Planning Commission Comments
General Plan Update
Preliminary Hearing Draft
Planning Commission Hearing 4/19/07
Chapters 16 – 19 (1st half of the meeting)
Chapters 20 -21 (2nd half of the meeting)

Planning Commissioner:	Comments
General Process	
Emad -	Note taking at a past meeting– "county policy can create shortages for individuals in the upper income level" caused a furor and backlash from the public (in particular Healthy Humboldt constituents). We are tasked to provide land use and available land for all income levels per state law. The comments that were provided by the young man at the last meeting were very inspiring and made a great impact on me, and I don't believe we really validated this speaker. I believe that staff is ultimately the responsible party for land use decisions because they are here before the elected officials and long after our tenure. **Staff Response** – Staff provided recommended revisions to the guiding principle that spoke to affordability to read "affordable to all income levels."
Murguia -	**Response to C. Emad** - I recall the meeting that you made that comment, I don't believe that we acted on this. I have not seen the upper income levels having a difficulty finding housing but I do take your comments very seriously.
Emad -	**Response to C. Murgia** - I do not think we should short change one income level for another. A healthy economy needs all levels of housing for all income levels for a vital community. We need a plan to support this.
Murguia -	I am generally supportive of your comments, but the shortage that we have seen is in workforce housing.
Gearhart -	When we started this process, we were confused on the guiding principles. I was under the understanding that they were only for guiding the GPU process (the wording is then really important). **Staff Response** – They are intended to stay in the General Plan to help guide future decisions.
Smith –	It is my understanding that we would return to the Guiding Principles in order to clarify policies that we are in the process of developing. **Staff response** – That is correct. They certainly may be subject to adjustment throughout this process.
Herman -	We should not be focusing on the specific wording of the Guiding Principles yet, but it is important to keep an eye on this throughout the process and return to it. I am concerned that we are not responding to the public comments on the "no project" alternative. I am also concerned about staff's characterizing public comments in Alternative A, B or C. We are not trying to adopt Alternative A or C. We may want to put these comments in the preferred alternative. I was also concerned about the note taking regarding the young man that spoke very passionately about his desire for having 5 acres. I noticed that staff got caught up in the testimony also, and didn't write anything down (as reflected in the letter that was received). **Staff response** – We are trying to characterize the comment we have received not present a point by point response to each comment. If the commission would like staff to do this level of review, you can so request. Staff appreciates the level of details of the comments we have received.
Group 2	
Smith -	I think the comment made by Joel Canzoneri regarding the comparison of the

	Framework Plan policies and the new policies would be helpful to me. Also, what Bill Peckham said regarding deleting the LEED reference was important to me. There are many policies and discussion in the Energy Element that deserve attention but I'm not sure if they warrant the level of attention in the General Plan – I'm having trouble justifying the redundancy of the General Plan policies and the new requirements in the UBC. The green policies (LEED etc) will become standard in the building code and I am concerned about putting that in the General Plan. Regarding the Air Quality Element, we should defer to the North Coast Air Quality Resources Board – they are on top of it. I'm concerned about the cost to taxpayers if we create another layer in county government that they have to pay for. If we are not satisfied with the job the Air Board is doing, we should address that instead of adding another layer. Regarding the Mineral Resources Chapter – I don't see the need for the ceilings on extraction of hard rock as noted in General Plan. I would also like to add about a comment about the group regarding promoting growth at 2%. Even if we don't grow, we still live with all those concerns today regarding energy usage. We can plan to live in areas of higher density – but there needs to be a demand for it.
Herman -	I agree with much of what Commissioner Smith had to say and I am also concerned with overlapping government agencies and regulations. Minerals – there is a state office that deals with this. All the chapters in this group we are creating government redundancy. The county has a lot of work right now and I have concerns that staff won't be able to handle the additional workload. The comments tonight regarding energy conservation and land use, I do not support additional layers of regulations that are already covered by another agency. It is a general plan, and should stay general.