

Few More Comments from SMP land uses section 11-2-16

1. P. 3-10-- #(1) West side RMF referring to L St.
 - L ST. probably should be separated into west side of L and E side of L
 - On west side of L the concerns are mostly slope and access being from alley only.
 - On the E side there is a mixture of RSF and RMF with the majority being single family and mostly occupied.
 - P. 3-9 Section A: says Densities in RMF typically range from 10 to 26 units per acre. We adamantly do not want a density more than 20 units per acre. (again, I know county has their quotas and may not be willing to go along with our wishes on this) High density was a big issue for us as we consider high density definitely taking away from our rural character and small town atmosphere. We are a small town and high density won't make it better, only worse.

2. Figure 3-B. on p/ 3-7
 - Color coding is an issue: all of river area should be open space, not agriculture. That's one of many reasons I think the river should be identified. Perhaps that is an EIR issue now to change, but I would think that Environmental groups and Ag would not want agriculture occurring in the river bed.
 - There is no Recreation zoning I can see in the vicinity of 11th and the Verde extension. Not sure why recreation zone in two places east of RR across from Mission and just north of Mission (also E. of RR)—see fig. 3-N on p. 3.26-27 which shows a better indication as well as a better indication of the N St. CS zone.
 - Also in that same area E of and across from Mission is zoned as RSF even out of the boundaries of SM URL which actually is in river bed area
 - Parcel just north of CSD sanitary ponds (wastewater treatment plant) is SR, but why is strip east of it in the river bed labeled SR. Interesting to note that most of the properties that border river extend to the "middle" of the river. The ones on the terrace side of town that extend into the river are the ones on west side of the road. The little section of cream color (RS) just before the URL almost comes together to form that terrace rectangle is river area, the lines designating the river bluff development are the only part that are not river.—p.3-13 says "All of the RS areas in S M are east of the Salinas River..."
 - RMF, I've told you before that I believe some of the RMF areas indicated in this map are not RMF. The figure 3-E pm / 3-11 is a little closer.. The main exceptions are: the 11th St. end Rec area and the northerly section on N St. That should only be a small rectangle on north side of 16th St. The south side of 16th street is a block with

all RSF homes. Most of these were built maybe 20 years ago and it's almost totally built out. There is one larger lot with a small home on the south west side of 16th St.

- It was interesting to compare it to current map and see the extent of RS zoning in that map
 - P. 3-16 D, says "certain locations in the CR category are identified as "Mixed Use" areas on the land use Map in Figure 3-B" and yet the Figure 3+B only indicates Multi use (RSF/CS) There is nothing to indicate CR/Mixed use ?
3. Figure 3-F, p. 3-12 indicates RSF. I think some is missing, especially in area close to Mission and along Mission St. and part of L south of 9th St. and the one block I pointed out between 15th & 16th and N and Bonita Pl
 4. P. 4-22 Table 4-D

There are a few errors on that list and I could give you an update, but not sure how important it is. Same thing with list of historical family names to use for street names, not corrections only additions I could give you.

5. Is the RR track access the reason to limit URL boundaries? And also the reason the north strip of URL says "

11-3-16 SMP Appendices:

1. First of all the Appendix D should have been pointed out as a place for residents to start evaluating what committee had suggested and how county handled it. I would have liked to have that reference at the beginning of my review. It added answers to some questions I had in the Public Hearing SMPlan draft.
2. Are standards that say they apply only to particular site because already have a permit/plan in place, such as Mission Gardens site and Mission Vineyards because they already have an approved plan?
3. Figure 104-3 –CS-N St. Area under F. SD land use category, 2. N St. area : that figure shows you where the two workshop buildings exist on the Van Horn Property and you can see one of those is in that back 60' wide small strip and their property (from what I understand includes ½ of what years ago was designated as 13th st. There is a strip (I believe it is 25' wide) between the Van Horn Property and the Single Family home. That strip goes only to another 60' strip behind the RSF home and is a part of their parcel. I believe those pieces were from one of the very early maps (late 1800's, subdivision or what ever you call it). They had areas for corrals and also several blacksmith shops and related services in the area.
4. K. RMF, Figure 104-13-RMF East of RR tracks: Again I feel that the map is incorrect. I know it probably won't get changed, but I don't believe it is accurate
5. Under Figure 104-5-RMF, N St. b. says as shown on Figure x-X (I don't find figure x-x)

I think I've covered the essence of the whole plan! The hard copies certainly helped me tremendously.

San Miguel Plan review comments: October 18, 2016

By Laverne Buckman, San Miguel longtime resident,
Chair of the San Miguel Resource Connection History Project,
Discover San Miguel webmaster,
and chairperson of San Miguel Forward
(formed by San Miguel Advisory Council to review the SM Plan)

To begin with I'd like to say that overall I am pleased with the plan and the assistance we had from Michael Conger, planner, in its development. He did listen to the wishes of those interested in being heard and did his best to incorporate them into the plan which included putting some "teeth" into some of the land use standards specifically for San Miguel. We had a committee that spent many hours working on the original update which we completed in 2013. Unfortunately, it has been over 3 years that we've waited to see the revisions made by the county. As a result, some of the statements regarding what is are no longer accurate, but such is a part of a lengthy drawn out process-- as is the difficulty in trying to comprehend all of what is now a part of the plan.

I have done my best, within the time constraints and limitations of only online access, to include here items that I feel need further consideration.

1. We discussed very seriously the issue of how density is calculated. Overwhelmingly consensus was that it should limit the acreage calculation by applying it only to the acreage that is NOT in the flood zone. I see that issue addressed in policies 5-01 as excluding flood hazard (FH) areas from density calculations. In discussion it was our feeling that history has told us where that flood area is and that there are maps that indicate that as well. I cannot see an indication (FH) of that boundary in this plan except for one map showing E. 11th St. and it is unclear. Unfortunately, one development has been in the works for some time and will soon be starting on land with a large portion of it in flood hazard area, so this plan will not affect it anyway. Is there a good map somewhere that indicates flood areas more specifically? It should be a part of our plan.

2. Another consideration from our committee was the consideration that the URL for San Miguel should be coterminous with the CSD boundaries. Looks like the area was considered but no URL change. If a URL is part of the plan it does not create the extra costs associated with LAFCO, so I do not understand why it was not incorporated into this plan. It just makes sense for the CSD boundaries to be coterminous with the San Miguel URL. It is mentioned in 3.4.2 I am curious about the reason for not making this change. Does it have anything to do with property tax and how it can be used by the county?

3. Referring to the land use p. 3-16, B-2, it mentions the "Farmer's Alliance Mill". This is one of our historic buildings and that WAS its original name in 1892, but it has been the San Miguel Flouring Mill since 1903, so perhaps it should be stated differently

4. Page 3-22 of land use discusses Father Reginald Park and has a figure 3-J of possible configuration. The land itself is owned by the county, but maintained by the San Miguel Native Sons. Any changes should be done in agreement with county parks and Native Sons and presently San Miguel Resource Connection. The San Miguel Resource Connection has already made arrangements with Native Sons and Co. Parks for incorporating aspects of the history project and installation of the kiosk. The kiosk has been installed and the history display panels on the kiosk are almost complete. The final panel will come from the San Miguel Chamber of Commerce to encourage use of town businesses. I believe this is mentioned again in Implementation p. 9-9, 6.5 and should include SM Native Sons.

5. Town Center Concept on p.3-28 (conceptual drawing) needs to be changed. It does not reflect what is already planned or what has been discussed. Looks like a Cal Poly concept drawing. Should be more meaningful to San Miguel if it is included. (In papers given us at Oct. 5 meeting, I see figure 3-L which appears to be a little different from the one on p. 3-28 which has no figure numbers, but can't see it well enough to know what it has on it) Town Center Concept should have more details for clarification. We had talked about the need for public bathrooms downtown, but I see nothing about that in the plan.

6. page 3-38, figure 3.0 , N Street Design should be eliminated or changed to show what committee discussed and what plan reflects --

that area is in NOT for RMF or RSF. You will see the red line cross outs above the figures. The figures should also be eliminated.

7. p. 3-40, figure 3 –P, 11th St. Rec. designation: This figure is confusing. It appears to allow flood Hazard area to be considered in figuring density.

8. Item 6- 01, 1, Establishing twice annual code enforcement walk throughs—Glad this is included but think it should specifically be included in Implementation.

9. item7-13 : Alley access is one of our major safety issues. This is mentioned in several places and not consistent with all alleys. I think all alleys should be identified. Regardless of which alley, all need safety requirements and enforcement for fire truck/emergency vehicle access, for resident access, and parking—especially those properties without vehicle access from K, L, M, or N. The naming of alleys is also important for safety. An example, presently the fire dept. just needs to know if “that L St. address is accessible from L St or not, or take more time to drive there to find out”. The alley between the Lillian Larsen School and Mission St. have residences facing that alley with access only from that unpaved alley and with very limited access for emergency vehicles. It is a dead end alley that was supposed to be paved and go through to 18th St. But that never happened. A Fire Engine cannot safely maneuver in that area, especially in case of a fire. **Perhaps this is an area of the plan that needs map drawings of where there are alleys and the concerns with each.** The 5ft. required set back in alleys needs to be enforced. I assume that means they cannot have a fence or shrubbery in that setback?

Perhaps this should include some of the strange roads on the terrace that are narrow, dirt in many cases, and property setbacks not appearing to be in place or enforced. Under implementation, p. 9-8, 5-8 talks about fire improvements and it needs to include alleys L& M and L& K and some of the very narrow roadways on the terrace.

10. I know the county land use plan has density bonuses with Affordable Housing Incentives. We discussed at length not wanting affordable housing, or any other, to be allowed to reduce onsite parking requirements as our streets already seem to be overcrowded

with cars. I'm not sure if this is included or if we have any say about it. It seems to be more and more of an issue in this world of each family having numerous cars.

11. Implementation: table 9A , p. 9-6 , 3-5c, Public Art Murals comes under "Masters in Artful Places" and that is San Miguel Resource Connection, not county. It is correctly stated in another section.

12. Appendix (could not find any page numbers. It is a confusing section, formatting is different and it appears to be a jumble of items that belong in other sections? I expected to see further explanations or examples or reference materials.

Section D. Comm, rec & mixed use

1. PARKING REQUIREMENT (1 space per 1000 gross ft. of Commercial bldg. space)—is there no consideration for type of business? Places like the two deli's in town require considerable parking. I'm also assuming that the residences provided require additional parking?

2. a. setbacks on E. side Mission St. —Not sure this makes sense to have rear setback of 5' listed here as the RR makes a big difference in the back setback and its requirements which are stated elsewhere. Pieces of requirements are scattered throughout the plan, which seems confusing to me. Seems they should be more together.

Section K. 6 ,regarding N St. Rec zone, referring to figure 104-15 listed as RMF. I think it states somewhere that RMF is allowable in Rec (think that is E. 12th St). However, this rec zone along RR on N St. SHOULD NOT ALLOW RMF. The new standards listed are also confusing. There is very limited space in that area and the private road part is confusing (maybe only to me). Sounds like this is an attempt to not allow on- street parking there, which is a good idea, but not sure it is stated as such.

13. Overall, I think there needed to be more study and input on the Terrace area of town. There has been very haphazard development there and roads are poorly planned and/or maintained.

14. Overall, I also feel that the hiring of a consultant to develop an economic plan was a total waste of money. There is nothing valuable in the plan regarding economics that was not already known. The suggestion of utilizing the counties' Mills Act is also interesting—especially after checking and discovering that SLO City has a Mills Act program but the county does not. The process for developing such for the county does not indicate that it is something to count on happening and yet it is in our plan. (I appreciated Brian Pedrotti getting me some information on the process

for the county to initiate a Mills Act Program.) In working on the San Miguel History Project, I can see how the Mills Act might be very helpful in our attempts to preserve historical buildings in our community. I just do not see the county moving forward with the involved process of putting a Mills Act into place for the county just because it was mentioned in the San Miguel Plan.

15. Generally, my comments regarding the plan do not amount to anything that would require major changes, but I think they are important. I believe the Plan needs to be practical and useful for accomplishing its intent for orderly growth in San Miguel. I also feel that the comments submitted by the San Miguel CSD are very important for inclusion in the plan. I understand that the CSD was undergoing changes in administration during the initial development of this plan, but those changes recommended by current administration need serious consideration. I think some of those changes have been made, but I am unsure.

I appreciate that several of our county planners spent time in San Miguel, trying to get acquainted with the town and not just viewing it from county documents. The plan reflects a better knowledge of San Miguel than it has in the past. Thank you for the opportunity to give my input. I appreciate your consideration .

Respectfully,

Laverne Buckman

Clarifications on the SMP 11-2-16

1. P. 3-32, FIGURE 3.0 NST. DESIGN CONCEPT

Neither of those two drawings is a correct depiction of the proposed zonings for that area. If you have decided to leave the easterly strip RMF for what Self Help owns, it is still incorrect.

CS should be from 14th St. to the strip noted as 1-2 units that runs east- west next to the existing SFR. That long narrow strip and the one small easterly piece at the back of those two parcels are presently all a part of the existing SFR.

The bottom drawing is closest to correct as the section labeled 1 RMF unit & and the green roadway next to it belong to one parcel presently CS and the small easterly piece at the back of that parcel is owned by the same person and contains a workshop building that overlaps both parcels and there is another workshop at the front of that parcel. So, if you leave the RMF from 14th St at the back long strip to where that first 2-4 units is labeled and change the 2-4 units section and the RMF toward N St. to CS it would be what we talked about.

-
2. Can you clarify “overall density” for me ? first bullet under D on p. 3-33
 3. Not sure how that Figure 3-p on p. 3-33 will be used, but it does not say concept map and that combined with the one on p. -3-29 (which has no label that I can see) are concerning because the overall density looks much greater than we want to see so that it appears that the river area was used in that calculation—something we want to get away from. Also appears to me there is not a correct indication of where that river bluff goes in either figure. P. 3-33 . Also, I thought that areas on So. Side of 11th St. was intended to be single family housing in an attempt to reduce that huge area of RMF and try to balance the housing that was put in on north side of 11th. Perhaps I’m not remembering that correctly, but I don’t think there is space for that much housing on the property west of what is really the river bluff. I would like to try to make sure that planners in SLO are well aware of the terrain in that area and do not allow building in areas below the river bluff for reasons stated elsewhere in the plan regarding pumps for sewer.
 4. P. 3-37-- still think it makes more sense to at least extend the SMP area straight across at the South end, corresponding with CSD as it then makes that terrace piece fit better into the total picture and even though it is mostly river area, that river area is important to San Miguel. Same is true at north end before that “holding zone” where that small river section leaves a small loop out of our area with the newer Indian Valley strip then left as a small loop going north. If that square corner next to river just went straight across to Indian Valley area, it would make more senses. I know, it’s probably too late to change that but the river area is important to be recognized in our planning area, As it is, it is only included between 14th St. and 10th St and a part of it north of 16th and south of 10th.

