

**Subject: P&Z Notes from 2/4/98 (long)**

**Date:** Fri, 6 Feb 1998 12:10:19 -0800

**From:** cgk@well.com (Chuck Kozak)

**Reply-To:** Coastside Discussion List <Midcoast-L@lists.monterey.com>

**To:** midcoast-l@lists.monterey.com

MCCC P&Z Notes from 2/4/98

I hope these notes suffice with Paul out of town - he usually has a laptop computer - all I had was a chartpad and a big marker. The Disclaimer - THESE ARE NOT MINUTES - these were my notes on the big pad and some small scribbles on separate sheets, mixed with random recollections. I think I got the action items and dates and such right. Please feel free to chime in on anything I missed or got wrong. Most comments and observations here are uncredited, as I neglected to note who was talking, so rather than try to remember, I will let the responsible parties claim their own statements. I've tried to clearly mark \*\*\*Editorial Comment\*\*\* as such. Decoder:

- "BoS" or the "the Board" = Board of Supervisors
- "MCC" or "the Council" = MidCoast Community Council
- "P&Z" or "the Committee" = MCC Planning and Zoning Committee
- "County" = San Mateo County Staff and Elected Officials

-chuck-

-----  
MidCoast Community Council Planning and Zoning Committee  
3-0 cafe, Wednesday, Feb. 4, 1998 - 7:30PM

Attending: MidCoast Council Members Ric Lohman, Dave Spiselman (Council Chair), Laura Stein (Committee Chair)  
P&Z Members: Tim Duff, Chuck Kozak, Kathryn Slater-Carter, Elizabeth Vesprimi

-----  
Agenda Review - Laura had added 5 time-sensitive late-breaking items to the agenda, indicated here as items A through E. The previously posted 1 through 6 stayed as proposed, although the items were dealt with slightly out of order to accommodate those who had to leave early. For these notes, they appear in the order as they were listed on the agenda.

-----  
A. Board of Supervisors (BoS) Agenda Item for Tuesday, February 10, 9:45AM: Hearing to "... consider minor corrections to the LCP amendments derived from the Coastside Protection Initiative, approved on November 18, 1997."

It was noted that those who did receive a copy of the County Staff report on this item had only received it the day before this meeting, and that the time to study and respond to the proposed "minor corrections" was inadequate. Committee approved unanimously the motion that Laura Stein and ~~David Spiselman~~ write a letter to Terry Burnes, with copies to Rich Gordon and Paul Koenig stating that (1) An extension is needed for proper review of this item, and (2) For now, the MCCC stands by it's earlier recommendation of adoption of the CPI as amended by the Coastal Commission.

-----  
B. BoS Consent Agenda Item for Tuesday, February 10, 10:00AM: "... hearing to consider a resolution authorizing the execution of an agreement with EIP Associates for the preparation of the Mirada Surf Development Environmental Impact Report."

The issue of how the County had dealt with the process was discussed: The County had mailed the Request For Proposal (RFP) to 7 environmental consulting firms and only 2 had responded with proposals. One firm, Brady LSA of Berkeley, had been recommended to the County by members of the MidCoast Council. It was reported that (1) representatives of Brady LSA had

called the County with questions concerning the RFP and received no response, (2) P&Z members questioning the County about this were told that it was their policy not to response to questions concerning RFPs so as not to give an unfair advantage to any of the applicants, and (3) Bill Rozar at the County stated that they had never received any calls.

The question was brought up as why an EIR is even necessary at this point, and why the County isn't dealing with the larger issues of the changes to the Zoning, General Plan and LCP first, rather than proceeding with a project EIR.

It was discovered, after a thorough search of the Council office, that the Council had never received a copy of the RFP. The Council had received copies of the two proposals submitted, which weren't available for review at this meeting.

The suggestion was raised that the Council ask the County to allow the Council to interview the applicants for the EIR consultant firm. There was also concern expressed over how the process is structured to make it easier for the owners of the property to avoid submitting a concept plan and the appearance of implied consent to the project by proceeding with an EIR.

Motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to have Laura Stein call Supervisor Gordon and ask for removal of the item from the Consent Agenda based on incomplete notification, incomplete information, and questions and concerns about the process.

\*\*\*\*\*

Follow-up and Editorial Comment: Thursday (2/5/98), I contacted Dave Holbrook, the County planner for this project, about obtaining a copy of the RFP. He is sending a copy to the MCC PO Box, which should be there Friday or Saturday. He is also sending extra copies of the proposals from the two responding firms for our study.

We discussed the process at length, and Dave pointed out that this item on the Supervisors' agenda was the approval of the contract, and possibly not the best place to be arguing the merits of the project. He agreed that concerns over the selection process should be communicated to Supervisor Gordon. We agreed that a critical point for public input in this process would be the EIR scoping meeting, which would be held toward the end of February or early March at the El Granada School. At that point it would be important for members of community to be sure that the study would include all the aspects they feel are important to be studied, especially the larger issues of the proposed changes to the General Plan, Zoning, and LCP. He stated that he felt EIP had demonstrated the most awareness of the importance of these larger issues, and that was a factor in their selection. He recommends that their proposal be studied carefully in preparation for the scoping meeting.

I would suggest it is still important that Laura contact Rich Gordon, and express the concerns and questions raised, and see what his thoughts are on whether he would be willing to pull the item based on that input.

End Editorial Comment

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
C. Planning Commission Consent Agenda Item for Wednesday, Feb. 11: Request for reallocation of water capacity (2) from properties in Princeton to private home sites in Half Moon Bay.

This item had apparently been discussed at the HMB City Council the previous Tuesday, with no resolution because no one knew what to do about it. It was discussed whether priority water allocations had ever been transferred from the Unincorporated MidCoast to the City of HMB before - no

one could remember it happening. The relevant LCP section (2.8c) allows public agencies and utilities to reallocate Phase I priority capacity to non-priority land uses under certain circumstances - and while CCWD does serve both Princeton and HMB, the LCP does not mention one way or the other about transferring them out of the area covered by the LCP, although one would assume that was not the intent. Wouldn't one?

Motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to write a letter from David Spiselman, Chair of the MCC, and the P&Z committee asking the Planning Commission to remove the item from their consent agenda and delay action upon the application until these issues are further reviewed.

-----  
 At this point a discussion ensued about asking for all these delays, and it was brought up that most of the information on these items had only arrived on the MidCoast on Tuesday, Feb. 3, and they were for agenda items the following week in Redwood City. As there was no time to study them before the P&Z meeting, and the next MCC meeting would be after both the Supervisors meeting and the Planning Commission meeting, it was nearly impossible for the MidCoast community to properly study and address these issues. Various members of the committee offered to bring this bad timing up with contacts at the County and to begin thinking of ways to get full agendas, packets, and reports in a timely manner from the County. This topic will probably be discussed at the P&Z organizational meeting (see item #1 below.)

-----  
 D. Planning Commission Agenda Item for Wednesday, Feb. 11: Coastal Development Permit, Peter Vanos, construction of 15 soil-dependent greenhouses in Pescadero.

As the MCC had heard this item and written an advisory letter already on this item, no action was taken by the committee.

-----  
 E. South Moss Beach Affordable Housing Proposal:

The scoping meeting for the EIR for this project has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 18th, 7 PM at the El Granada School. The committee voted unanimously to schedule a strategy and review meeting on this project for Tuesday, February 10, 7:30 PM at the MCC office at the HMB Airport. Information on the project may be obtained from Joe Sordi, the County Planner for the project. His number is (650) 363-1867.

-----  
 1. Set time, date and place for special meeting to address by-laws and Charter for Planning and Zoning Committee, to cover topics such as voting, long/short-term planning, interaction with other committees, regular schedule, etc.

The committee voted unanimously to schedule this meeting for Thursday, February 12th, 7:30 PM at the 2-0 cafe at the HMB airport. Email or call in issues and suggested agenda items to Laura Stein (712-0225 or laura.mclaughlin@worldnet.att.net) by Monday afternoon (2/9) so she can get the agenda posted 72 hours in advance. This will be a posted, public meeting.

-----  
 2. Zoning Hearing Officer Consent Agenda Items for February 5, 1998:

(a) Consideration of a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to allow conversion of an existing storage building to retail fish market use

(b) Consideration of a Use Permit and a Coastal Development Permit to allow construction of a new single family residence at 325 Coronado in Miramar on a non conforming parcel of 4,400 sq. ft where the minimum parcel size is 10,000 sq. ft.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend rejection of item (b) as on

the Hearing Officer's Agenda on the following points:

- \* Use Permits and Variances should not be allowed while the Substandard Lot Study is underway.
- \* The project is out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood.
- \* The project is contrary to zoning and planning for that area
- \* This, and other similar projects, will accumulatively result in adverse affects to Coastal Resources by exceeding the planned buildout of the LCP.

### 3. Substandard Lots:

After presentations by Tim Duff and Kathryn Slater-Carter, and discussion by the whole committee, the committee voted unanimously to:

- \* Ask for the study to be broadened to include all lots that are substandard within their zoning (As in Miramar and others areas with zonings others than s-17 and include commercial.)
- \* To get a more accurate count of the number of Substandard Lots, request that the County:
  - a. Include consideration of unmerged developed lots
  - b. Include Caltrans ROW property in Urban, Rural Residential, and Rural areas
  - c. Apply current Planning Department precedents and practices to these properties
- \* Support the basic concept of proposed merger ordinance based on application for development, and request the County broaden the proposed Merger Ordinance to include Floor/Area Ratio (FAR), Lot Coverage, and Setback Restrictions that encourage merger for larger houses and encourage use of existing single owner substandard lots for affordable housing.
  - a. ~~Care should be taken on setbacks matching modular housing sizes~~
- \* Agree on the need for a workshop to define all the issues clearly before we can offer solutions.
- \* Recommend the MCC, at their next scheduled meeting of 2/11/98, write a letter to the County saying we need this more complete data to begin working on solutions. If data cannot be supplied in timely manner before scheduled 3/10 hearing before BoS, hearing should be delayed.

4. Design Review: Determine questions we need answered from the County on this process and decide what organizational structure will best address this project.

This item was deferred to the Thursday, 2/12 P&Z organizational meeting.

5. Del Monte/Portola Project and El Granada Highlands Project - Review of adherence to County ordinances; adequacy of roads, retaining walls, parking, grading slopes; Action to be taken:

The Del Monte Project had been discussed at the previous P&Z meeting, so this discussion focused on the project at 119 Highland in El Granada, DSR #97-0182.

Sponsor Kathryn Slater-Carter presented that there is no staff report on this project, only a set of blueprints that appear to misrepresent the scope, implications and setting of the project - two examples: the "paper street" Highland is shown as a fully developed street in the project plans, while in reality it is just a footpath, and a close inspection of the contours on the plans indicate a 20 foot cut is necessary for the proposed driveway, yet no retaining wall or other reinforcing construction is indicated.

Kathryn will continue to follow this project.

6. CUSD proposed "land swap" - How does it fit in with LCP buildout?

This item was only briefly visited - MCC Chair David Spiselman presented for review by members of the committee a draft of the letter he will deliver to the CUSD Board meeting on Feb. 26th. Adoption of the letter by the MCC will be on the consent agenda of their next scheduled meeting on Feb. 11th, 1998. Copies of the letter for review are available from David: 728-1714 or dave-s@coastside.net.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10 PM.