

Draft Minutes of the 05/09/01 Meeting of the MidCoast Community Council

Chair Laura Stein called the meeting to order at 7:37 pm. Members present were April Vargas, Ric Lohman, Paul Perkovic and Joe Gore. Chuck Kozak arrived at 8:00 pm.

Public Comment and Announcements

Secretary April Vargas read an inspirational note from Congresswoman Anna Eshoo in which she commented "So few take the time to express their appreciation and I want you to know how much yours means to all of us."

Ric reminded everyone of the Save Our Shores fund raiser on May 11. Details have appeared previously in meeting minutes.

Laura commented on a letter she had received from Warren Slocum, County Clerk/Recorder, outlining the regulations governing the holding of two public offices simultaneously. Anyone wishing a copy of the regulations should contact the MCC.

She also received a letter from the Peninsula Bicycle and Pedestrian Coalition asking for endorsement of a plan to make Hwy 1 near Skyline Blvd. a Class 2 bicycle facility. The Council will discuss this at a future meeting.

Board of Supervisors Report

Joe Causo was not in attendance and there was no report.

Treasurer's Report

The balance remains unchanged at approximately \$400. No scheduled deposits have been made due to the lack of appropriate paperwork being filed with the bank. Paul promised to fulfill this responsibility prior to the next meeting.

Committee Reports

Park and Recreation: The committee met on May 7. The Committee for a Coastside Dog Park addressed them about the need for a facility. P and R Committee members made suggestions on how dog owners might proceed. Pilots have expressed concerns about using County owned land adjacent to the airport for a dog park due to the possibility of dogs escaping from their park enclosure and running loose along the runways. The next P and R Committee meeting is set for June 4 at 7:30 pm at the Three Zero Cafe.

The remainder of the Committee reports were postponed until the time following the final agenda item, because it was 8:00pm.

Consent Agenda

Paul moved, Ric seconded and the motion was unanimously approved to adopt the four Consent Agenda items as presented.

Regular Agenda

1. Interviews with El Grananda community applicants for the Design Review Committee. William Katke is a 2 1/2 year Coastside resident. He is a software developer who grew up on a farm. His father was in the construction industry. He believes that aesthetic concerns have not been

adequately covered in the current design review guidelines used by the County. April asked what aesthetic training or talent he possesses that would aid him in performing his duties on the committee. He answered that he has none but has looked at nature for a long time and can appreciate beauty.

Ric asked his opinion of community versus individual rights. Bill said he respects property owners' rights but when decisions affect neighbors, accommodations must be made. He supports the Peninsula Open Space Trust's purchases of land to maintain open space but does not support down zoning to make development on parcels impossible.

Laura asked what his judgments and comments would be based upon when reviewing a project. Bill answered that he would rely on the Architectural Review guidelines as written. She asked how many Planning and Zoning Committee meetings he has attended and he answered three.

Paul asked if he can take plans and visualize what the completed project would look like. He said not to the degree that he should. He is skilled in visualizing completed software so he feels he can learn to do this architecturally as well.

Joe Gore asked how he would feel about removing trees to open a view or allow for construction. Bill said he doesn't favor removing significant trees. Projects should be designed around them. If a tree is near the end of its life span it should be removed prior to construction to avoid danger to the completed structure.

Ric asked about nonconforming and substandard lots. Bill does not favor building on these, due to the traffic congestion and property devaluation which he believes would occur with such development.

Laura asked how he learns new information and new concepts. His response: by listening to others. How does he deal with conflict? He has been trained to use conflict as a benefit to group process. He contends that peoples' brains work better when passions are intensified.

Chuck asked what the most important component is when reviewing a project. He answered the design review guidelines: lot size, house size, tree placement. All components of the standards are important. Chuck asked how familiar Bill is with the current standards and what his ideas are for developing new, MidCoast specific standards. Bill said he would ask people for input on the standards and would depend on other peoples' opinions more than his own. There were no questions from audience members.

Morgan Walford has lived in El Granada since 1995. He has 35 years experience in the building trades and is an electrician and member of IBEW Local 6. As a young person he worked for his uncle who was a general contractor. He has experience in the private and public sectors and is currently the electrical foreman at a San Francisco waste water treatment plant. He was elected to a design review board for the Bernal Heights neighborhood of San Francisco, where he lived at the time. He served two years, one of them as Chair. He is a certified horticulturalist and is a member of the San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners. His construction and horticultural background afford him a unique perspective. He is familiar with reading plans and feels that he has the qualifications to serve on the MidCoast Design Review Committee.

Joe Gore asked about potential conflicts of interest relating to a proposal from Bernal Heights while he served on the committee there. He explained that there was no conflict at the time. The committee reviewed the street improvement proposal only, not the building plans. The property was eventually purchased by the City and retained as open space. Morgan had advocated for this decision. The property owners wanted this as well.

Paul asked about the makeup of the Bernal Heights committee. Morgan explained that it was composed of one architect, two architectural designers and two at large members, of which he was one.

April asked what aesthetic experience or talent he could bring to the committee. He answered that he is familiar with design review criteria, has worked with architects and is himself a landscape designer who has analyzed form, balance and structure. He has reviewed hundreds of projects.

Laura asked what part of his work on the Bernal Heights committee he enjoyed most. His answer was working with people. He frequently interviewed neighborhood residents and developed a good relationship with the San Francisco Planning Director and the Planning Commission. What he liked least was the amount of time that committee membership forced him to spend away from his family.

Ric asked Morgan to give an example of a controversial project and how the situation was resolved. A developer brought in a plan for a lot line adjustment on parcels with insufficient infrastructural improvement and fire flow water capacity. The houses were too large and the site had a steep slope. The committee requested repeated redesigns and eventually the developer stopped paying taxes on the property so the plan was dropped. He said that negative experiences were in a definite minority when compared to the positive experiences he had serving on the committee.

Chuck asked if the Bernal Heights group have approval power and what his suggestions would be for specific design criteria for the MidCoast. The B.H. group had advisory power only but the Planning Commission usually followed their recommendations. He would suggest:

Conformance with the LCP

Conformance with applicable zoning ordinances

Conformance with neighborhood character, which includes square footage, height, window placement, size of side yards, siding materials used, set backs. These criteria must be measurable.

Asked if there should be requirements for siding, color and landscaping details in the guidelines, he said he would support landscaping specifics but felt that other items should receive input but not be mandated with specifics.

Laura asked what he felt the neighborhood character of El Granada is. He answered that there are many neighborhoods in El Granada and that is a positive attribute. He mentioned the Burnham plan and its large stretches of open space and broad roads oriented to a view of the bay as the overall community character.

Leonard Woren asked his opinion about trees. He supports the Heritage Tree Ordinance and maintains that tree removal should occur only with good reason. He believes that the permit process allows for public input on removal. He does not value eucalyptus trees because they are shallow-rooted, fire-prone and dangerous.

He believes there needs to be more community discussion on house size. The current proposed ordinance may be restrictive enough if it is enforced. Variances are inappropriate and should not be allowed. He is appreciative of POST's recent acquisitions.

Bill was brought to answer the question about lot size. He said he prefers lots of five acres in size.

Kathryn asked how each of them would handle the proposed removal of a tree to accommodate a driveway. Bill answered that it should be explored whether the driveway can be moved or if the location of the garage can be adjusted. Houses should be designed to protect trees.

Morgan asked what type of tree was involved and outlined problems with eucalyptus once again. He would explore alternate arrangements for the driveway and garage in the example cited above. Construction should not damage trees. This should be written into permits. Disputes regarding trees on property lines should be decided by the property owners, not the Design Review Committee. Chuck clarified that after researching the question he has discovered that the Committee will have input on tree/removal issues as they relate to specific projects presented to the Committee.

At this point, the presenters for Agenda Item 2 had not yet arrived so it was decided to conclude the Committee Reports until they were present.

Committee Reports continued

The Planning and Zoning Committee met last on May 7, 2001. They discussed the proposed Negative Declaration for the house on the Vallemar Bluffs in Moss Beach. They approved a letter to the County asking for the rescheduling of a public meeting about the proposed development on the El Granada Post Office lot. The Annual report from the County on the average parcel size of developments in the S-17 zone of the MidCoast was received from Environmental Services Agency Director Marcia Raines. The median size for projects built in 2000 was 5400 square feet.

Chuck explained the background of the Harbor District's proposed restroom/commercial building thus far. The letter to the Harbor District approved in the Consent Agenda will be copied to Supervisor Gordon, Zoning Hearing Officer George Bergman and Planner Miroo Brewer.

There no report from the Public Works Committee.

The presenters for the next agenda item arrived at 8:55 pm and the Regular Agenda continued.

2. Council consideration of report and/or recommendation from Planning and Zoning Committee concerning eligibility for visitor-serving priority water allocation for the previously approved (CDP 98-0027) 14 room expansion of the Harbor View Inn, east of Highway 1 at 11 Ave. Alhambra in El Granada. APN 047-045-210, 220. Chuck gave the P and Z Committee report, recounting that the project was approved and then the owners were informed that they did not qualify for priority water to serve the addition. It is in the Neighborhood Commercial zoning district as specified in the Land Use Designation of the General Plan. It is not in a visitor serving zoning district. Because the use serves visitors should it qualify for priority water? This is the question. Is there any way to serve the project without setting a precedent for priority water for other projects within the Neighborhood Commercial zoning district? Does zoning determine priority or use? There is as yet no report from County Counsel addressing these questions.

Paul asked about available capacity and suggested a mathematical scheme for allocating priority water if it were available and was then subtracted from the capacity set aside for other visitor serving uses. Only if there was remaining capacity after all the calculations were complete could this project be served. Other Council members found it premature to try to find a solution without a more comprehensive understanding the issues involved.

JR Rodine represents the applicant/owner. CCWD currently has a first party transfer program only. That is, capacity can be transferred between only those parcels which are owned by the same person. Other problems: supply must exceed 50% of the mandated reserve before any allocation can be made and a 1 1/2 inch connection is needed. The applicant currently has only a 5/8 inch connection.

The only condition not met under the CDP is water. CCWD won't serve the project without a letter from the County stating that the project is visitor serving. Up to this point, the County has refused

to do so. There was discussion about how to keep this contradictory circumstance from happening again. There is no other water available beside priority. There were questions about the validity and completeness of the CDP. Was it issued erroneously? If so, can it be repealed? The Council listed several questions which need to be answered before any recommendations can be made:

1. What did CCWD send to the County, in terms of a letter stating intent to serve, and what response did the County send back? Was there uncommunicated intent on the part of either of them?
2. Did the original owner of the business have an opportunity to become part of the Crystal Springs Project assessment district, thereby qualifying for Phase I water? Was this opportunity declined?
3. Did the existing building receive priority water?
4. What was Granada Sanitary District's response to the referral form from the County regarding this proposal? Does the County have a copy of this response? A Special Districts response form is required to remain in the project file.
5. Is the parcel slated for the addition currently being assessed for water?
6. Is Paul's proposal, succinctly referenced above, worthy of serious consideration?
7. How is the County verifying the requirements on projects submitted for approval? Copies of incomplete applications received by P and Z and designations of hardship cases will be included to illustrate the urgency of the County's need to act to improve their review and approval policies.
8. Will County Counsel please review this situation and provide legal direction?

Paul moved and April seconded a motion to send these questions to the County; Supervisor Gordon, Director Raines and Planning Administrator Burnes, to continue this item until a response is received and ask the Chair of P and Z and others of his choosing to meet with County officials to discuss these matters in more detail and report back to the Council. The motion passed unanimously.

Joe Gore left at 10:40 pm.

3. Discussion of Proposed Letter to the California Coastal Commission recommending approval of San Mateo County LCP Amendment no. 3-00-A (Residential Standards)

After brief Council discussion, Chuck moved that this item be continued to the next meeting. Paul seconded the motion and it passed unaniamously.

4. MidCoast Local Program Review Update
There was no report.

Future Agenda

May 23 meeting

Consent Agenda

Approve minutes of May 9, 2001 meeting

Regular Agenda

1. LCP Amendment
2. Vote to Recommend MidCoast Design Review candidates to the Board of Supervisors
3. Requests for Building Permits on Substandard and Non-Conforming Parcels in the S-9 District
4. Presentation of X-Terra Race and Route
5. MidCoast Local Coastal Program Review Update

Adjournment

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 11:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Secretary April Vargas