should define the Los Osos of our future.

Thank you for considering my comments in the development of the Community Plan. Sincerely, Crow White

Kerry Brown

From: Frances <fbleitch@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:52 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Suggestion: The Los Osos Shoreline for ALL!

Kerry Brown
Planning Commission
San Luis Obispo County

To Kerry Brown and The Planning Committee:

I'd like to suggest doing a concentrated effort, at this time, in fundraising, proposal, and negotiations, to **buy the (empty lots) directly adjacent to the ocean shoreline to preserve our towns friendly beaches, enjoyable walks, magnificent views, and the heaven we have here for ourselves and future generations.** (SWAP) DID THAT FOR US IN CREATING THE ELFIN FOREST. It can be done. I'm thinking of the areas off the water -- from the conjunction of Los Osos Valley Road and Pecho Road to the South and onward -- along the shoreline, at least, to the Baywood Pier. Ideally, it would stretch Northward and Eastward -- to the base of the Elfin Forest. Minimally, we might at least target particular areas that mean so much to us all: for example the Eucalyptus grove area just north of Cuesta by the Sea, off of Pecho Road, from the beach to the road. (I suspect this is privately owned.) **We'd preserve the beauty that fulfills us all, for ourselves and future generations -- this wonderful bit of heaven on earth: the Los Osos beach.**

Cordially,

Frances Leitch
Los Osos Resident

Kerry Brown

From: Gari Stinebaugh <garistinebaugh@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2015 10:27 AM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: West of South Bay BLVD @ Pismo

I have great concerns, as I have lived at the corner of 18th and Pismo for 25 years. I may be behind in my understanding, but when I saw a proposed plot map, I was astounded. Here are some of my issues:

1. El Morro doesn't go through, why not relocate the bike trail?
2. Pismo doesn't go through, makes for a crummy feeder street, and no stoplight??? with hundreds using that intersection.
3. Why would other areas for development have as few units per acre and this one 26 units per acre?
 - a. West of SB = 26 units per acre
 - b. East of Palasides = 10 per acre
 - c. Corner of Mt. View / Santa Ynez = 1 per 3 acres.If everything about the empty lots (12, I think) on 18th Street is to change, then everything about those other lots should change. $3 \text{ acres} + 2.5 = 5.5 \times 26 \text{ units} = 143 \text{ additional units}$. WooHoo.
4. Map 7-43 doesn't show the Middle School, doesn't this limit the retail? What about soccer season and the traffic jams at the Middle School?
5. What about the drainage? I was told by Public Works (in the 1990's) that a drainage plot would have to be 17 feet lower than the current low spot in order to be functional. Certainly this is now complicated by the water well, sewer well, and pump station located on that property.
6. Where oh Where is the water increase going to come from? I'm sick of drought issues, while the State mandates more housing.
7. If our sewer system is being built for the existing housing, then how will the increase in housing be responsible for another sewer system???
8. Where does all the traffic go? This is a poor example of a development plan and I hope that someone has already pointed this out. And who decided that all those trees and landscape is a good idea?

I know that this isn't very timely, but I was caring for my aged parents and now they have both passed away.

Gari Stinebaugh

Kerry Brown

From: Geoff Straw <gstraw@slorta.org>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 5:11 PM
To: 'kbrown@co.slo.ca.us'
Subject: Comments on Los Osos Community Plan

Hi Kerry –

Susan Nazionale contacted me and expressed some concerns about the Los Osos Community Plan update. I was not aware that it was being updated, so I am glad that Susan suggested that I also review the plan and provide some comments to you as they relate to transit issues. See below for details; call or email me with questions.

Geoff Straw
Executive Director
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority
179 Cross Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
805.781.4465 office
805.458.8216 mobile

1. Page F-2 – Section F-1, subsection I states:

Regional Transit Service. Ridership on buses is low for many reasons. They include infrequent service and other service deficiencies, poor access to bus stops, lack of sheltered bus stops, a poorly located park-and-ride lot, and a lack of incentives to use transit. Since over 75 percent of workers living in Los Osos commute to jobs in other communities, providing a high level of transit service is an important need.

Comment: RTA provides the same hourly frequencies throughout the county, primarily along the US-101 and SR-1 corridors, but also in the more densely-populated area surrounding the commercial area of LOVR and the neighborhood to the north including the Baywood Park area. Ridership on Route 12 in the Los Osos/Baywood area, while not as robust as that experienced at the Cuesta College campus, is still above the RTA standard of 22 passenger-boardings per service area and a farebox recovery ratio of 25%.

It should be noted that ridership is stymied somewhat due to the low population density (as you mention in D.1.3, there's an average of 2.38/DU in Los Osos, and 2.48/DU in the County as a whole). The income levels presented in D.2.1 suggest it is on par with the countywide average.

In terms of incentives, RTA provides deeply-discounted RTA-only passes (31-Day, 7-Day and Stored Value cards), as well as deeply-discounted regional passes good on all fixed routes in the county (RTA, SLO Transit, SCT, Paso Express). The Summer Youth Ride Free program continues to experience very good support.

I agree that access to bus stops is a problem in Los Osos/Baywood, since sidewalks are non-existent many areas and ambient lighting is relatively poor. We have passenger shelters and benches in a few places that meet our thresholds (20 boardings/day for a shelter and 5 boardings/day for a bench), yet we are not able to fully-implement those amenities at all deserving locations due to a lack of ADA-accessible sidewalk connections. In any case, I am certain that we are not meeting our goal of achieving an 80% favorable rating of bus stop appearance by customers and the communities we serve in Los Osos/Baywood – although the Plan's directive:

“Streets in commercial areas have landscaping, trees, social areas, curbs, gutters, street lighting and sidewalks, and utilities are underground. Streets in residential areas do not unless a majority of the residents of the neighborhoods request these improvements.” (from A.8 of Vision chapter)

will severely limit the possibility of addressing the challenge of bus rider access.

I am not sure there is a formally-adopted park-n-ride lot in Los Osos, anecdotal evidence suggests that some RTA riders park in the commercial area in Los Osos and access RTA buses at the LOVR/10th bus stop.

2. *Figure B-3 Baywood Commercial Area Design Concept* – we have not considered the idea of placing a bus stop on 3rd Street between Santa Maria and El Morro. Rather, we planned to continue to operate on El Morro between 7th and 2nd on the way back to Santa Ysabel. The Boulevard concept indicated in the plan might be problematic if a bus stop were to remain on 2nd; we’ll have to take a closer look as this project moves forward...

3. The following Vision statement in A.8 could be revised as follows:

*A transit system is established, permitting residents **near the commercial core** to access public transit within 1500 feet of their residences. A local transit loop connects with a regional transit terminal which provides frequent, fast and convenient connection to the major employment centers served by our residents.*

Specifically, the neighborhoods along LOVR (east of South Bay Blvd.), and to west and south of LOVR/Pecho Road are not within the 1500-foot boundary (we typically consider the service area to be ¼-mile or 1320-feet to be the effective service area).

Kerry Brown

From: George Miller <losososgemjean@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 11:09 AM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: West of South Bay Blvd

Here are a couple thoughts on the project:

I think the area under discussion could be a meeting place for students at the middle school across the street and the adults of the community. I can envision educational, creative and just plain fun activities that would serve to enhance contact and develop closer bonds between the youth and adults of the neighborhood. For example, a small Amphitheater like in National and State parks--to seat about thirty-- where students and area residents could meet for lectures or discussions of topics they themselves would suggest, led by people knowledgeable on the subject discussed. Maybe a little overtime for volunteer teachers from the middle school. Other nearby attractions could be stone chest boards, a bocce court, horse shoes--etc.

Housing in the area should be town houses and apartment clusters occupying and using as little space and water as necessary.

The area does not lend itself to a facility for the elderly. Too much coming and going of traffic and maintenance equipment.

I repeat my main point. Welcome all good ideas that would serve to create a closer bond between the middle school students and the neighborhood. This could result in a very attractive area to view and more important a contribution to civic cohesion

George Miller--1397 18th St. Los Osos, CA 93402
Phone 805-528-6229.

Comments after attending the April 20 community outreach meeting

- 1) Vision Statement update---e.g. as of 2015. The opening description on page 2-3 infers the 1995 version is what Los Osos residents' desire today. County Planning should draft a present-day Vision statement the County believes reflects the community's current view. Commentary or footnote can include this is based upon elements of 1995 Vision statement, recent survey, public comments at sessions and historical interaction with LOCAC as issues arose. Scanning the Shandon Community Plan document organization and specifically the Vision statement, is more readable for what they are looking to achieve. Writing it as if we are in the last year of the 20 year horizon (2035) is a common approach. As we discussed earlier, effective Vision statements are difficult to actually write for people having limited experience in this area. Prior to actually inserting it, you might give LOCAC a chance to review for comment but, as you stated in the meeting, this is a County document and the Planning department is presenting the recommended plan as the County sees it given all the input that has been received and the Planning group's expertise in community planning. Therefore, a current community Vision that this Plan is tied to needs to be presented. The Public Review period could be used to make changes if the community sees inadequacies. The community goals that have been tabled are really Critical Success Factors that must be met to be successful in achieving the vision in 20 years. Purely an editorial style comment is I think the Public Review document should exclude the 1995 Vision from the document—even the Appendix. Going forward with an approved document, having it in the 2015 document just confuses the reader and no longer has any relevance for this revised Plan.
- 2) I raised the subject of forecasted future age demographics as being important in the meeting as well as earlier. I believe it is important to do some risk analysis on this aspect and at least have it as an appendix item if not main text material. There are various approaches to trying to model this. The easiest might be to start with modifying the assumed size of house hold to say +.5 and +1.0 people to the forecast you house to use assuming average age becomes younger and more families with school kids move in as the current residents are gone. You likely could draw some conclusions regarding additional impact to water, transportation/circulation and needs for public facilities if these changes materialized. This could then project an additional risk if the new development areas materialize as envisioned. All these risks might be small or reasonable to mitigate...or not, but right now we have no way to really gauge this. This is crucial to be a successfully adopted document.
- 3) A new item should be incorporated into the document is some means of time weighting priorities. Much discussion has been given about the short comings of present day Baywood commercial and CBD including a lot of empty commercial. There needs to be a recommendation that some condition placed on the new developments approval that incorporates some level of occupancy or refurbishment of our existing business districts before expanding into a new area. Otherwise new businesses, and even existing local businesses, could prefer the new modernized location for their business and the other present day business areas being older could become

more blighted with higher building vacancies and further disperses a recognized LO “downtown”. Some people have voiced a concern that today there is no truly recognizable “downtown”. This could be an unintended consequence. My earlier comment regarding concern that Sewer buy-in costs in new-build in the Prohibition area is also wrapped into this unintended consequence question. A conditional permitting metric needs to be established to ensure the current CBD and Baywood commercial areas are not disadvantaged by adding commercial use to plots currently being considered for the new large scale multi-use areas.

- 4) The need for safe walking theme and attractive gathering points such as pocket parks and recreation points keeps coming through at all meetings. This should come through the document as a highest order priority for the County to address. Or the document should describe why something considered so important by the present residents does not raise to the highest level for attention by county Planning to be addressed.
- 5) While I do not have an understanding on Vacation rentals issues, your explanation of not addressing it in the Plan, or at least noting what county Planning’s view about the community’s desire was from other recent work seemed weak. Vacation rentals do influence the community feel and could affect the viability of other motels, new or existing, by capturing some of the potential clientele. The present draft has inserted the desire to have no drive-thrus. This was a recent contentious issue and the recent application was approved, yet the County has taken the view in this document of “No” in the Plan draft. In a community with decisive views on both fronts, the County has voiced a recommendation and the thinking behind this recommendation needs to be visible. It is not sufficient to just state that this is what the community wants. Both of these issues are of similar type and should likely be treated with similar attention in the document. This should be left silent and at some time something might be tables, it could be addressed with data regarding that specific proposal rather than a blanket “no”.
- 6) Regarding the discussion surrounding the 3rd mini development area west of South Bay, I question whether a new small commercial as described can ever be sustainably profitable based upon a base of local neighborhood (walking) customers. Small convenience stores generally require small premium prices for the lower volume and convenience factor. They would need an additional customer base that would require driving. If someone has to drive, then better choices should already be available in the existing business areas. It goes against the theme of new developments that reduce the use of cars. Also note, in reviewing the proposed changes map foldout at the front of the document does not indicate any commercial for this area....only REC and RMF.
- 7) Parks planning & water needs – There should be some discussion about the use of the Purple Pipe reclamation water system and viability to use for park or recreation irrigation. The present backbone pipeline system layout might also then dictate priority areas to target locate the parks. With regard to the discussion about the property at Pine and Los Osos being available, w/o water, maybe this would be a solution....or maybe I missed the points that were raised regarding potable water rights exchange dilemma. Drinking water needed for drinking fountains. Public toilets could be of the modern campground pit type w/o water that needs to be pumped from on a regular basis. This is not an ideal solution, but practical given Los Osos’s water limitations.

- 8) What I have learned listening in various forums is there appear to be a group of people wanting zero growth (water; quality and way of life); another group is satisfied with limited growth(new jobs; alternative housing/new services; retain quality of life); And others who desire high growth(more economic development; better jobs). County has recommended “limited growth” and built this Community Plan upon it. There needs to be a table outlining pros/cons of each and why the County selected limited growth as the preferred plan for Los Osos.
- 9) Dark Sky - Visual Resources. Someone brought up visual resources in the meeting as a category that needs to be included in the Environmental Resources section. Visual can include daylight viewshed and other types as well. It also could include dark nighttime skies. LO might be one of the few last urban locations that could achieve this and some people have expressed an interest in maintaining this. Once it is gone...it is gone forever. So, some aspect of the report needs to highlight this aspect and desires in the community, pro and con, then state the County’s Planning recommendation along with rationale. Perhaps a pros/cons table would suffice to explain the rationale. I would support this Dark Sky as a goal and discussion should be incorporated in both the Resources section and Planning Design section if County Planning recommends this. There should also be an outline of a conceptual way the community might implement conversion or adaptation to this in our developed areas.

International Dark Sky Communities ~ a town, city, municipality, or other legally organized community that has shown exceptional dedication to the preservation of the night sky through the implementation and enforcement of quality lighting codes, dark sky education, and citizen support of dark skies.

An International Dark Sky Community excels in its efforts to achieve a community-wide lighting code, promote responsible lighting, dark sky stewardship, and exists as an example to surrounding communities on the possibilities available with the proper lighting. Each community shown below has gone above and beyond the requirements as stated in our International Dark Sky Community Guidelines.

Certified International Dark Sky Cities

Name	Location	Year Designated
Flagstaff	Arizona, USA	2001
Borrego Springs	California, USA	2009
Isle of Sark	Channel Islands	2011
Homer Glen	Illinois, USA	2011
Isle of Coll	Scotland	2013
Dripping Springs	Texas, USA	2014
Beverly Shores	Indiana, USA	2014
Sedona	Arizona, USA	2014
Westcliffe / Silver Cliff	Colorado, USA	2015

- 10) Two stage implementation of the Community Plan. The report acknowledges the challenge with regard to managing within sustainable resources...namely water. This is a key requirement for the ability to initiate these new development multi-use complexes and many residents believe the water situation may be insurmountable. The Plan needs to highlight the important items that can begin and be achieved prior to a potentially delayed water solution. What this also highlights is that many people believe Los Osos has many shortcomings today that is affecting our quality of life now...most seem to pertain to safety. i.e. if a new bike corridors are being identified to support new build areas, the Plan needs to identify those bikeways that would benefit the community even while these new developments are in limbo. There are several other items like this example.

- 11) Another purely editorial style comment, while I understand the County is trying to streamline the endangered species "Take" parameters associated with permits and may be important to that process; it really does not add anything to this Plan in what the 20 year outlook will look like. Placing this discussion in the Resources section just adds complexity to the average reader. Having success at getting this change does not affect the overall Plan.....Or does it? If it does, then that needs to be highlighted as a risk to achieving the Plan and why. Perhaps just a reference to this effort in the main text and moving the write-up to an appendix would help at a minimum.
- 12) While this was only notionally mentioned and may be more appropriate for a Circulation element discussion, it has a possible knock-on effect to Land Use. There was discussion regarding the dedicated bikeway on El Morro to South Bay Blvd...then a stop lighted cross walk to Los Osos Middle School. This stop light negatively affects traffic flow on South Bay Blvd. After incorporating future traffic volumes, with greater number of residents, visitors LO expects to attract with visitor oriented services, and even new projected flow of through-traffic to/from Montana de Oro SP, this will become even more a problem. Many communities solution is an overhead protected walkway. County Planning should estimate these forecasted volume projections at build-out....or even in 10 years out without a build-out. This might also influence some land use designation to hold at least enough land to accommodate the walkway ramp pad needed on both sides for the future.

Kerry Brown

From: Sayers, John@Parks <John.Sayers@parks.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 3:14 PM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Chapter 7, Planning Area Standards

Hi Kerry,

Doug Barker passed along an email about an upcoming meeting to discuss the LCP for Los Osos. I will not be able to attend, but I did have one comment to pass along. Under Section L. 3. a. it has tree size required being 15 gallons at least. Coming from a restoration and nursery background I can tell you that this is a guideline looking to be bent. I have seen contractors put a small plant into a 15 gallon pot, water it for a couple weeks and then deliver it as a 15 gallon plant (and that would meet the standards). I would suggest some more specific language about tree caliper and height, as well as being completely rooted, but not root bound be added. That would limit the range of plants that would be acceptable under the proposed guidelines. Any licensed landscape architect should be able to provide you with standardized language that is used in the industry. That was all I had. Good luck with the meeting.

John Sayers

Environmental Scientist

CA State Parks, San Luis Obispo Coast District

11 State Park Road, Morro Bay, CA 93442

(805) 458-9626

John.Sayers@parks.ca.gov

Kerry Brown

From: Kathie Sperow <ksperow2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 8:44 AM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us; trochte@sbcglobal.net; Kathie Sperow
Subject: Hello from LO Folks.....

Dear Kerry,

As the plan project Manager with the County Planning Department I am sending you this correspondence concerning my opposition to the current plans for the tract of land designated as the "West of South Bay Boulevard" site.

Please put us on record as opposing the general plan in place for the above mentioned track. This beautiful track of land survives in a natural state and borders both our walking and bike path as well as the entry to our town coming from Morro Bay. This property is habitat for many of our coastal creatures, including the Banded Dune snail, kangaroo rat and so many more. Many Indian artifacts have been found in and around the intersection of the Jr. High school. We are in desperate need of open park areas within our community of Los Osos.

The general plan needs to be revisited with consideration for the people of our community and the fact that there are very few open areas that can still be preserved. With consideration of our "water table" issue and the fact that we are on a 50 gallon per day per person ration mandate currently (We are respecting that ration, and it is very very restrictive for our household) and that we are dealing with salt water intrusion; that the traffic would greatly affect the intersection of Pismo and South Bay Blvd as it also accommodates the Jr. High School and soccer fields as well (Visit that intersection when we have a soccer match on the weekends, it is hazardous); that the wildlife would be obliterated with the current plan; that we as citizens that live or visit here would forever lose the beauty of that open field.....we ask for you to revisit the current county plan.

Please help us preserve what is special about our beautiful community.

Respectfully Concerned Citizens, Kathie and Dan Sperow

Kerry Brown

From: Ken Christensen <kendartman@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 7, 2015 10:16 AM
To: kbrown@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Los Osos

Dear Kerry,

I attended the recent meeting at Monarch Grove school and I thank you for all your efforts on our community's behalf. I know it's not easy working with the public. I would like to reiterate the need for a city center. Los Osos has many charming and unique neighborhoods. It is embarrassing that the city center is nothing more than nondescript shopping centers. The obvious location of some sort of public park or central focus would be next to the Post Office which fortunately has an available lot for sale. I don't know what the condition of that sink hole next to the P.O. is but that is also the best location. That entire plot should be acquired before it becomes another cheap commercial space with a big parking lot. There are potential commercial spaces on the opposite side of the empty lot, a funky little building which could be rehabilitated. I'm not sure what a public park would look like but with so many artists in Los Osos, I'm sure a nice design could be created. I would suggest a central fountain, work of art, or monument (another bear sculpture?). Perhaps a bocce court could be integrated or something else to encourage the locals to congregate, get to know each other, and share news.

Another matter, which may not be part of your duties, is the homeless encampment in the open space beyond the Los Osos library. I live at the extreme east end of Rosina Drive at the other end of the open space. My street has become the gateway to the homeless camp. There is a constant flow of homeless people coming and going. This is not the random people who are simply hiking or walking their dogs. The homeless have not caused me any direct harm but I object to the front of my house being a bus stop where the homeless get dropped off and picked up. Cars will wait in front of my house and even beep their horns for someone in the encampment to come. It is disturbing when a car pulls up late at night when the only cars would normally be for my house or my neighbor across the street. I pay very high property taxes and one of the attractions of my home is the quiet and lack of traffic at the end of a dead end street. I should not have to put up with the questionable activity of my street being the driveway for a homeless camp.

sincerely,

Ken Christensen
599 Rosina Dr
805 528 1498

590 Binscarth Road
Los Osos, California 93402
June 30, 2015

Ms. Kerry Brown
County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning and Building
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Subject: Comments on Los Osos Community Plan Public Review Draft

Dear Ms. Brown,

Thank you for your terrific public outreach efforts regarding the Los Osos Community Plan Public Review Draft dated January 30, 2015. The public meetings that I attended were very helpful and informative, as is all of the information that you have posted on the webpage for this project.

Unfortunately I was unable to attend the last two public meetings (May 18, June 8) and have had limited time to devote to this in recent weeks. Therefore my comments are made without benefit of hearing the information presented in the last two meetings, and having only read portions of the draft plan. However, I have lived in Los Osos for over 30 years and have made many connections in the community. I have attended many community meetings over the years. I actively participated in the public input process for this plan that occurred in the mid 1990's. I have thought a great deal about the information and discussions from the meetings that I was able to attend this year, as well as the portions of the current LOCP draft that I have been able to read. On this basis, I present a few comments below.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lisa Wallender".

Lisa Wallender

Overall comments

Each community in San Luis Obispo County has its own unique character, and Los Osos is no exception. Los Osos is characterized by being a quiet, low key, rural, walkable, relatively affordable, and friendly community that is located in a beautiful setting. Some key features that contribute to this special character include the following:

- Mostly residential development
- Many undeveloped streets
- Much natural beauty

These features attract and retain mostly full time, moderate income residents who value a laid back lifestyle wherein they are connected to their neighbors, to the community, and to the natural environment. To preserve Los Osos' special character, these features should be vigorously protected when considering any and all new development and redevelopment projects. Toward that end, I make the following suggestions.

Residential versus business development

Large commercial development of any kind should be discouraged. Small commercial development may be encouraged, especially small home-based businesses that have minimal impacts on neighbors, or locally-owned businesses that serve the current residential population. Businesses that may encourage growth or other movement of people (residents, workers, tourists) into Los Osos should be discouraged.

Streets and traffic

In general, streets should be maintained and, if necessary, "improved" in ways that encourage and prioritize pedestrian and bicycle traffic and actively discourage motorized vehicle traffic.

Many Los Osos streets, especially in residential areas, are narrow and lack curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Many streets have dead ends, including impassible areas in the middle of the street. Several streets have unpaved stretches. In most areas, these factors have the following significant beneficial effects, and therefore they should be preserved and maintained:

- Contributes to rural character of the town
- Helps keep home prices down
- Vehicles slow down and drivers remain attentive
- Vehicles yield to pedestrians and bicycles
- Through traffic is concentrated on only a few streets, leaving other streets relatively quiet and safer for pedestrians and bicycles

Vehicular traffic dominates on a few streets (chief among these are Los Osos Valley Road, Santa Ysabel Ave, Santa Ynez Ave, Los Olivos Ave, 11th St, 9th St, and 7th St). On these streets it may be appropriate to install sidewalks and other features to improve pedestrian and bicycle access and

safety. But most other streets are fine as is, and any changes are likely to have more of a negative impact on balance than a positive one.

Natural Beauty

Los Osos is fortunate to be situated in a location with outstanding natural beauty. Residents are able to stay connected to the natural environment because of the following factors, which should be vigorously preserved.

- **A sense of openness.** This occurs because of the small scale of homes and businesses, and should be strongly guarded.
 - Every time someone builds up to gain a view, someone else loses a view, whether it is a direct view of the bay from a home, or a general view of the greater surroundings from a yard or a street. Therefore, when existing homes or businesses are remodeled or rebuilt, the resulting building should be no taller than the original building, with the exception of buildings that currently have a flat roof; they may be allowed to build a new pitched roof of minimal height needed for runoff. Additionally, the scale of the new building should be compatible with neighboring homes. Any increase in square footage should be limited to avoid a significant visual impact from the street or on adjacent homes.
 - New homes built on empty individual lots currently scattered throughout existing neighborhoods should be limited to one story in height (approximately 14 ft). The scale of new homes (square footage, setbacks) should be no greater than other homes in the vicinity, especially adjacent homes.
 - New residential buildings (homes, apartments) in Morro Shores or West of South Bay Boulevard should be no more than two stories high (approximately 24 ft).
 - New businesses should be no more than two stories high (~24 ft).
 - Fences should be limited to the sides and backs of properties, and should be no more than six feet tall unless a specific need is identified that cannot be met some other way. In no case should side and back fences be more than eight feet tall. Front fencing should be discouraged. When it is allowed, front fences should be no more than four feet tall, and preferably have an open design or feeling (no fortresses).
 - Gated communities should be prohibited (not merely discouraged).
- **Dark night skies.** Streetlights should not be installed in residential areas. New streetlights in commercial areas should be kept to an absolute minimum, and should follow the guidelines developed by the International Dark Sky Association. Alternatives to lights should be considered when safety or navigation issues are raised. For instance, reflective street signs may help with navigation at night.
- **Quiet.** Because Los Osos is an almost entirely residential community, there is little traffic or other noise, especially at night. This is a key reason why Los Osos is a very quiet, peaceful community, and is an important reason why Los Osos should remain largely

residential. Commercial ventures, especially those that increase traffic or otherwise create noise after normal business hours, should be strongly discouraged.

- **Wildlife.** There is a significant wildlife population in town (including deer, coyotes, raccoons, foxes, owls, and other birds, to name a few). Although the wildlife can be a nuisance at times (which I know from personal experience), the benefits of this important connection to nature outweigh the occasional inconvenience. New development should not have a negative impact on wildlife habitat and travel corridors.

Staying connected to the natural environment promotes the physical and emotional well-being of individuals and the community, and provides a sense of peacefulness and serenity that is lacking in more developed communities. This should be vigorously protected.

Sense of community/safety and well-being

All of the factors described above contribute to a very friendly, open, positive sense of community. This enhances both community and personal safety and well being. Neighbors know each other, and look out for each other. This should also be vigorously maintained and encouraged through development standards.

An additional factor that encourages community connectedness is homes that are “open” to the street – that is, the front door and a front window are the dominant feature from the street, not the garage. Rebuilt/remodeled homes and new homes should be built in this same manner. The garage should not be the dominant feature of a home as seen from the street.

Water supply

No new building should be allowed until there is a solid body of strongly reliable data that clearly demonstrates that the Los Osos groundwater basin has been restored to good health and that it can withstand additional withdrawals without incurring damage to either the quantity or quality of the groundwater. The language in section 7.3.D of the draft LOCP (Communitywide Standards/Los Osos Groundwater Basin) should be strengthened in this regard.

Morro Shores Mixed Use area, and West of South Bay Boulevard area

I generally agree with the plans for these two large properties as outlined in the draft LOCP. I support development of affordable housing for seniors and low income people. I agree with providing accessible, neighborhood-serving small commercial development. In the Morro Shores Mixed Use area, instead of a business park I would encourage a cultural arts center and/or a natural history center. Franchise and national chain stores should be discouraged throughout throughout town. Drive through businesses should not be allowed anywhere in town.

Los Osos Community Advisory Council Vision for Los Osos

The LOCAC Vision for Los Osos (adopted June 22, 1995) that is included in Appendix A of the LOCP Public Review Draft (dated January 30, 2015) was written following an extensive public outreach process. I largely agree with this vision statement, with the following exceptions:

- In Section A.6, Planning and Zoning: *“Self governance has been achieved”*. I do not see how this is feasible without becoming an incorporated community. I strongly disagree with that idea. Los Osos should remain an unincorporated community.
- In Section A.6, Planning and Zoning: *“If lands south and north of the South Bay Boulevard Extension are deemed developable, consider development as a resort hotel/golf/shopping as a gateway to Montaña de Oro with high density and considerable open space.”* I disagree with building facilities such as resorts and golf courses that are designed for high income visitors. If visitor-serving facilities are built, they should be geared toward lower- and middle-income visitors. However I agree with the “high density and considerable open space” portion of this suggestion.
- In Section A.11, Tourist-Oriented Facilities: *“One or more 18-hole golf courses.”*. I object to additional golf courses in Los Osos.

Final comments

Overall, I think the current draft of the Los Osos Community Plan reflects our community values fairly well, and I applaud SLO County Planning and Building Department staff for your determined efforts in that regard. In further support of that, I offer the following final comments.

When planning for the future, community members, especially community leaders and business people, often say they want “more, more, more”. More jobs, more housing, more shopping, more visitors, etc etc. In over 30 years of living in Los Osos, I have seen that happen over and over again in other SLO County communities. Every time they get more of these things, they then need more roads, more traffic lights, more public safety officers, more tax revenue, and so forth. It is a vicious circle. No one is ever satisfied. There never seems to be enough.

Los Osos has been an exception to this. Because of the sewage discharge moratorium imposed on Los Osos in 1988, the town has been essentially frozen in time for nearly 30 years, neither demanding nor getting more of anything, and it is doing just fine. Please make sure that development guidelines and standards for Los Osos prevent it from falling into the “more, more, more” trap. In Los Osos, less is more. Less development is more open space. Smaller homes (less size) are more affordable homes. Less fencing makes for a more friendly community. Less developed streets mean more walking and bicycling opportunities. Less lighting means more stars are visible at night. Less commercial development means more peace and quiet for residents.

Please do not allow Los Osos to become like everyone else, with the same boring cookie cutter houses, the same noise and traffic problems associated with large commercial development, the same public safety problems that result from too many people and a lack of sense of community. People come to Los Osos because they want to get away from those things. People come to Los

Osos because they like it the way it is now. Please be bold in setting development standards to protect and preserve this wonderful, unique coastal community.

Thank you.

Kerry Brown

From: Lisa Wallender <lisaw.ff@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 11:51 AM
To: Kerry Brown
Subject: Fwd: Park discussion follow up

Ms. Brown,

I am forwarding the following email to you in case anything in here has any value for the Los Osos Community Plan update. I'm not certain if it does or not, and I don't expect you to necessarily do anything with it. But I wanted to put it out there for consideration in case it does have some value. Thank you kindly.

Lisa Wallender

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lisa Wallender <lisaw.ff@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Apr 21, 2015 at 11:42 AM
Subject: Park discussion follow up
To: Pandora Nash-Karner <[Pandora@pandoraandcompany.com](mailto: Pandora@pandoraandcompany.com)>, Lou Tornatzky <ltornatzky@gmail.com>

Pandora and Lou,

This is a followup to the discussion about parks at last night's LO Community Plan update meeting. I send this to you as our two primary local parks advocates.

I raised the idea of turning vacant lots around town into mini-parks. An interesting and informative discussion ensued, and I appreciate the feedback. Unfortunately I missed a few of the final comments (mainly Kerry's) as the person sitting next to me started a side conversation that was a big distraction. So I apologize if anything I mention here was already addressed last night.

I heard Pandora mention that the County doesn't favor small parks due to high maintenance costs. However I wonder if there might be some other possible approaches.

What I envision is many truly tiny parks on currently vacant residential lots scattered around town. I am thinking of something really simple and low maintenance - basically just a couple of benches set among native plants, with a tree for shade. No lights, garbage cans, or toilets. I submit the following thoughts for your consideration.

Benefits

Maintain/enhance walkability

Los Osos residents are walkers! Yay for us! Mini-parks could improve walking opportunities for many people as illustrated in the following examples.

Young people - Just last week I was walking in Cuesta-by-the-Sea with a young mother whose infant became hungry and restless. Thankfully we just happened to be near the Rive Gauche lot on Mitchell - a private lot that landscaped with a garden, a short pathway, and a bench, and that appears to welcome visitors. Although we weren't entirely sure it was OK to use the bench, we did so because of her infant's need to nurse. That allowed her to attend to her child, and

allowed us to continue our walk afterward. Tiny pocket parks around town could help young parents get outside more often and stay outside longer.

Older people - I have several elderly neighbors who need and like to walk, but they are limited in their range, and often need to stop to rest. Tiny pocket parks could help them get out more often and for longer periods of time if they could sit down and rest along the way.

Middle age people - I know several people who have needed to walk following various injuries and surgeries, whose range has also been limited. They too could benefit from being able to sit and rest along the way.

Fostering community and reducing isolation

A young parent or especially an elderly person resting on a bench in a pocket park will have opportunities to interact with neighbors that they won't have otherwise. The park may even become a destination for that reason.

Opportunities for free play

Nowadays it seems like children only get to play outside at school or in some organized sport that their parent drives them to. Pocket parks could provide opportunities for children to get out of the house more often, under their own power, to experience free play very near to home.

Retire vacant lots

Some people have owned vacant lots for years with little prospect of ever being able to build. A mini-park could put that land to good use and also relieve those property owners of that burden.

Maintain charm

Los Osos is often described as being charming. Mini-parks all around town could only enhance that character. A friend of mine recently visited Savannah, Georgia. She raved about how beautiful it is, and specifically identified the numerous small parks around town as being the reason for that. Her comments echo others I have heard over the years about that city.

Maintain openness

Most new residential construction is very likely to be as tall and possibly as large as possible. I suspect that will happen with major remodels of existing small homes after the sewer plant is operational as well. Consequently, the small scale of many of our neighborhoods will disappear. Turning vacant lots into parks can help maintain some sense of space and openness around town and serve to counteract the possible massiveness and crowding of new construction.

Storm water capture/groundwater recharge

A mini-park presumably would have little or no impervious surface, and could be designed using LID principles to maximize capture of storm water for groundwater recharge. This also would help reduce pollution going to the bay.

Challenges

Acquisition of properties.

I wonder if the Trust for Public Land or other similar organizations could be a resource to help purchase properties? (I have been a member of the TPL for many years and am reasonably familiar with what they do. This seems like a good fit).

Ownership

An organization would need to accept ownership of the properties. Perhaps the County would accept ownership if they don't have to maintain it, much like the Elfin Forest is owned by the County but maintained by SWAP. Or could this fall under the CSD's authority?

Design and development

These being small projects, I could see design and development being done by Eagle Scouts, Cal Poly Landscape Architecture classes, the Guerilla Gardeners, etc. Maybe some local nurseries would help. Perhaps some could be demonstration gardens for groups with a specific interest. Maybe have some community gardens?

Maintenance

Of course the parks should be designed for minimal maintenance, but still some maintenance will be necessary. Being small, perhaps parks could be adopted by service organizations, schools, neighborhood groups, etc

Liability

I presume that the owner would have appropriate liability coverage.

I realize the challenges are big - I don't presume this would be easy to accomplish. But I think the idea has enough merit that I wanted to at least put it out there as food for thought.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Wallender
590 Binscarth Road
528-7741