

Brian, Ken,

If I recall correctly at the last Laetitia hearing it was suggested that we help develop some findings in case the commission chooses to approve the project.

Without implying that any decision has been reached on my part, here're a few thoughts:

1. Re the South County Plan, the development does not add a residential element but provides a more orderly development than has occurred in the area to the south of Los Berros Creek and east of the 101, while still providing for the continuation of a viable agriculture business.

2. The impacts of AES 4,5,6 & 18: can be minimized by a revised grading plan and the elimination of the phase 5 lots.

3. Bio impact 3 has been refuted by the applicant.

4. The applicants assertion that the project does qualify for the density bonus under the AgCluster ordinance is correct due to the reasons they have submitted.

On page 4 of 30, re goal 10, I'd suggest a COA that requires the replanting of vineyards, and the establishment of those vines, to occur prior to any house construction is allowed.

Finally, the development as proposed is superior to the alternative of no development due to the potential for a piecemeal sale & development of the underlying parcels which would result in greater traffic impacts, a reduction in the agricultural uses, and a greater impact on water resources without any water reclamation, water treatment. And that the neighborhood's streets would remain unimproved without shoulders or replacement.

As I said, I don't necessarily hold these positions but am just trying to assist with alternative findings should the Commission choose to reject the staff recommendation. And hoping to speed the process this next meeting!

See you Thursday!

Jim

--

Jim Irving