

REPORT ON
1999 GROWTH GOALS
FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY UNINCORPORATED AREA

Santa Cruz County Planning Department
September 1998

TABLE 1: 1997 POPULATION AND GROWTH RATES
OF COUNTY JURISDICTIONS

Area	1/1/97 Population Estimate	1/1/98 Population Estimate	1997 Population Growth Rate
City of Capitola	10,850	11,050	1.8
City of Santa Cruz	53,100	54,600	2.8
City of Scotts Valley	10,050	10,550	5.0
City of Watsonville	36,600	37,150	1.5
Santa Cruz County Unincorp.	134,800	136,800	1.5
Santa Cruz County Total	245,400	250,200	2.0
State of California	32,670,000	33,252,000	1.8

Source: DOF E- 1 Population of California Cities, 5-98

The DOF estimated 1997 growth rate for the unincorporated area (1.5%) is less than the estimated 1.8% State growth rate for 1997, but greater than the adopted 1.0% growth goal. According to the DOF estimates, the State's growth rate increased from 1.2% to 1.8% between 1996 and 1997, the four incorporated cities' growth rates were higher than in 1996, while the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County was stable at 1.5% both years. The increase in the unincorporated area's growth rate over the adopted 1% growth goal can be partially explained by the current household size, which has been increasing each year since 1992, and unpermitted dwelling units. The Planning Department continues to receive numerous complaints about alleged illegal dwelling units. The current growth rate is far below the average growth rates of 2.0% for this same area during the 1980-1990 decade, as can be seen through comparisons to the numbers in Table 2. It may be noted that these recent County growth rates also represent a significant change from previous decades when the County grew much faster than the State.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Growth Management Referendum adopted by the voters in 1978, Measure J, requires that the County “provide for the establishment, each year, of an annual population growth during that year of an amount which represents Santa Cruz County’s fair share of statewide population growth”. This policy is now codified in County Code Chapter 17.01, Growth Management, and implemented through the provisions of Chapter 17.04, Annual Population Growth Goal for Santa Cruz County. This report provides an analysis of the relevant information for consideration by the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in determining the annual growth goal for 1999.

This report highlights a series of factors critical in establishing the annual growth goal. Following the introduction, Section II describes population growth projections and trends in the County and cities. Section III identifies the actual residential building permits which have been allocated, issued, and carried over since the adoption of Measure J. Section IV briefly summarizes some of the resource impact and public service issues which the County’s Growth Management system was intended to address. Section V describes the Association of Monterey Bay Area Government’s (AMBAG) Regional Housing Needs Plan, status of the Housing Element, and the continued need for affordable housing in the County. Section VI is the Growth Goal recommendation, providing the population growth goal, showing how it translates into building permit allocations and describing how the carryover of permits can be utilized, if needed.

II. POPULATION TRENDS

Population Estimates:

The most recent official estimates of population for Santa Cruz County and the incorporated cities was published by the State of California Department of Finance (DOF) in May of 1998, and is shown in Table 1 below. These rounded estimates, which are prepared annually, indicate a county-wide population of 245,400 (136,800 unincorporated) as of January 1, 1997 (Source: DOF E-1 Total Population of California Cities, 5-98). The County adopted a population growth goal for the unincorporated area of 1 .0 percent for 1998. As can be seen in Table 1, the DOF population estimates indicate that the unincorporated area grew in 1997 at a rate of 1.5 percent, the same rate as 1996. The cities in the County grew at a faster rate, resulting in a County-wide growth rate of 2.0 percent.

TABLE 3 : AMBAG POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY (1994)

Area	Actual 1990(1)	1995	2000	2005	2010
City of Capitola	10,171	10,187	10,232	10,267	10,299
City of Santa Cruz	49,040	54,004	57,232	59,927	61,253
City of Scotts Valley	8,615	10,031	11,704	13,213	14,117
City of Watsonville	31,099	34,170	46,447	51,033	53,338
Unincorporated Area	130,809	135,386	134,290	140,023	144,389
County Total	229,734	243,778	259,905	274,463	283,396

(1) 1990 Federal Census, 4/1/90

City Annexations:

There were no annexations involving population shifts approved in the last year. Proposed annexation #855, involving the Freedom/Carey area, will shift 2,022 persons from the unincorporated area to the City of Watsonville. This annexation, if adopted, will affect the year 2000 population rate figures.

Of continuing interest is the proposed annexation of an area off of Riverside Road and an area off of Lee Road to the City of Watsonville. These annexations would potentially provide dwelling units, commercial/industrial space and open space to the City of Watsonville.

III. BUILDING PERMIT ALLOCATIONS

The number of Building Permits issued for new residential units (not including replacement units and, since 1992, affordable units) since the implementation of Measure J are

TABLE 2: POPULATION GROWTH RATE COMPARISONS

Year	County Unincorp. Population	County-Wide Population	State Population
	Growth*	Growth*	Growth*
1960	42,309	84,219	15,720,860
1970	68,440	123,790	19,957,304
1980	107,129	188,141	23,668,562
1990	130,809	229,734	29,760,021

*Compound average annual growth rate

Source: 1960, 1970, 1980 and 1990 U.S. Census

Population Projections:

In 1994, AMBAG updated its population forecast for all of the jurisdictions in its region. The projections for Santa Cruz County are presented in Table 3 along with a comparison of the 1990 Federal Census counts. The AMBAG population forecasts are based on employment projections and local land use plans, and are utilized in regional planning efforts such as the Regional Air Quality Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and the Regional Water Quality Plan.

enumerated below in Table 4. Building Permit totals for 1998 are shown through the first of September of 1998.

TABLE 4: BUILDING PERMITS ALLOCATED, ISSUED, AND CARRIED OVER

YEAR	CARRIED OVER	ALLOCATED	SUBJECT TO THE ALLO- CATION (1)	TOTAL ISSUED SUBJECT TO THE ALLOCATION (1)
1979	0	930	930	741
1980	189	1055	1055	972
1981	272	937	937	934
1982	275	968	968	738
1983	505	972	972	619
1984	858	991	991	609
1985	1240	757	757	710
1986	1287	768	768	595
1987	1460	468	468	606 (2)
1988	1322	489	489	670 (2)
1989	1141	489 + 1384 (3)	489 + 1384 (3)	420
1990	2594	487	487	267
1991	2814	495	495	173
1992	268	509	433	367
1993	66	512	435	146
1994	289	525	446	168
1995	278	528	449	131
1996	318	530	450	138
1997	312	531	451	194
1998	257	526	447	148 (4)

(1) Prior to 1992, market rate and affordable units were subject to the allocation; beginning in 1992, only market rate units were subject to the allocation.

(2) More building permits were issued than allocated due to issuance of permits from the carryover reservoir.

(3) A special allocation of 1384 additional affordable permits were approved to allow attainment of the regional housing goal for the 1980-90 decade.

(4) Total as of September 1, 1998.

1999 GROWTH GOAL REPORT

In 1992, the Residential Permit Allocation System ordinance (County Code Section 12.02.020) was amended to exempt all affordable units from the requirement for a Measure J allocation. As a result, the previous practice of carrying over the large reservoir of unused allocations for affordable units was dropped. As shown in Table 4, however, there was a carryover of 257 unused residential building permit allocations for market rate units at the beginning of 1998.

As part of the 1998 Growth Goal Report, presented to your Board in September and November of last year, staff advised your Board that the demand for building permits was increasing and that the Planning Department would closely monitor issuance rates and would advise your Board if issuance began to approach the 1998 permit allocation. As of September 1, 1998, issuance is approaching the allocation in the Urban 5+ category.

The number of permits already committed this year and projections for the remainder of the year are shown below:

1998 Building Permit Allocation Status (as of 9/1/98)

	Urban 1-4	Urban 5+	Rural
Allocated	150	150	147
Committed	54	127	90
Projected Additional Demand	25-35	115-130	25-35
Projected Surplus or <Deficit>	61-71	<92-107>	22-32

The projections in the Urban 1-4 and Rural categories were made based on current year activity and historical building permit application trends for the months of September through December. The projections in the Urban 5+ category were based on discussions with developers and review of the status of large projects.

The potential deficit is caused by the number of large projects that have been approved in the past several years. Chapter 12.02 (Residential Permit Allocation System) states that an allocation may only be issued if there is one available in the appropriate allocation category and that a building permit may not be issued unless it has first been granted an allocation.

As part of the adoption of the 1998 Growth Rate, your Board authorized use of the carryover, if needed. As the above projections show, it is clear that the carryover will be used in 1998.

IV. POTENTIAL GROWTH IMPACTS

The Growth Management System was instituted to address resource and public services impacts of growth in the County. The following discussion briefly highlights recent impact issues and some of the steps being taken to ensure adequate resource protection, and to ensure that proposed growth can be accommodated by adequate urban services.

Resource Protection

The premiere resource issue in the county is water. The drought from 1986 - 1993 affected both surface and groundwater supplies throughout the county, and emphasized the need for water supply and water use planning and management. County staff have recently completed a report entitled "An Evaluation of Water Resource Monitoring and Management Efforts in Santa Cruz County". The findings of this study lead the County Administrative Officer to develop an interdepartmental water resources working group. The interdepartmental water resources working group has developed goals and objectives to deal with some of the problems identified in the report. Efforts of the County water resources working group have also expanded to include input from the various water purveyors. Some of the facts from the above report and some of the major water resource related actions being undertaken include the following:

- The City of Santa Cruz Municipal Water Service is updating water demand projections through water supply planning aimed at meeting demands for City water service through the year 2020 and the subsequent projected "build-out conditions" estimated to occur sometime between the year 2030 and 2040. City of Santa Cruz year 2020 demand will exceed the safe yield of their system by 1.8 billion gallons (about 5500 acre-feet). The safe yield of their system in a severe drought is 3.3 billion gallons. Present use is about 4.4 billion gallons. Projected growth is 1% a year in demand, and projected demand is about 5.2 billion gallons. Following recommendations contained within their Urban Water Management Plan, City staff are conducting long-term water conservation planning to maximize conservation efforts and to free-up a reliable source of water to apply toward any new water supply alternative. Conservation programs are targeted to achieve a 5-10% reduction in use per connection over the long-term and between 10- 15% reduction in short-term use. The review of long-term water supply alternatives is expected to take a couple of years.
- In the Pajaro Valley, overdrafting and seawater intrusion continue to be a problem in the underlying aquifers, and additional sources of water will be needed to offset these problems. Annual pumpage in the Pajaro Basin is

68,000 acre-feet/year. The safe yield of the basin is cited in the Basin Management Plan as 31,000 acre-feet/year under current pumping patterns. The overdraft is approximately half of the annual pumpage. The Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency's Basin Management Planning was predicated on the implementation of groundwater management activities, including a number of local and long-term alternatives for providing additional sources of water supply, including potential importation of water from the San Felipe Project of the Bureau of Reclamation. The passage of Measure D has halted work on long-term importation of water in favor of constructing local recharge projects. Construction of an import pipeline for Federal water allocated to the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency and for other additional water supplies has now been postponed for ten years. The Pajaro area has the most significant water supply imbalance in the County. There exists a lack of local consensus on problem solutions.

- Groundwater experts informed the Soquel Creek Water District that the mid-County area cannot continue to depend solely on groundwater basins to meet all water supply needs. Since then, the District has initiated and is completing a decision making process to establish projected water demands and select the best alternative(s) to meet that demand. Soquel Creek Water District's current groundwater production is approximately 5400 acre-feet/year. It is projected to increase to about 6700-7400 acre-feet/year in the year 2030. The District needs to develop 1000 to 1500 acre-feet of new supply plus an additional amount to correct the current overdraft. Central Water District produced about 600 acre-feet in fiscal year 1997. Private wells also extract a significant percentage of the total groundwater use from the mid-County area with estimates of use ranging from 2000 to 4000 acre-feet/year in the Purisima formation. The District continues to expand its groundwater management activities and has initiated a public involvement plan to identify a recommended plan of how to proceed with a preferred water supply alternative.
- The Scotts Valley Water District, the San Lorenzo Valley Water District, the Lompico County Water District, the City of Scotts Valley, and the County continue to meet regarding cooperative management of limited groundwater resources. With the localized depletion of the Santa Margarita aquifer, pumping has been shifted deeper to the Lompico formation. The Lompico formation is the last known developable aquifer under the Pasatiempo, Camp Evers, El Pueblo, and North Scotts Valley area. Developed water supplies using current pumping locations in the Lompico formation are not sustainable at present demands (4400 acre-feet/year). Groundwater pumpage in the Pasatiempo, Camp Evers, and El Pueblo areas slightly

exceed the estimated safe yield for the areas' aquifers (4200 acre-feet/year). Proposals for new development projected in Scotts Valley and at Mount Hermon are out of balance with available supplies. The Scotts Valley Water District is reworking its Urban Water Management Plan and Drought Contingency Plan, expanding its groundwater modeling efforts, revisiting estimates for safe yield and is on track to have its new reclamation plan on line by Fall 1999. The San Lorenzo Valley District has completed engineering studies to augment their groundwater supplies in the Pasatiempo area.

Annexation of prime agricultural land is the second major issue. This concern includes the City of Watsonville's proposed annexation of lands designated as Commercial Agricultural. This issue will continue to be a major issue in the future.

Urban Services:

The County continues to pursue a number of activities to improve its ability to provide adequate services throughout the urbanized portions of the unincorporated area:

- Yearly adoption of the Capital Improvement Program which identifies scheduled public service improvements (such as road, roadside, drainage and park improvements) and provides a basis for development of the necessary financing programs.
- The Live Oak/Soquel Redevelopment Agency continues its efforts to upgrade the urban infrastructure in the Soquel and Live Oak areas.
- Plan lines and route design concepts continue to be completed and adopted for arterial and collector streets in the urban area, particularly in Live Oak and Soquel. An on-going, multi-year effort has been undertaken to establish plan lines throughout the urban area to provide needed information for roadway design, capital improvement programming and the review and conditioning of new projects.

A report was prepared, this year, for the Transportation Commission concerning Highway One congestion and alternatives for mitigation. While there is consensus that unacceptable congestion exists, there is, at this point, no consensus on the appropriate measures needed to improve the situation,

Because of the magnitude of the urban service needs, significant construction of projects will be needed throughout the urban areas over an extended period of time to support

existing, as well as future, development.

V. HOUSING NEEDS

Regional Housing Needs Plan:

In June 1990, AMBAG adopted a Regional Housing Needs Plan which establishes housing construction goals for all of the local jurisdictions in the AMBAG region including Santa Cruz County. These goals provide an allocation to the local jurisdictions of the regional housing goal established by the State Department of Housing and Urban Development for the period of January 1989 through June 1996. The AMBAG Plan established a goal for new housing construction in the County of 11,983 units for the seven and one half year period and provided a breakdown by income group as shown in Table 5. AMBAG has not provided the County with goals beyond June 1996.

Following the initial adoption of the Housing Needs Plan, Santa Cruz County requested a reduction in the County's housing goal to 7,302 units. Although the request for a reduction in the Plan's housing goal for the County was approved by AMBAG, along with the requests of six other jurisdictions and followed statutory requirements, the State Department of Housing and Urban Development declined to approve the Plan change. The County's request for a reduction was based on the following considerations:

- The State's allocation to the region was predicated on accommodating a significant growing population that commutes out of the region to Santa Clara County, which both encourages and institutionalizes a continued pattern of conduct in the adjacent ABAG region of providing inadequate housing to match the job growth in that region, and resulting in undesirable pressure on Santa Cruz County housing prices, regional traffic congestion and air pollution;
- The AMBAG Plan would require unincorporated Santa Cruz County to grow at a rate well in excess of historic growth rates;
- The AMBAG Plan exceeded the population growth allowed in the Regional Air Quality Management Plan;
- The allocation assumed a need for replacement housing at a rate twice the documented housing loss rate for the County.

1999 GROWTH GOAL REPORT

As provided in State law, the housing goals of AMBAG's Regional Housing Needs Plan have been utilized as the basis for the County's Housing Element which was adopted with the General Plan update in 1994. These housing goals not only provide a basis for housing policies, but also are important in the formulation of the Land Use Element of the General Plan and associated implementation policies and programs. The adopted 1994 update to the County General Plan was not only predicated on meeting the regional housing goals, but also on strong resource protection and public safety policies, the availability of public services and infrastructure to support residential development, and strong public sentiment regarding community character. Together, these considerations place constraints on the ability to continue the growth in the unincorporated portion of the County. The County, therefore, has chosen to meet the regional housing goals in large part through the development of second units on single family parcels. As shown in Table 5, the build out of the General Plan will allow more than twice the housing required to meet the regional housing allocation.

In order for the County to obtain certification of the adopted Housing element, the State has indicated that the Housing Element and the General Plan must not only be based on the allocations in the Regional Housing Needs Plan, but also that the County's growth management system must not preclude the possibility of attaining these housing goals. A draft of the current Housing Element was first submitted to the State Housing and Community Development (HCD) on July 1, 1991. In response to HCD review and comments, revised drafts were forwarded to the State in 1992 and 1993. In July, 1994, the County submitted the adopted Housing Element to HCD for certification. The adopted Element was again reviewed by HCD who responded in November 1994 with further comments and requests for changes in County policies and programs. In response, the County adopted revised regulations for second units which are intended to facilitate the construction of these units to fulfill the housing goals. These regulations were forwarded to the State in May of 1997; HCD responded in November of 1997 with, again, further comments and requests for changes in County policies and programs. Since that time, the County has adopted yet another revision to the Second Unit regulations, and staff continues to work with HCD staff to achieve certification of the Housing Element.

TABLE 5: HOUSING GOALS AND ALLOCATIONS

Housing Type	AMBAG Allocation	1994 Housing Element Build Out
Low & Very Low Income	5,507	9,559
Moderate Rate	2,165	10,586
Market Rate	4,311	8,828
Unit Total	11,983	28,973

Affordable Housing:

Measure J contains the policy that “at least 15 percent of those housing units newly constructed for sale or rental each year shall be capable of purchase or rental by persons with average or below average incomes.” The number and percentage of affordable housing constructed in the unincorporated area since the implementation of Measure J in 1979 is shown in Table 6 below.

Over the nineteen year implementation period of Measure J from 1979 through 1997, an average of 14.2 percent of the new housing constructed in the unincorporated portion of the County has been affordable. In 1994, 12.5 percent of new housing starts were for affordable units; for 1995, 13.8 percent of new housing starts were for affordable units; for 1996, 4.8 percent of new housing starts were for affordable units; and for 1997, 3.1 of new housing starts were for affordable units. In the first eight months of 1998, 12.8 percent of new residential permits have been for affordable housing.

TABLE 6: AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION (1)

Year	Total Units	Affordable Units	Affordable As % of New DU's
1979	741	0	0.0 %
1980	972	62	5.9
1981	934	251	26.9
1982	738	235	31.8
1983	619	52	8.4
1984	609	129	21.2
1985	710	61	8.6
1986	595	98	16.5
1987	606	75	10.4
1988	710	23	3.4
1989	420	14	3.3
1990	267	9	3.4
1991	173	20	11.6
1992	367	209	56.9
1993	198	30	22.2
1994	192	24	12.5
1995	152	21	13.8
1996	145	7	4.8
1997	194	6	3.1
Totals	9342	1326	14.2

(1) Santa Cruz County unincorporated area

On average, the County has been close to meeting the 15 percent affordable housing goal in the past. The paucity of affordable units of the past two years can be attributed to the small number of large projects seeking building permits and because State and federal subsidies for affordable housing have largely been eliminated. In 1998, however, there are a number of large projects, approved in the past two years, obtaining building permits, which results in more affordable units. Also, recent changes in the Second Unit ordinance are resulting in increased numbers of affordable units.

VI. GROWTH GOAL RECOMMENDATION

Growth Goal:

The County adopted a 1.0 percent growth goal for each of the last eleven years. During 1987 and 1988, the issuance of Building Permits exceeded the allocation through use of carryover permits; however, since that time and until this year, Building Permit issuance has dropped well under the allocation.

Demand for Building Permits by owner builders increased in 1997 and has continued as the economy remains strong. As discussed earlier in this report, demand for building permits in the 5+ category will exceed the allocation this year and use of the carryover will be necessary. It is probable that demand will continue to be strong in 1999, with a number of developers building out additional phases of approved large projects. A continuation of the 1.0 percent growth goal for the coming year may or may not be adequate to accommodate this demand in the Urban 5+ category and further use of the carryover may be necessary. Planning staff will be monitoring issuance rates closely.

In order to facilitate the attainment of affordable housing goals, the County has exempted affordable housing units (including second units) from the need to obtain permit allocations under the County's growth management regulations. The development of affordable units will, therefore, not be affected by the adopted growth goal.

Building Permit Allocations:

Table 7 presents the methodology by which the 1.0 percent population growth goal for 1999 is converted into a Building Permit allocation.

TABLE 7: BUILDING PERMIT ALLOCATION BASED ON A 1.0%
ANNUAL GROWTH RATE

Estimated Total Household Population 1/1/98 for Unincorporated Santa Cruz County*	134,790
Estimated Group Quarters Population 1/1/98*	2,003
Estimated Total Population 1/1/98*	136,793
Annual Growth Goal - 1998	1.0%
Projected 1/1/99 Total Population	138,160
Annual Growth Goal - 1999	1.0%
Projected 1999 Population Increase	1,381
Persons Per Household (DOF estimate for 1/1/98)*	2.749
Required 1999 New Housing Units	502
Additional New Units Required for 5% Vacancy	25
Reservation of 15% of the Building Permits for affordable units.	<79>
Total Number of New 1999 Units Allowed (including affordable units)	5 2 7

* Source: DOF E-5 Population of California Cities and Counties, 5-98

The Building Permit allocations have been distributed in previous years based on the criteria listed below. These criteria will produce the specific Building Permit allocations by category for 1999 as shown in Table 8.

- Division of the 1999 growth between urban and rural portions of the unincorporated County on a 67-33 ratio.
- Allocation of rural permits without regard to project size.
- Allocation of 50% of the remaining urban permits to the 1-4 unit category.
- Allocation of the remaining urban permits to the 5 and more unit category.
- Reservation of 15% of the total allocation for affordable units as prescribed by County Code Section 17.01.030(e).

TABLE 8: RECOMMENDED 1999 BUILDING PERMIT ALLOCATION
DISTRIBUTION

Area	Total Market Rate Units	1-4 Units	5+ Units
Urban	300	150	150
Rural	148	N/A	N/A
Total	448		

Allocation Carryover:

Section 17.04.065 of County Code provides the ability to carryover Building Permit allocations from the previous year. It is RECOMMENDED that the unused 1998 market rate housing allocations, as well as any unused allocations that may be reallocated from the carryover by your Board, be carried over and made available in 1999, if necessary, to allow the attainment of the housing production goals of the County Housing Element. This carryover will retain its urban and rural distinctions, ensuring that any future use will maintain the ratios set by your Board.

Rural Land Divisions:

County Code Chapter 14.04, Annual Limits - Rural Land Divisions, limits the number of new residential parcels to be created in the rural portion of the County to 35 percent of the number of residential Building Permit allocations for the rural area. Based on the above recommended allocation, this would create a limit of 52 new rural residential parcels (no new rural lots have been approved to date in 1998). As the number of new rural residential parcels has not exceeded the yearly limitation this decade, no further action is indicated for the control of rural land divisions.

Second Units:

As a condition of the Coastal Commission Certification of the ordinance amendments to County Code Chapter 13.10.68 1(f), an annual report is required. The report is intended to evaluate the cumulative impacts associated with the second units within each planning area, particularly within the Coastal Zone. This analysis is to look at traffic, water, public views and environmentally sensitive areas impacts.

In 1997, your Board adopted revisions to the Second Unit ordinance. The revisions, including increased unit sizes in the rural areas, have made second units more attractive to the public. As the figures below indicate, application rates have increased. It is also clear that these units are being built primarily in rural, noncoastal areas.

Since September 1, 1994, a total of 92 Development Permits for second units have been approved, resulting in the issuance of 41 Building Permits. These permit approvals and issued Building Permits are for sites situated in the following planning areas of Santa Cruz County:

Second Unit Discretionary Approvals by Planning Area

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998(1)
Aptos:	0	0	0	2	1
Aptos Hills:	0	2	3	4	3
Bonny Doon:	0	0	2	3	3
Carbonera:	0	0	3	6	5
Eureka Canyon:	0	0	1	3	4
La Selva:	0	0	0	1	0

(Continued on next page)

0000419

Live Oak:	1	2	0	1	4
North Coast:	0	0	0	0	0
Pajaro Valley:	0	2	1	3	3
Salsipuedes:	0	0	0	0	0
San Andreas:	0	0	0	0	0
San Lorenzo Valley:	1	2	1	5	2
Skyline:	0	0	0	2	2
Soquel:	0	1	0	4	5
Summit:	0	1	1	0	1
TOTAL	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12'</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>33</u>

(1) Through 9/1/98

Second Units Issued Building Permits by Planning Area

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998(1)
Aptos:	0	0	0	1	1
Aptos Hills:	0	2	1	1	1
Bonny Doon:	0	0	1	2	1
Carbonera:	0	0	1	1	1
Eureka Canyon:	0	1	1	2	0
La Selva:	0	0	0	1	0
Live Oak:	1	1	0	1	0
North Coast:	0	0	0	0	0
Pajaro Valley:	0	1	0	2	1
Salsipuedes:	0	0	0	0	0
San Andreas:	0	0	0	0	0
San Lorenzo Valley:	1	2	0	2	2
Skyline:	0	0	0	1	0
Soquel:	0	1	0	0	3
Summit:	0	0	2	0	1
TOTAL	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>

(1) Through 9/1/98

Since 1997, four building permits have been issued for second units within the Coastal Zone. Given this low number of issued Building Permits and the minimal cumulative impact, if any, upon coastal resources, no action limiting the issuance of permits for second units is recommended at this time.