

Planning & Zoning Committee of the MidCoast Community Council

PO Box 64, Moss Beach CA 94038

Serving 12,000 residents

November 12, 2001

Via Email: 4 Pages

To: Tish Williams
PO Box 598, 101 Niagra Ave.
Moss Beach, CA 94038
650.728.0466 - email: TWilliams@spaceimaging.com

re: MCC P&Z letter regarding PLN2000-00585 (101 Niagra in Moss Beach.)

cc: Marcia Raines, Environmental Services Agency Director
Miroo Brewer, San Mateo County Planning
Karen Wilson, MCC Planning & Zoning Committee member
Dell Williams

Tish:

Karen Wilson has forwarded your emails (attached) to me for response. First, let me apologize if you did not get a copy of our original comment letter. I had assumed that the County would forward it to you when they received it and I had not followed up on that.

I have reviewed all the materials we had been supplied and my notes on this case in the light of your comments, and cannot agree that the MCC P&Z letter is false or misleading. It was unfortunate that Karen was unable to attend, but I believe that with the materials that she had collected for us, along with the information provided by you and Elizabeth Vespremi and the comments offered by neighbors and other interested parties at the meeting were sufficient for us to draw the limited conclusions we did. I also would not agree that Karen had mis-represented any aspects of this case or that she may have had any conflicting influences as you allege. The notes she provided outlined what she had researched and her one recommendation about a possible location of the garage, which I explained at the meeting.

As the letter mentioned, there was no clear consensus other than that we felt that all options had not been sufficiently explored for the resolution of this case and on that basis we could not recommend approval of the project as presented. This was expressed further in our concerns about extending further existing non-conformities of the house and others in the neighborhood, and trying to preserve a reasonable approach to further development in the area.

There is no allegation that the driveway/road grading options were withheld – Karen had tried to get copies of these plans from the County and was told that they were not available. The first time I or any of the committee members saw them was at our meeting, as was noted in the letter. And we do not suggest that the options we put forth were not

explained adequately or fully by you beforehand or at the meeting, but that we remained unconvinced that there may not be other solutions other than what was proposed. Our comments on the drainage do not seem to be out of line with your concerns – we stated (with typos preserved):

“Drainage and potential impacts on the coastal bluffs were other topics that brought much discussion. No one at the meeting was clear what the final drainage system on Niagra would be, especially after Public Works completed its re-grading of the street. It was agreed that any solution would have to take into effect the management of stormwater runoff both in protecting the integrity of Niagra and in not causing any further erosion of the blufftop.”

You also mention “ ... four options that were examined in detail and available in detailed architectural drawings.” Aside from the rejected detached garage idea, I have no recollection, and Karen has said she does not either, of seeing any other options in drawing form.

In regards to how “damaging” our letter may be to your case, please realize that the Planning & Zoning Committee of the MCC acts only in an advisory capacity to the San Mateo County Planning Department by offering comment and recommendations on referred projects. We have no decision-making or regulatory authority. Any recommendations or assertions we make are researched and verified by Planning staff before acceptance or rejection. We review 10 – 15 applications a month, many as complex or more so than this one, and we do it on a non-paid, volunteer basis. We provide County Planning with community-level input and we strive to base our comments on what we feel is best for our communities and for protection of our coastal resources. As I noted at the end of our letter, we “ ... encourage that the County work with the applicants and the neighbors to find a solution that would be most protective of the coastal resources in the area and the preservation of existing zoning standards. We would be happy to assist in this effort in any way we can.”

I understand that this a complex case and I can appreciate your concerns about how this will affect your house, but I see no reason at this time for altering our original comments. This case is being provided a full and open hearing before the Planning Commission at which time these issues can be addressed further if necessary.

Thank you for your time to review this matter, and again I apologize that you did not receive a copy of our letter in a more timely fashion.

Sincerely,



Chuck Kozak, MCC Planning and Zoning Committee Chair
POB 370702, Montara CA 94037

Home: 650.728.8239 Day: 650.996.8998 - cgk@montara.com

From: "Williams Tish" <TWilliams@spaceimaging.com>
To: "Karen Wilson (E-mail)" <loordus@home.com>; "Marsha Raines (E-mail)" <mraines@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Cc: "Dell Williams (E-mail)" <dellw@home.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2001 12:07 PM
Subject: Mid coast council letter

> Karen: Today, we received for the first time a copy of the letter that the
> Mid Coast Council sent to the San Mateo County Planning and Building
> division signed by Chuck Kozak. The letter was faxed to us by Miroo Brewer
> and is absolutely false in its allegation re: our not presenting options
> for the driveway to the Mid Coast council ahead of time, and the discussions
> that we had with you personally on your visits here, on the phone and
> documented via e-mail as well as with Chuck when he visited the site. The
> proposals in the letter submitted as other ideas that should be examined
> were discussed with you specifically and were noted as not having
> sufficient turn around radius and access to be in conformance as well as
> architecturally flawed. We specifically went through with you the four
> options that were examined in detail and available in detailed architectural
> drawings. In addition, it was us who specifically discussed with you the
> drainage and problems associated with the removal of the retaining wall and
> our interest in minimizing any further erosion of the bluff and the road.
> The statements in the letter are false and specifically the approval by
> Public works for the road as being proposed considered the re-grading that
> was necessary, the access and appropriate slope necessary to the proposed
> garage, and minimization of further erosion. In fact the pictures we showed
> you of the original road prior to our rebuild and the current condition of
> the road clearly indicate the road is in the same or better condition than
> it was prior to our rebuild. This is not an accident, but a condition which
> we assure is maintained. The Mid coast council in several of the
> statements appear to be denying us the same rights that all of our other
> neighbors currently enjoy and have had in place for some time.
> Furthermore, I believe the Mid Coast council has an obligation to provide a
> copy of their comments re: our project to us directly, and in a timely way,
> as I personally requested of you subsequent to the meeting. The Mid Coast
> Council meeting was held 8/29, over two months ago. I would hope that you
> take action to correct Chuck Kozak's view of what actually transcribed re:
> our project.
>
> Tish Williams

From: "Williams Tish" <TWilliams@spaceimaging.com>
To: "Karen Wilson" <Loordus@home.com>
Cc: "Dell Williams (E-mail)" <dellw@home.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2001 8:20 AM
Subject: RE: Mid coast council letter

> Karen: I have not heard from you and we have a hearing in front of the
> Planning commission this Wednesday. In the interest of fairness and truth I
> would appreciate it if you respond to what has been done to correct the
> impression that Chuck Kozak wrote in the Mid Coast Council letter which is
> very damaging to our case and which does not reflect the reality of us
> providing you an understanding of all of the options we considered both in
> the driveway access to the existing garage as well as changing our original
> request for a separate garage under a "use permit" to a garage which could
> be incorporated partially in our existing garage via HIE. In addition, any
> comments that Chuck made re: evaluating an additional approach to the garage
> was discussed with you as well and we supported his further discussion on
> this with our architect, Elizabeth Vespremi. So Chuck was also provided
> any information that he requested. I would appreciate a statement from you
> to the effect of what actually transpired and the fact that this was not
> made known to the entire Mid Coast Council because of your inability to
> attend the hearing. I thought when we discussed all of this personally with
> you that you would be honest and fair considering your own personal
> problems. I also hope that your affiliation with McCracken did not skew
> your ability to provide a fair and accurate representation of our case,
> which today leaves that in doubt.
>
> I will be home all day and next week and hope you get back to us to make a
> difference before Tuesday.
>
> tish
>
> tel: 650 728-0466