

From: Robert Rosales <robert@rosalesrealty.com>  
To: TWahler@co.slo.ca.us  
Cc: Dana Lilley <dlilley@co.slo.ca.us>, jirving@co.slo.ca.us  
Date: 05/21/2014 05:05 PM  
Subject: Housing Element Update 2014

Hi Terry,

While it may be late to include these comments as part of tomorrow's discussion, I ask that you consider them going forward...

- An integral component of a sustainable/livable community is having a balance of the various types of residential units w/n the community. Having too many, or not enough of a certain type results in an undue strain on the resources and infrastructure of the community and the region.
- We support the recommendations to NOT require a minimum density per acre for parcels zoned MultiFamily for the reasons stated in the Staff Report. Particular to Templeton, such requirements would be contrary to the Templeton Community Design Plan. Our entire downtown core, the heart of our community, is zoned RMF. Requiring all development in this area to have a higher density would destroy the small town, rural character of the community.
- As was stated to me once, "Folks do not move to Templeton to live above a deli..." Higher, metropolitan type density development (commercial and residential) is better suited for cities, not communities with a rural character.
- As suggested in passed discussions, Templeton is best suited for secondary dwellings as a means to addressing the need for workforce/senior housing.
- Studies show that employees prefer single family dwellings over multifamily (SLO EVC Housing Survey 2013). Create incentives for subdivisions of smaller single family units (1600-2000sf) such as streamline processing, fees based on size of units...
- While it may not be necessary for this report, the element should include an inventory of residential units built in nonresidential zoned areas, so that decision makers have a more accurate assessment of need.
- Inventory for the analysis particular to Templeton should include 2 projects I did not see:

(a) SUB2005-00244 40 Townhomes (under construction) APN:  
040-280-057

(b) SUB2008-00041 Templeton Properties/Templeton Livestock Salesyard – 40 single family units and 67 detached condos on RMF and Rec zoned areas. APN: 040-211-026.

This project was not included in the last Element update because the current use is not residential. The project has since been approved, and it is of significant size, thus it should now be included. I would note that many of the units are proposed to be built on the Rec zoned area of this property, which goes to my point noted above.

One last point - I do not believe that the water from the Naci project is State Water, as drafted in Chapter 3, page 3-25...

Thank you for your consideration,

Rob Rosales

--

**Robert Rosales**

**President of the Board**

**Templeton Chamber of Commerce**  
**805-712-7493 • [Robert@RosalesRealty.com](mailto:Robert@RosalesRealty.com)**

The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments thereto, is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee(s) named herein. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by replying to this message and then permanently deleting the original and destroying any printout. Your receipt of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privileges.

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

North Coast Advisory Council comments, 5/21/2014, on the Public Review Draft, County of SLO General Plan Housing Element 2014-2019

Chapter 3: Sites Analysis –

- p. 3-3 Not mentioned under Realistic Development Capacity is the impediment to development of housing in Residential Multi-Family zoning which is inherent in CZLUO (2011) 23.08.042 Warehousing, which allows the development of mini-storage on RMF-zoned parcels. The Housing Element 2009-2014 Program HE 1.G (“Revise residential development standards”) proposed prohibition of mini-storage in RMF land use category. Has this been achieved, or does the replacement 2014-2019 Program HE 1.F still pursue prohibition of such a use in RMF? ***Opinion: Removal of mini-storage as an allowable use in RMF is desirable in the context of fulfilling Housing Element goals.***
- p. 3-10 Secondary dwellings. “Secondary dwelling units are often affordable to low or very low income households because they do not require acquisition of added vacant land and County regulations limit their size to 1,200 square feet when located on parcels of 2 acres or more. On parcels of less than one acre and in urban areas, secondary dwelling sizes are limited to 800 square feet. **In the North Coast Area Plan, secondary dwelling sizes are limited to 640 square feet.”** ***Opinion: Add this language; this is an existing NCAP standard that should be maintained in future, due to ESHA in Cambria.***
- p. 3-12 Table 3.7 Vacant parcels for Moderate Income Households. We are aware that at least one parcel in this table (Cambria 023-151-034) is in process with County for 33 units which are *committed to a variety of income levels – not all moderate income household units.* ***Opinion: Although the required 193 potential units for moderate income households would likely be shown to be available even if there are other inaccuracies in this Table, accuracy does matter.***

Chapter 5: Housing Needs Assessment –

- p. 5-32 Primary resources and the community’s ability to develop housing – Cambria. “Very limited water supply, with a LOS III. The Community Services District is focusing on ~~seawater (or brackish groundwater)~~ desalination for long-term drought protection ~~and as a supply for new development and existing users.”~~ ***Opinion: The permit issued May 2014 by County for a brackish water treatment operation specifically states it is for drought protection only, to recharge a nearby well-field.***
- p. 5-36 “Community advocates defend the ability of a community to voice its opinion on the compatibility and desirability of proposed development projects, and note that planning laws require that all project impacts and community resource shortages shall be fully considered. There have been some recent, positive trends that the public is finding common ground on how to respond to the county’s housing shortage. For example, some advisory councils and other agencies...are publicly saying that the county needs more affordable housing. Some advisory councils and community groups...are also voices in support of housing initiatives.” ***Note: In 2013 the NCAC did recommend approval, with conditions, of a revised affordable housing project on parcel 013-151-034, although deeply concerned about water as a limited community resource.***

