Planning & Zoning Committee of the MidCoast Community Council

PO Box 64, Moss Beach CA 94038

Serving 12,000 residents

February 25, 2001 FAX: 3 Pages

To: Ms. Lily Toy

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: **PLN2000-00833:** Resource Management District Permit, Coastal Development Permit and Coastside Design Review for the construction of a new 4,353 sf. single-story single-family residence with attached garage on a 11,603 sf. parcel located at 10 Juliana Ave. (at the Strand) in Moss Beach. APN 037-086-260

Lily:

Sorry for the delays on these. On 1/31/01, the Planning and Zoning Committee of the MidCoast Community Council reviewed the above referenced application. We had the following comments:

- 1. The committee greatly appreciated the sensitivity of the design of the proposed house, and had no further comments on the architectural aspects. We agreed it was very well designed visually for this sort of site, and took into account minimizing visual impacts by its low design. We did note, however, that in terms of raw square footage, it would be largest house in the area.
- 2. Our main point with this application is we feel that in the development of any of these seven lots, there needs to be the consideration for the overall impacts of all of the parcels. Although formed from a Lot Line Adjustment, the effect was to create the equivalent of a small subdivision. The LLA and the subsequent well permits for these parcels have not taken the overall impacts of developing these blufftops into account, and the individual consideration of the parcels for residential development would allow for incremental impacts that, when considered cumulatively, could have farreaching implications for the environment and the surrounding community.

We feel that this approach would be a piecemeal approach to a larger development, and respectfully request that the owner and/or applicants be required to do some level of overall impact study – perhaps this could be done through the Pre-Application process, or perhaps a full EIR process may be needed.

3. The proposed drainage of the house is onto Juliana Ave. No sort of retention system is shown. Current storm drainage running down Juliana and joining with runoff from Weinke runs into the ocean at the end of Juliana. There it has created a severely eroded bluff face. This bluff is an LCP-designated Coastal Access (entry #12 of Table 10.1 on page 10.19 of LCP) and is the only way to get to the section of the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve that lies below this property. Part of the access is owned by the County, the rest is privately owned. Channeling extra runoff to this point will worsen

the problem, causing further damage to the access and to private property. See #4 below.

- 4. We would like to review the Hydrology Study for this project. As noted in other comments concerning the permits for wells at these parcels, the area has subsurface water flows rather shallow below the ground surface. The proposed grading and setting of foundation pilings for the proposed house, as well as other potential construction on the other parcels, could disrupt this water flow, causing flooding problems for the houses and environmental impacts where the water emerges on the faces of the cliffs in he Marine Reserve. Refer to # 3 above and reference RM/CZ DRC Zoning regulations 6912.2(f), 6912.4(a, b, c, e, & h) and 6913.4(b & d).
- 5. The project is adjacent to a designated route for the Coastal Trail (entry #12 of Table 10.1 on page 10.19 of LCP) along its western boundary. LCP Policies 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 should be taken into consideration. Erosion of the bluff over the years will eventually force the trail up against and possibly onto the subject property. As surface erosion, not necessarily wave-undercutting, seems to be the predominate erosive force at this point, development of the parcels along this route may hasten the erosion that would eliminate the existing County property that is proposed for the trail. We feel that the property must be conditioned to accept the inevitable inclusion of coastal trail egress along the western edge, and that drainage for any development be engineered to avoid further erosion of the blufftops.
- 6. We would like to have the ownership history of these parcels researched, to verify that the area was not in common ownership at the time of enactment of the existing RM/CZ regulations, and therefore not subject to the 5 acre minimum size requirement.
- 7. In the supplied applications for the project, we found a number of errors and points of contention:
 - a. On the CDP application, (#4 Project Information), items i, p, and t are checked "No." there will obviously be removal of vegetation (i), the project is between the sea and the first public road (p the "Strand" has been abandoned as a road for many years) and the proposed coastal trail and a long-standing public trail adjoin the property (t see #5 above.)
 - b. On the Environmental Information form, items c, j, & k are checked "No" we feel that these should certainly be "Yes" for reason explained above.

Although we found the proposal numerically within the framework of its zoning, we believe that the overall impact of development of this and the other six parcels has not been adequately researched and assessed to allow approval for this project. At this time we see the even the individual impacts of the project as proposed to be detrimental to the surrounding environment and community unless the issues raised above are resolved. Thank you for your help, and please keep us informed of any further redesigns, developments, denials, approvals, or appeals concerning this application.

Chuck Kozak

MCC Planning and Zoning Committee Chair

POB 370702, Montara CA 94037

hunch togal

Voice/FAX: 650.728.8239 Day: 650.996.8998

cgk@montara.com