



GPUSC MEETING SUMMARY, JUNE 9 and 10, 2010

During the June 9 and 10 meetings, the GPUSC reviewed each of the General Plan elements and made recommendations for changes to be included in the revised draft. GPUSC members were encouraged to bring key points and recommended changes for discussion by the full committee. Below are (1) key decision-making points for each element that the General Plan Team identified based on community input; (2) a list of key GPUSC discussion points for each element; and (3) specific recommended actions for revisions to the Draft General Plan. The following summary is organized by element.

1. Introduction

Key Decision-making Points
Minor Comments

GPUSC Discussion

- Include a place for an improved vision in narrative form.

Action: Peter will draft and send new vision language to the GPUSC.

2. Land Use and Growth Management Element

There were multiple points identified for discussion in the Land Use and Growth Management Element. The following section is organized according to each specific point as discussed during the GPUSC meeting.

CHANGE AREA #3

Key Decision-making Points

A high percentage of Town Hall meeting participants were not in favor of increasing density from "medium" to "higher" on at Oak and Mitchell (Change Area 3). **Do you support this change?**

GPUSC Discussion

- Change Area #3 is currently higher density.
- It is located close to downtown.

Action: Retain proposed higher density designation.

URBAN RESERVE AREAS

Key Decision-making Points

At recent meetings the GPUSC heard from the public about the Urban Reserve Areas. At one meeting there was discussion about eliminating these areas and at the

last meeting a local resident mentioned that it was important that his parcel remain designated as an Urban Reserve Area. **What direction do you recommend?**

GPUSC Discussion

- The Urban Reserve Areas are still relevant from a planning perspective.

Action: Retain policy and language as is.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

GPUSC Discussion

- Limit growth on all types of housing.
- Limit growth to the RHNA numbers.

Action: Consider changes to the Growth Management System Ordinance that limits the total number of new units to those included in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Based on the updated ordinance, make changes to the Land Use and Growth Management Element and the Housing Element to reflect the change.

3. Economic Sustainability

Key Decision-making Points

The Chamber recommended some specific comments including their recommendation regarding restaurant and hotel caps. **Does the GPUSC want to revise their restaurant and hotel caps recommendation or have the Planning Commission and City Council discuss?**

GPUSC Discussion

- Hotel and restaurant caps

Action: For ES 2.3, combine Alternatives 2, 3 and 4. In addition, remove "such as" on Alternative 2.

4. Public Facilities and Services (Water/Wastewater)

Key Decision-making Points

The preliminary results of the research performed by the Infrastructure Committee show that the city has enough water to accommodate the potential development outlined in the Draft General Plan.

GPUSC Discussion

- The water data are not correct.
- The sewer treatment issues can be solved with funding.

Action: Alan G. will provide an update with correct water data.

5. Circulation

Key Decision-making Points

A high percentage of Town Hall meeting participants were in favor of removing all roadway extensions with the exception of the Mitchell to Charter Oak St extension of Oak Street for autos, pedestrians and cyclists.

The majority of survey respondents were in favor of the proposed circulation improvements with the exception of the potential connections to Mills Lane.

The majority of survey respondents were in favor of the proposed connection to the Silverado Trail via Adams Street over the connection via Mills Lane or a second bridge at Pope Street.

The majority of survey respondents were in favor of the proposed extension of Adams Street east to Starr Avenue where it would connect to an extension of Starr Avenue north to Adams Street.

Based on this input do you feel that the proposed roadway extensions should be modified in any way? If so how?

GPUSC Discussion

- Oak Avenue
- Extension to Mills Avenue
- Include scooter language in element
- Prioritize complete street and Safe Routes to Schools.
- CR 4.B must be concurrent with an extension on Starr Avenue.
- Ensure pedestrian access on Main Street/SR 29

Action: Oak Avenue – remove emergency vehicle and add “scooters” and “with the intention to build/allow automobile access.”

Action Mills Extension – Change title to include “Alternatives” or “Study Areas.”

6. Historic Resources

Key Decision-making Points

Minor comments

GPUSC Discussion

- Identify and celebrate historical buildings, and make them more visible.
- Make them something that can be enjoyed by residents and visitors.

Action: Create a new goal that addresses this.

7. Community Design

Key Decision-making Points

The number of units, heights/setbacks, parking and privacy were the most common concerns listed that would need to be addressed for in-fill projects. **Based in this input how would you recommend modifying the draft?**

GPUSC Discussion

- Identify and celebrate historical buildings, and make them more visible.
- Make them something that can be enjoyed by residents and visitors.

Action: Create a new goal that addresses this.

8. Open Space and Conservation

GPUSC Discussion

- No major comments discussed.

9. Public Health, Safety & Noise

GPUSC Discussion

- No major comments discussed.

10. Climate Change

Key Decision-making Points

Public comments included a recommendation to include goals and implementing actions focused on adaptation measures in addition to reduction strategies to address climate change. **Based on this input would you recommend adding policies and actions related to climate change adaptation to the draft?**

GPUSC Discussion

- Adaptations to climate change are unclear.

Action: Add to introduction statements. Clarify how to adapt this language.

11. Housing Element

Key Decision-making Points

A high percentage of Town Hall meeting and survey participants were in favor of identifying multiple sites of 25 units or less per site to accommodate housing for the future. **Do you support this direction?**

Note: the Housing Element has already be adopted by the City Council and approved by the State of California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD). Any changes will require a supplemental General Plan Amendment and must be resubmitted to HCD.

GPUSC Discussion

- Mention that there is a preference for “low impact” development or use another term that is less vague and indicates that developments should be 25 units or less.
- Phasing for larger parcels is difficult.
- Developing affordable housing is difficult and these policies may make it more difficult.
- Add new language to the Community Design Element.
- “Fast track” and “streamline” terms are too aggressive. Open up a conversation with the State Housing and Community Development Department about requirements.
- Add community character descriptions, policies and actions.

Action: Include development preferences in the Community Design Element and Vision.

12. Parks & Recreation

Key Decision-making Points

Public comments included a recommendation to establish the national maximum (10 acres per 1000 residents) as a standard for parkland instead of the minimum (6 acres per 1000 residents) as mentioned in the draft. **Based in this input, do you support increasing the parkland standard to the national 10 acres per 1000 residents?**

GPUSC Discussion

- Park Level of Service (LOS) standards should increase to 10 acres per 1,000 persons and include language about upkeep and maintenance.
- St. Helena has access to various open space amenities.
- Spend money to keep up existing parks before developing new ones OR ensure adequate maintenance of parks.

Action: Park LOS standards to 10 acres per 1,000 persons.

13. Arts, Culture and Entertainment

GPUSC Discussion

- No major comments discussed.