

**COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**DATE:** January 10, 2001  
**PLACE:** Board of Supervisors Chambers, Room 525  
County Government Center, 701 Ocean Street, Santa Cruz, CA

---

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** DENISE HOLBERT (CHAIRPERSON), TED DURKEE, ROBERT BREMNER DENNIS OSMER, RENEE SHEPHERD.

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** CATHY GRAVES, DON BUSSEY, KIM TSCHANTZ  
JOAN VAN DER HOEVEN

**COUNTY COUNSEL PRESENT:** RAHN GARCIA, JIM LEWIS

All legal requirements for items set for public hearing on the Santa Cruz County Planning Commission agenda for this meeting have been fulfilled before the hearing including publication, mailing and posting as applicable.

- A. **ROLL CALL:** COMMISSIONERS HOLBERT, DURKEE, BREMNER, OSMER, SHEPHERD present at 9:00 a.m.
- B. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** None
- C. **COUNTY COUNSEL'S REPORT:** None
- D. **ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA:** None
- E. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** None

**(ELECTION OF OFFICERS)**

**MOTION**

COMMISSIONER BREMNER MOVED TO NOMINATE COMMISSIONER HOLBERT AS CHAIR AND COMMISSIONER OSMER AS VICE-CHAIR.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD SECONDED THE MOTION.

VOICE VOTE: 5-0 TO APPROVE

Ag compatability, 350' from Arbanson property.  
Road agreement- maintenance agreement.

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

**COMMISSIONER OSMER:** What is 36?

**STAFF:** Road upkeep/minor improvements.

**COMMISSIONER OSMER:** Damage to road.

**STAFF:** Add conditions-  
Road repairs to pre-constitution level.

**COMMISSIONER DURKEE:** Reasonable use for site.

**COMMISSIONER BREMNER:** Road turnouts, identified by fire & DOW including signs, not parking. Conditions cover this.

### **EVENING SESSION**

#### **G. CONTINUED ITEMS**

**G-1** Proposal to update the Mount Hermon Conference Center Master Plan to include: **1.** A Specific Plan that establishes a Rural Services Line and a General Plan amendment for 16 1 parcels to change the land use designation from "Suburban Residential" to "Existing Park and Recreation" and to rezone 93 parcels from the "SU" (Special Use) zone and the "R-1- 1 5"(Single-family Residential with a 15,000 square foot minimum parcel size) zoning district to the "PR" (Parks, Recreation and Open Space) zoning district; and **2.** A Master Plan to guide development in three development phases. The Master Plan would include new and reconstructed facilities as specified below in three phases. Phase 1 is a 1-3 year facility plan, Phase 2 is a 3-7 year facility plan and Phase 3 is a 7-15 facility plan. This project requires the adoption of a Specific Plan, a General Plan Amendment, a rezoning a Commercial Development Permit to amend Permit 47887-U and a Preliminary Grading Approval.

**Master Plan Phase I:** Replace the existing Newton Memorial Center with a new Ministry Center. Replace the existing auditorium with a new auditorium Relocate the Central Lounge Meeting Room building to a new location near

the Azalea Lodge. Renovate the existing parking lot near the Ministry Center to include 28 more spaces and additional improvements. Renovate the existing recreation field to recrown the field. Construct a new 11 space "Conference Drive" parking lot.

**Master Plan Phase II:** Construct a walking path around the existing recreation field. Replace the existing tennis and basketball courts at the recreation field with a new sports pavillion amphitheatre. Construct a new miniature golf course. Replace the existing cabins at Redwood Camp with 8 new larger cabins. Replace the existing tennis and basketball courts at Redwood Camp with a new sports pavillion. Expand the existing dining hall at Redwood Camp. Construct a new 6 bed lodge named New Black Cabin. Construct a new 36 space "Upper Parkway" parking lot to replace Tamrack and Mullberry cabins and one dwelling.

**Master Plan Phase III:** Construct a new activity center to replace an existing dwelling and garages near the recreation field. Construct a new Village Center to house the post office, registration center, store and arts & crafts facility to replace the existing post office and Forest Hall. Replace the existing Toyon cabin with a new 8 bed Toyon cabin. Construct a new 6 bed Heather cabin to replace the old Heather cabin that was destroyed in the earthquake. Construct a new 60 bed Lakeside Lodge to replace an existing dwelling. Construct a new 90 bed Forest Lodge to replace 6 dwellings. Construct a new 29 space Forest Lodge parking lot. Construct a new "Lower Parkway" 3 1 space parking lot to replace 3 dwellings.

OWNER: MOUNT HERMON ASSOCIATION  
 APPLICANT: MOUNT HERMON ASSOCIATION  
 SUPERVISORIAL DIST: 5  
 PROJECT PLANNER: KIM TSCHANTZ, 454-3 170

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Bruce Laclerge will speak on water issues. Staff has researched items requested by Commission and Mt. Hermon has amended project. Increased project area by including additional parcels, changing number of development phases, and including Rural Services Line in proposal. Also propose relocation of the central lounge.

Slide presentation and description of proposed changes to the project and project phasing. Discussion of Historic Commission action regarding designated historic structures. Discussion of Rural Services Line and concept of expansion to include additional adjacent properties. Matrix is applicable only outside USL and RSL. Community has characteristics that are more like area within RSL, and the use of the matrix is not appropriate. Matrix is used for properties with rural densities and lack of public services. Staff looked at maximum visitor and staff usage as part of analysis. Total maximum number of people on site at heaviest usage time would be to 1,556

persons, and would include day users and employees.

0337

Discussion of 1973 permit. Stated that maximum occupancy should be limited to 886 persons, but “person” is not defined. It is not possible to tell if that also included employees and day users, or just referred to overnight guests.

**RAHN GARCIA:** Commission can have a discussion about 1973 master plan for the purpose of evaluating this project, but commission cannot make a decision that would affect existing master plan without proper legal notice.

Discussion about increase in overnight and day visitors. Commission could specify total number of beds and total number of day users.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** Does not really understand policy that you cannot expand RSL, but Commission is asked to allow expansion as part of approval. Doesn't that constitute a phased project?

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** To take the first step to establish the RSL is not taking the final step. Proposal would establish a phased or conceptual RSL, to be considered by the Board. Board could agree or direct that RSL be established only around the project area.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** Concerned that establishment of RSL have environmental review.

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** All the environmental review that would be required has already been done and is covered by EIR. Staff reports would become an addendum to EIR, and additional review would not be required.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** When project was proposed, RSL was not part of project and was not mentioned in project description. Should go back to environmental coordinator for opinion.

**RAHN GARCIA:** Issues of segmenting project for Env. Review deals with attempt to avoid environmental review. Review so far would be sufficient to determine that RSL could be drawn around specific plan area.

**COMMISSIONER DURKEE:** What is benefit to following recommendation.

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Takes matrix out of the picture. Can be used to determine density in the rural area, but did not work in this case. Determined that there was a reason that matrix did not work, and that was because of existing density and the availability of urban services.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** May not be proper analysis of what RSL would change, and

0338

what effect that might have.

**COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD:** RSL would also address question of whether this is precedent setting. Would only apply in similar circumstances.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** What is development potential for private properties within project area? If it is not all rezoned, is there additional development potential?

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** If private properties maintain existing zoning and GP, owner would be allowed to build a house on a vacant property if septic was approved. If zoned PR, additions would be limited to 500 square feet. Building a new house would require that design be subject to park review process.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** What about parcels that Mt. Hermon owns that are now included. Are they all vacant? Is there a condition that would require them to remain vacant?

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** No specific condition, but there is nothing in this proposal that would include additional single-family dwellings. Building new homes would require an amendment to the master plan. Commission could also look at having parcels combined. There are many small properties that are currently vacant.

**COMMISSIONER OSMER:** Why are we not applying an urban services line?

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Difference between rural and urban services line. RSL recognizes existing density and services, but USL designates places where new development should occur.

**COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD:** Why is other property not included in project, Ponderosa Lodge.

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** 1973 use permit does not include Ponderosa Lodge, and they are here to amend existing permit. Ponderosa is not part **of the** project.

**COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD:** What if they wanted to add beds to Ponderosa? Would they be required to amend or apply for permit?

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Yes, they would be required to apply for a use permit.

**COMMISSIONER BREMNER:** Questions relating to conditions of approval regarding grading on slopes over 30%.

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Specific plan would allow development standards to vary from County policies. Some of proposed parking area would be on slopes over 30%.

0339

**COMMISSIONER BREMNER:** If we downsized facility, the parking would not be required. Why should they be allowed to expand if it would require construction on slopes over 30%?

**BRUCE LACLERGE:** Water Resources Manager for County. Describes his experience with water issues in the Mt. Hermon area. Staff promotes innovative methods to increase water and preservation of existing supplies. Two additional reports have been produced to address concerns raised by City of Santa Cruz and San Lorenzo Valley water districts. Discussed water issues in the area in general, Santa Margarita groundwater basin, and the proposal for injection wells. As Water Resource Manager, very comfortable with the proposal from Mt. Hermon. Water resources section would take responsibility for monitoring conditions of approval for compliance.

**COMMISSIONER HOLBERT:** Would the water injection and improvements be needed even if the density was not increased?

**BRUCE LACLERGE:** Improvements are needed. There are several areas where water quality must be addressed.

**COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD:** What about recycled water from Scotts Valley and water that will become available when quarries are no longer operating?

**BRUCE LACLERGE:** It is possible to inject recycled water, but it is subject to certain criteria. Criteria could not be met within Scotts Valley water district boundaries, but could possibly be met elsewhere in the County.

**COMMISSIONER OSMER:** What year did Mt. Hermon stop using spring water and start using well water?

**BRUCE LACLERGE:** 1992. Condition of using groundwater required them to allow spring to flow into Bean Creek to increase streamflow.

**COMMISSIONER DURKEE:** Would the treatment that would be required for the spring water be similar to that which would have been required for them to use the spring water?

**BRUCE LACLERGE:** It will probably be more extensive, because they would be required to remove nitrates.

**DAVID ROSS,** board member of San Lorenzo Valley water district. Aquifer from which Mt. Hermon well 3 and our production wells draw from is very poorly understood. All water agencies have begun to discuss cooperative water management. Would be beneficial to include analysis of whether Mt. Hermon should use water from San Lorenzo Valley district from line that would run very close to or through Mt. Hermon.

**AL HAYNES,** San Lorenzo Valley Water District. Request continuance to allow review of the

new report and the staff report. Would like to see phased project that includes water conservation measures, etc., which would come back to the commission for review.

**COMMISSIONER BREMNER:** To inject water from the springs, would it need to be treated to a higher level than for domestic use? Couldn't they just use the water and not inject it?

**BRUCE LACLERGE:** His discussion was in support of the preferred alternative in the EIR. There may be other methods that were not covered in the EIR that could also be beneficial.

**COMMISSIONER BREMNER:** Prior to Phase I in condition of approval, Mt. Hermon is required to implement water conservation measures. There is no requirements for injection wells until Phase 3. Wouldn't it make sense to do it earlier so there would be some history of injection?

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Design and engineering of diversion/injection system will take time, and could not be implemented earlier than Phase 3. Conservation measures will be required and monitored beginning in Phase 1. Most of the increase in the number of guests will not occur until Phase 3. EIR looked at several water supply alternatives including connection to SLV water. Analysis determined that infrastructure and capacity issues precluded these alternatives, based on information from district staff.

**DAVID ROSS:** SLV water cannot serve them now, but perhaps together a solution could be found.

**COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD:** Why was diverting and treating for use different from diversion and injection.

**KIM TSCHANTZ:** Diversion and treating for use would be year-round, even during periods of low water usage. This was unacceptable because of impact on salmon and steelhead. Diversion and injection would not withdraw water during period of low stream flows.

#### PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

**ROGER WILLIAMS,** Director of Mt. Hermon. Believes that staff report addressed issues that were raised previously. In support of recommendations of staff report. Improvements would allow for increased capacity, above that currently existing. All issues associated with increased capacity have been addressed in the EIR and have been mitigated so that there would be no impact. Vacant parcels now included in plan are not planned for development. All intended development is included in master plan. Ponderosa Ranch is operated under a separate use permit, that is not covered by the Mt. Hermon permit. Any expansion of use would require a permit amendment. Alternative spot has been located for parking to avoid grading and construction on slopes over 30%. Traffic study is adequate, as it analyzed a 26% increase in traffic, although the increase in the number of people is only 19%.

JOE SCALMANINI, Water consultant. Third party monitoring is not needed because State determines when and where sampling should occur, sampling is performed by licensed treatment plant personnel, and analysis is completed at State-licensed labs. Discussion of water quality issues as they relate to utilizing springs for water use or water injection. Injection well would be back-up water source as well as injection well.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD MOVED TO CONTINUE TO 2-14-01.

COMMISSIONER BREMNER SECONDED THE MOTION

VOICE VOTE: 5-0

MOTION CARRIED AND SO ORDERED. PASSED 5-0.

PLEASE NOTE: THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AS OF MAY 9, 2001.

---

KRISTY MILLER  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT