

**CITY OF SANTA CRUZ COUNCIL MEETING
SANTA CRUZ CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
AUGUST 27, 2019**

Revised Six-Month Work Plans (CM/PL)

RECOMMENDATION: Accept the proposed modified City-wide and Advance Planning Division six-month work plans.

BACKGROUND: At the August 13, 2019 City Council meeting staff presented proposed City-wide and Advance Planning Division work plans. By motion, Council directed staff to make modifications to both work plans. The motion was broken into seven parts, as follows:

MOTION: Accept the report as presented by staff, and revise the six-month work program as follows, returning to Council with changes at the August 27, 2019 meeting:

Part 1)

- Retain the SB2 Planning Grant Program;
- Retain anything mandated or time-sensitive;
- Retain the Rental Housing Data Collection program (pending Council discussion during the evening's agenda item);

Part 2)

- **Add the Planning Commission review of General Plan policies related to the Corridors to resolve existing conflicts;**
- Retain the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Affordability Review recognizing it may need to drop off depending on how much time the Planning Commission review of General Plan policies may take;

Part 3)

- Add recommendations that may come from the Community Advisory Committee on Homelessness (CACH) where they involve Advance Planning;
- Delay recommended projects until 2020, with the exception of projects that don't impede the above;

Part 4)

- Retain review of the Planning Commission Subcommittee in the Community Outreach Policy;

Part 5)

- Prioritize development of a childcare impact fee in the next four months;

Part 6)

- When cannabis comes back to Council, there is consideration for standalone cannabis consumption sites, which differ from onsite consumption;

Part 7)

- Ensure that inclusionary ordinance updates for ownership and rental projects are included as a priority for the general six-month City-wide work plan.

Discussion: The City Staff discussed breaking the revised work plan into action items that could be achieved in the next six months, moving some items off to next year. The specific items that took highlight at the city council meeting on August 27 were three specific to the business community. The item highlighted in **RED** are of deep concern to the Chamber.

Action: On the first item highlighted in **red** — **Add the Planning Commission review of General Plan policies related to the Corridors to resolve existing conflicts.** The discussion turned from a policy best practices conversation between the city council and city staff -when Councilmember Brown made a point of clarification that the community feels unlistened to and do not want additional upzoning in the neighborhoods; she further returned that the developers will find away around any zoning requirements that benefit the developer not the city. The debate continued until

Councilmember Brown made a motion to **'remove the corridor zoning issue from further consideration.**

Motion Accepted and passed on 4-3 vote

Yes: Vice Mayor Cummings, Councilmembers Brown, Krohn and Glover

No: Mayor Watkins and Councilmembers Mathews and Meyers

Chamber's position: The Chamber has actively supported policy decision at the city level which increase the opportunity to create more housing — especially affordable housing for the lower and middle income residents, including inclusionary zoned units based on economic viability for the city, the residents and the developer. The Chamber supported aligning the city's out date zoning regulations to the City's General Plan. It is common practice through out the country and in California by creating housing opportunities along a community major transit corridors provides more density in walkable, cycling and public transit options thus reducing single vehicle travel. Removing the corridor plan from further consideration does not address our housing problems, nor does it address the goal of reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions. The city council's decision now places the issues squarely in the hands of the state legislature where

a number of legislative options are in process that could mandate local land use policy through state action.