



Planning and Building Division

County of San Mateo

Mail Drop PLN122 · 455 County Center · 2nd Floor · Redwood City
California 94063 · Telephone 650/363-4161 · Fax 650/363-4849

Board of Supervisors

Rose Jacobs Gibson
Richard S. Gordon
Mary Griffin
Jerry Hill
Michael D. Nevin

Planning Administrator

Terry L. Burnes

November 30, 2000

To: Midcoast LCP Update Project Participants
From: Marcia Raines, Director of Environmental Services *mr*
Subject: Final Project Scope of Study

We are pleased to announce that over the past four months, County staff and community participants prepared and refined the scope of study for Phase One of the Midcoast LCP Update Project. The final project scope of study is attached.

Staff will next prepare an Alternatives Report that: (1) analyzes the issues under study, (2) describes and evaluates a set of alternatives, and (3) recommends a preferred alternative/policy change.

Multiple community workshops will be scheduled to discuss, revise and refine the Alternatives Report, particularly the recommended policy changes. As general agreement is attained, staff will prepare the exact draft amendment language for elected officials to consider.

The Midcoast Community Council would review the amendments, and submit its recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would act on the amendments, followed by the Coastal Commission certification process.

Thank you for your participation in this important first phase of the project. We look forward to your continued input in the months ahead. Should you have any questions, please feel free to call George Bergman, Project Planner, at 650/363-1851.

Happy Holidays.

MLR:GDB/kcd - GDBK1791_WKO.DOC
Attachment

cc: Members, Board of Supervisors
Members, Planning Commission
Members, Midcoast Community Council

**SCOPE OF STUDY
MIDCOAST LCP UPDATE PROJECT - PHASE ONE**

1. Recalculate LCP residential buildout based on existing LCP policy. Include single family units, multiple family units, second dwelling units, and caretakers quarters.
2. Determine the number of non-conforming parcels in the project area based on a reliable count rather than a sampling method.
3. Recalculate the transportation and infrastructure capacity (roadway, water, sewer, schools, etc.) necessary to serve existing buildout using the most current demand data.
4. Reevaluate whether the annual residential growth rate limit (125 dwelling units/ year) should be lowered, and develop alternatives as necessary. Clarify that the limit applies to number of dwelling units, rather than number of building permits.
5. Evaluate the adequacy of existing controls on non-conforming parcel development. Prepare and assess alternatives, to the extent allowed by law. Consider the following options: (a) merge non-conforming parcels, (b) prohibit exemptions to development standards, (c) establish disincentives for development on non-conforming parcels, and (d) allow development of non-conforming parcels only as a last resort.
6. Revise design review criteria to complement the new house size limits, perpetuate the coastal and nautical character of non-residential areas, and promote the preferred scale and character of the community. Consider the following options: (a) required landscaping, (b) improved sign design, (c) required underground utilities, and (d) light and noise standards.
7. Develop traffic mitigation requirements for new development that are derived from the C/CAG Congestion Management Program – Land Use Component Implementation Guidelines.
8. Evaluate the opportunities for, and the impacts from, increasing/expanding commercial and office development in the project area. Emphasize sites at Princeton and beside Half Moon Bay Airport. Consider (a) traffic and coastal dependent use (e.g. fishing and boating) impacts, (b) wetlands constraints, (c) options within the Airport Overlay (AO) zone, (d) opportunities to re-designate an expanse of vacant residential land for office development, and (e) implication of the Half Moon Bay Airport Master Plan.

Evaluate: (a) whether permitted residential units for the C-1 and CCR zoning districts should be limited to mixed use development, (b) whether permitted residential units for the W zoning district should be limited to caretaker quarters (20%), or expanded to allow mixed use development and caretaker quarters (>20%), and (c) whether residential units should be prohibited by the COSC zoning district. Consider each Midcoast community separately.

10. Evaluate: (a) methods to increase the protection of land designated Open Space (RM/CZ) and Agriculture (PAD) located in the urban Midcoast, (b) the appropriateness of the existing LCP and zoning controls for land designated Very Low Density Residential (RM/CZ) located outside the urban Midcoast, i.e the Rural Residential/Portola Estates area, and (c) whether properties designated Park should be designated Open Space.
11. Evaluate opportunities to: (a) re-designate the CalTrans Devils Slide bypass right-of-way to a very low intensity use, e.g. park, trail, open space or resource preserve, watershed recharge area, etc., (b) add remaining segments to the Coastal Trail, and (c) establish a parallel trail within the Highway 1 right-of-way.
12. Revise LCP Sensitive Habitats maps to: (a) correct identified omissions, (b) incorporate information attained from site specific biological reports, (c) reflect changes in endangered species listings, and (d) reconcile with other adopted maps. Also, resolve conflicts in the definition of wetland, and clarify who enforces wetland violations.
13. Resolve LCP policy conflicts and clarify ambiguous provisions. Where conflicts and ambiguities occur, retain the most restrictive or protective policy/provision. Where possible, develop objective, rather than subjective zoning standards.
14. Identify the Midcoast related responsibilities assigned to the County by the LCP , Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada Community Plan, and other applicable documents, e.g. Coastal Commission groundwater monitoring requirements. Determine the status of, and evaluate the County's effectiveness in, meeting those responsibilities.
15. Consider adopting Coastal Act Sections 30210-30264 as LCP policy.