

Midcoast Community Council

An elected Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar

PO Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038

www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org

Len Erickson, Chair
Michelle Weil, Vice Chair
Claire Toutant, Secretary
Barbra Mathewson, Treasurer
Dan Haggerty
Dave Olson
Vacancy

Minutes for Meeting of JUNE 8, 2020

Call to Order (7pm) Meeting conducted virtually via Zoom due to shelter-in-place orders. This meeting is in lieu of the regularly scheduled meeting of June 10.

All Councilmembers present. Also present: 21 other people, including other government officials.

1. Board of Supervisors' Report

Carrie Dallman of Supervisor Horsley's office noted that new SIP order allows for previously-licensed outdoor dining and charter boat rentals. It also allows for outdoor funerals with 25 participants.

Harvey Rarback of HMB City Council noted recent public observances in favor of Black Lives Matter and Pride Month. Also, HMB has provided additional assistance to community groups including ALAS, homeless services, senior services and the Boys and Girls Club.

2. Public Comment & Announcements

Dan noted that he received complaints from the public having difficulty signing in to the meeting.

Ann Rothman expressed concerns that Cypress Point would create ghetto-ization of Moss Beach.

Claire reported that construction has started on the Vallemar Bluffs project, consistent with agreements worked out with MCC.

Dave said that the repairs of Highway One south of the tunnel were nearly done.

Barbara reported that Adopt-A-Highway would resume soon, that the new firehouse in El Granada was nearly done and that Supervisor Horsley was advocating with Caltrans for improved safety at the Moss Beach crosswalk.

3. Consent Agenda

Requests were made for 2 changes to the 5/27 minutes. It was moved by Barbra, seconded by Len and passed 6-0 to table the minutes to next meeting.

4. Regular Agenda –

a. Cypress Point—Comments for Planning Commission Letter

Dan asked that the letter include comments made in communications from Resist Density and Gregg Dieguez.

Dave is not in favor of the letter but in any case would like us to acknowledge that the project has been increased setbacks, lowered heights and set a goal of 75% local occupancy.

Barbara asked to hear from the public.

Gregg asked that the amendment to the LCP not be adopted until the effects of COVID-19 can be fully assessed.

Letters and emails were read from Rich Francis, Brian Gaffney, Liz Pearlson, Sherry Kritzer, Kerry Silverstein, Dennis Shapses, Anne Wright, Leea Henderson, Buffy Bunting, Yuriy Grinberg and Julian Amen. All were opposed to at least one aspect of the Cypress Point project. The emails were read after discussion of whether to include them; all but Dave agreed to have them read. Len and Claire thought that the most important aspects of the staff report for Cypress Point were assurances about the potential appeals process and about environmental review. Len notes that the report clarifies them.

Harald Hermann had technical difficulties presenting his data showing proposed changes to Moss Beach traffic and said that the biggest impact of the changes would be on the residents of Moss Beach and not on Highway One. He agreed to post his presentation with the report of the meeting.

Len said that internal traffic changes were never made clear.

Marcia Yates expressed frustration with the virtual meeting. She strongly advocated delaying decisions until in-person meetings were possible. She also felt that the public should not bear costs for private projects.

Ann was concerned about access to amenities by the handicapped and others. Mike Ferreira reminded us that North Wavecrest was once planned for over 1000 housing units but now there are none. Designation of an area for affordable housing does not require that it be built, especially when the designation was made in a different social environment. He described the location as the “worst possible.”

“Bruce from Moss Beach” agreed that even MidPen staff described the location as inappropriate.

Yuriy said that Cypress Point will become the focus of the town.

A formal discussion of the proposed letter ensued. At some point it was moved by Barbra and seconded by Dan that the letter be considered.

Initially, Dave opposed the letter as written, Dan wanted to add Resist Density points, Michelle was unsure about whether the Planning Commission would vote on the amendment this week, and Claire and Barbra supported the letter.

Regarding including Resist Density comments, Claire, Michelle and Barbra opposed incorporating them and Dan thought they were essential to the Council’s representation of the community. Len suggested adding the points RD made in bold to the end of the council letter and citing LCP 3.13 language about maintaining community character at the beginning of the letter. All councilmembers thought that was a good idea.

Yuriy objected to a comment that MCC represents visitors and future residents as well as the present community.

“JQ” asked to clarify what the environmental review would consist of.

“Michael” agreed and was worried about inundation of residential streets and whether parking would be banned or other measures would be needed,

The letter, as amended by Len, was approved 5-1, with Dave opposed.

b. Connect the Coastside—Virtual Meetings

Joe LaClair, Planning Services Manager, reviewed public suggestions from the recent virtual meeting about CTC. Suggestions included reducing reliance on cars (express bus, bike share), safety (Cypress speed, highway crossing, school routes) and development issues (lot retirement, impact fees, balance in timing of changes in traffic and development).

Meetings will be held on 6/15 focusing on Moss Beach/Montara and on 6/25 for other midcoast communities. County plans to summarize comments at a study session with MCC in late July, followed by revisions in August, late September

Planning Commission workshop, November Planning Commission action, late 2020 action by Board of Supervisors and final action in 2021.

Dan was unhappy with his experience with breakout sessions and wondered why CTC was required, fearing that it helped development. Joe replied that it is independent of development but does relate to it.

Michelle suggested better maps, more specifics and breakout groups tailored to specific areas of concern.

Claire thought the meeting was as good as could be expected but questioned the composition of the meeting participants and repeated our request that decisions be delayed.

Barbra was less positive about the meetings, thought that more careful breakout planning (with emphasis on local residents) would help, and agreed that decisions should be delayed.

Dan agreed that any decisions should be deferred.

Dave thought it was “reasonably successful” but disliked breakouts. He thought that no group should have fewer than 3 participants.

Len thought advanced registration should help plan the meeting.

Dave thought the breakout groups were a way to limit group communication

Michelle thought that better-prepared and trained group facilitators and recording of sessions would be helpful

Joe agreed.

Gregg thought that Zoom was a poor vehicle for these meetings and asked that decisions be deferred. He felt that citizen concerns were dampened rather than express in this format.

Kimberly Williams thanked Joe but thought that his summary was vague, that full data should be available, did not get the promised follow-up survey, thought it was development-friendly and wanted written information about the meetings in advance.

JQ thought the process was inadequate and decisions should be deferred. He wanted to clarify the role of HMB in the CTC process (they have a parallel process.)

Harald was reminded of earlier meetings about the MidPen project where he felt that comments were not noted by facilitators. He advocated for facilitators more familiar with the community.

Dolores Silva felt unlistened to in groups.

Dan expressed concern about HMB not being included in CTC but Joe said that the County and the City have separate LCP's.

c. Connect the Coastside—Path to Completion

The content of this item was largely covered in item “a.”

Gregg asked that lot merger and retirements be available NOW.

5. Council Activity

At Len's request, Claire and Michelle reminded us that full records of MCC referrals and comments on planning projects are available on the website.

6. Future Agendas

There may be some adjustment of meeting dates. On 7/8 virtual meetings will be assessed.

Adjournment 9:50