

**Planning & Zoning Committee of the MidCoast Community Council**  
**PO Box 64, Moss Beach CA 94038**  
**Serving 12,000 residents**

## **FAX**

March 20, 2002

**TO: George Bergman, Zoning Hearing Officer**

**TO: Miroo Brewer, Project Planner**

San Mateo County Planning and Building Division

Mail Drop PLN122, 455 County Center

Redwood City, CA 94063

650.363.1841 - FAX: 650.363.4849

RE: PLN2001-00189: Coastal Development Permit, Coastside Design Review and Amendment to Existing Use Permit # USE 92-0013 for a new 3 –story, 12,151 sq/ft building for a 12 unit addition to existing {Bed & Breakfast}.

On 3-20-02 the Planning and Zoning Committee reviewed the revised plans submitted for the above application. The committee had the following comments:

Clarification of the Kitchen units: When the committee originally reviewed the plans, only one kitchen was only labeled and the design was repeated without label. However, the garages were all named and labeled individually. Perhaps this caused the oversight by the committee. We support the change submitted to remove the kitchens from the third floor.

The committee recommends/supports the following conditions to be included:

- The condition in the original staff report for a 30 day limit on stays at the establishment. We would like to see that condition continued in any subsequent approval.
- Separate Use Permits for each building
- Enclosures or walls to contain and hide trash and trash containers
- A comprehensive final landscape plan submitted to include adequate screening of the parking are and conditioned not to be changed later.

1. Parking raised the greatest concerns as there is limited parking available in Princeton. If we could receive clarification as to what the definition of the project is, we would greatly appreciate it.

The original staff report refers to the project as a "hotel" (Zoning Regulations Definitions: SECTION 6102.49), which requires only 1 parking space for each 4 guest rooms (SECTION 6119, PARKING SPACES RREQUIRED). The revised project, as presented to us by the applicant, has 12 units - 6 have 1 bedroom and no kitchen, and 6 have 2 bedrooms and a kitchen. There are 13 parking spaces. Each unit has a separate entrance. **In our interpretation, this project is much closer in definition and in practical use to a "Motel-Motor Court/Tourist Court" (SECTION 6102.80), which requires 1 parking space "for each individual sleeping unit, or dwelling unit" (SECTION 6119).** The Zoning Regulations do provide a definition for "dwelling unit" (SECTION 6102.33), but does not define "sleeping unit."

Although the project, as presented to us, would meet either requirement, our concern rises from the projected use as explained by the applicant - that the 2 bedroom units with kitchens would be used by families or small groups (2-4 people) that would stay for a week or so - this raises the possibility of each of these units could often attract more than one car - the scenario of extended family members or friends sharing the unit and arriving in separate cars seems very likely, even the most plausible use of these units. In addition there is no public transportation available to this area, and is not typically served by tour buses or airport shuttles.

In this case, the parking would be inadequate - as soon as one unit has more than one car, that car is immediately forced out on the street to park, which in this area of Princeton is a very iffy proposition - the streets are unimproved, so parking adds to street congestion and traffic hazards, and parking spaces, because of the multiple driveways and access to surrounding properties, are actually quite limited.

Lack of adequate on-site parking, excessive on-street parking and the related congestion, and safety issues of vehicles left on the street have been continuing issues of concerns for the Princeton community, and we feel that these need to be addressed in this case.

2. A property owner across the street from this project was concerned that he was only notified once of this proposed project. He attended the hearing and it had been postponed. Unaware of the process, and not having submitted any written comment or filled out any speaker slips, he was never notified again. We feel it is important that the public within the notification area be re-noticed when a hearing is canceled or postponed so that all residents have an equal opportunity to be informed on projects directly affecting their property. The process is not easy to understand and many community members and residents may be unaware of the process.

3. The committee expressed concern that the "balanced diversity of uses" within the CCR District, as expressed in Section 6265(5) ("CCR" DISTRICT PURPOSES), be monitored and maintained by the County in this and other permitting process within this district.

4. The Committee is concerned that in the designation of visitor-serving priority water eligibility, that the County track these designations such that one category of priority use not be utilized excessively to the detriment of other priority uses - for

example, that all priority water connections be allocated to hotels and none be available for Marine-related services or flora-culture.

The Committee expressed concern that the "balanced diversity of uses" within the CCR District, as expressed in Section 6265(5) ("CCR" DISTRICT PURPOSES), be monitored and maintained by the County in this and other permitting process within this district.

The Committee would like to recognize the efforts and thank the Owner for taking the time to meet with the neighbors and Planning & Zoning to address and resolve concerns.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Karen Wilson  
Chair, MCC Planning and Zoning Committee  
POB 371273, Montara CA 94037  
650-728-3292  
[Loordus@attbi.com](mailto:Loordus@attbi.com)