

Mid-Coast Community Council – Planning & Zoning Committee
October 7, 1998

Disclaimer: These notes are not official minutes. They have not been approved by Mid-Coast Community Council or the Planning & Zoning Committee.

MCCC Committee members present: Laura Stein, Ric Lohman, Mary Hobbs, David Spiselman
Alternates: Katherine Slater Carter, Tim Duff, Chuck Kozak
Members of the Public: Fran Pollard, Dennis Doherty, Leonard Woren

Meeting started: 8:12 p.m.

Public Comment: David Spiselman is going to set up meeting with Jerry Hill (maximum of 3 MCCC members, so there is not a quorum).

Ric Lohman: Bed & Breakfast - rip/rap on creek bank is violation of builder's CDP
: On Board of Supers agenda, Ohlone Hotel Expansion (in Half Moon Bay) – why on B of S agenda?

8:24 p.m.

Public comment
Letter to County regarding Design Review Process
Laura has designee -Sarah Hindman

Agenda Item: Strengthening Design Review

County? # of non-conforming lots

Questions: community input
S9 and S17 revision

Chuck – county wanted study on non-conforming lots (from their discussion with County).

Bill? What are the proposed S9 and S17 revisions?

(Chuck) – incorporation newer design standards like in Fair Oaks

- Set up Design Review
- FAR (included new setbacks, new 1st/2nd floor ratios)
- Daylight plans
- An other needs to stand zoning regs

MCCC and county would work on this together

Laura to chuck: do they need public meetings to discuss Design Review.

Katherine: for public meetings put together pictures of trailers (mobile homes), old (traditional), and new (Miramar) construction and post in P.O. She does not feel public is involved enough – they (David and her) sampled people at the P.O. and found they had opinions and wanted land use control.

Laura? When should they collect public support for Design Review project?

Katherine: January would be nice in front of the P.O.

Laura? (to Chuck) what is realistic (timeline) to get back to the County with recommendations and show of community support (survey)

Chuck: “there is no good time to do anything”, all agreed beginning of the year would be a good deadline.

8:36 PM

Agenda Item -Mirada Surf

Ric Lohman (at easel) 2 Merits of Proposal

- a) no rezoning
 1. precedents (Bob)
 2. don't need housing rezoning now
 3. offended by 'better than prior ones' outrages
 4. Measure A implications
 5. Amending LCP 'implications'?
 6. Stats 40 acres 15 negotiable Park needs (rides, etc)
 7. Stoplight
 8. Uphold obvious intent of LCP, etc. Mirada has open surf (space??)
 9. Tax B persons on assessment (The Perkovic Argument)
- (I missed Ric's initial presentation”

Laura: MCCC gets 15 minutes to speak at meeting

David: MCCC P&Z does not need to take this back to MCCC full council

Laura: doesn't trust any one person to speak for the council at the meeting – thinks it will be a difficult job to sift out the important ideas for the speaker to present at the meeting

David: read the MCCC agenda item regarding Mirada Surf (not adequately agendaized to vote on)

David: 2 section of documents they submitted?? Fiscal impact and (Traffic??)

Laura: wants MCCC to comment on information but not provide answers to the questions raised

David: there is no Fiscal impact in EIR stated

Mary: says it is not required by CEQA

Katherine: says Fiscal can be property values but not easily quantifiable – but she said losing the park can be fiscal (environmental) on HMB parks or Fitzgerald marine

Leonard: Can other RMCZ owners then also get a change

Tim: he spoke to Jack at Coastal Commission and he said loss at parks (unique) Parks is a General Plan Designation, not zoning

Ric: continued through list – residential zoning – no more houses needed

Time: cite Coastside Community for level F type figures

Ric: wants (from list) “bigger than previous ones’ dropped from EIR

Laura: contacted Mike Murphy (Legal Council, County) he has not responded to her yet; Joe Caruso has

Katherine: Some parts of LCP is ‘starred’ (therefore under Measure A) the EIR avoids these items

Leonard: some people think the parcel is all wetlands

Mary: wetlands is not just puddle after the rains – she feels the wetlands are identified fairly well, but has not walked the parcel (this will be added as a bullet point to the list)

Katherine: Quimby Act requires so much park land for a given amount of population (3 acres to every 1000 people – per Fran Pollard)

Katherine: site next to Farrallon School is only now half-available for parks (other half has llamas)

Chuck: approx. 10 acres site in back of Montara (old bypass row) has park designation (therefore Mirada is one of 3 sites left on the Mid Coast for parks)

Katherine: County will have to pay \$30 for half of stoplight – have the developer pay this and the county give the money to local parks.

Ric: from list - #10) ocean piece as mitigation

- not ‘officially’ in (EIR??)
- in 50 years it will gone (eroded away)

Chuck: they must consider all three parcels in one shot

Katherine: in Montara/Moss Beach, Mirada surf is considered class 1 soil, it was supposed to be left open for mitigation (the soil was to be left available for future use)

11) giving wetlands to school for development? (no building within 100’)

12) Hammerhead trees will eventually be a fire hazard

Katherine: it is going to cost her \$2800 to remove (16??) trees - then what about 16 acres??

13) access easement was supposed to be 50’ – they only have 20’ in plan

14) berm wall – computer simulation shows 8’-0” berm to block view of houses

Laura to Tim and Chuck: must all agencies that receive NOP also receive Draft EIR – Tim – no, Chuck – County fulfills obligation by sending it to the State, the then sends it out

15) amount of grading excessive?

16) Apply for all three parcels in one stop (already commented on)

17) Study is evaluating this as 35 homes on a residential zoning not worst case scenario as 35 homes on open space

Chuck: this is only one part of the project (only impact of putting the houses here) not the zoning changes

Fran: on agenda it stated “35 homes in the unincorporated area of Miramar”

Mary: required by CEQA to address cumulative effects

Katherine: if this is developed then will be continuous homes from HMB to airport

Chuck part of community plan is to preserve open space

Katherine: EIR suggests construction during working hours, non-school hours

Laura: Caltrans recommended traffic study from ??? to Santiago

16.5) did not analyze effects of rezoning

18) if 3-4 density credits can be changed to 35 – what about McNee and???

19) all other studies – attachments and references

20) # of children per home – 1.3, therefore little impact on school

21) inadequate study of school costs

22) taking away parks – adding houses

23) old #'s used to judge

** not approving process by responding to DOC

24) Ag discussion as mitigation for other developments

Fran: Dave Holbrook said “you” can request extension of time for MCCC to comments

Laura: Dave Holbrook is going to fax her the staff report on Mirada Surf (except the attachments) does not include public comment

Chuck: there is also the ‘Technical Appendix’ which Chuck would like to get from Dave Holbrook (through Laura)

Ric: all this information will be brought to a meeting tomorrow night

David: will e-mail his 2 studies on Fiscal and Transportation impacts

Permits 9:48 p.m.

A) Moch (name of applicant) originally applied for in March

B) Single family res in Moss Beach (Seal Cove) 6334 parcel meets all zoning requirements. Bill says there is very little water in that area – wells went 500’ to 700’ and got no water

C) 464 3rd Avenue in Miramar, addition to existing residence

D) Anne Mahon - Cedar St Montara

E) - 1st and Cortez in Miramar