October 12, 1995

Honorable Ted Lempert, President Board of Supervisors County of San Mateo County Government Center Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Coastal Protection Initiative for the 10/18 95 Planning Commission Hearing

Dear President Lempert:

The MidCoast Community Council appreciates the cooperation, and communication the Planning Commission has shown the Council regarding the sequential system of review of the Coastal Protection Initiative.

Our Planning Committee has labored to keep us ahead of the Planning Commission so that our opinion on these three individual matters can be included in the Commission's debate. The Council provided the public with a Special Council Meeting last Monday Oct 9, 1995 to discuss only these issues. In that regard, we herewith transmit our recommendations regarding the three items scheduled for the 10/18 Planning Commission meeting.

Additionally, Mr. Bergman had asked for an explanation of the previously submitted wording "coastal dependent visitor serving". After lengthy review and discussion, we feel some examples may be the best description. A hotel does not need to sit on the bluffs blocking the residents' and visitors' view. A surf board shop would need to be. A gas station would not. A bait and tackle shoppe would. A fast food outlet, (think of the Taco Bell in Linda Mar), would not. An interpretive center would. Picture the types of businesses that depend upon coastal or beach access.

We look forward to seeing the Commission on the MidCoast next week at Seton's Fireside room. Should you or they need anything please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth Vespremi

James Marsh

Chair, Planning Subcommittee 728-9260

Chair, MidCoast Community Council 726-3589

cc Mr. Leo Mariano, Chair Planning Commission Mr. George Bergman

encl

File Coastal Protection Initiative # 95-30

Coastal Protection Initiative Items scheduled to be heard and discussed by the Planning Commission at Seton Hospital's Fireside Room on October 18,1995.

Limit building size on substandard lots.

The Council unanimously supported the Coastal Protection Initiative wording and offered the following additional comments:

As the Council recommended in March 1992, when the issue first came to the Council, we would prefer that the Planning Commission and the Board merge parcels rather than to continue to allow small "unbuildable" parcels to be "conglomerated" solely for the purpose of a larger house (and therefore more profits). We understand that the County has the legal right to compel the merger of lots. Additionally, we know from earlier studies that there are relatively few substandard lots whose common ownership are not contiguous with other small or substandard lots in the MidCoast.

Setback language should be added to the building/planning requirements as a matter of fire and life safety as access behind or between houses, fences, fireplaces, appurtenances, etc should be paramount. Additionally, setbacks create spaces for the view, and the "feel" that help to define the space and therefore the community.

The Council recommends that the Coastal Protection Initiative language be broadened to require only a one story house on the small 25' wide parcels. While limiting the profit on the house sale, smaller one bedroom houses will replenish the stock of small affordable beach houses that began development on the MidCoast. These smaller "affordable" (probably \$200,000 or more!!) houses would allow our children and our parents to have an affordable and or a simpler lifestyle after the kids have moved away.

Currently, retired or empty nesters must move to "Town" (HMB) into some sterile condo complex - this lack of choice robs our community of the varieties of age, of the "folk", this removes the "living history" from our neighborhoods. In essence, the MidCoast is fast becoming a uniform, homogeneous mass of look alike houses and inhabitants.

The Council has listened to, and read the Staff reports for Use permit after Use Permit, and asks that for substandard lots, the Planning Department retreat to the Variance procedures, which we understand are much more restrictive to speculative developers.

# 2 Reduce building height near Pillar Point Harbor

The Council unanimously supported the Coastal Protection Initiative wording and offered the following additional comments:

Additionally, the Council requests that the M1 zoning around the airport be amended to prohibit buildings over 35'. The 75' height as currently shown on the zoning map seems extreme.

3 Clarify density requirements for the rural designated land in the urban area

The Council unanimously supported the Coastal Protection Initiative wording and offered the following additional comments:

The Council feels that the buildout numbers for the MidCoast have been tacitly increased over the years by incremental changes to the intent of the first Community Plan and the LCP. These changes occur daily with the relaxation of Variance procedures, density transfers, density credits, lot line adjustments, rezoning parcel(s), etc.

The Council requests that the Planning Commission require public meetings on the MidCoast prior to any change to zoning - whether on a mega development or the change to a parcel, lot line adjustments, subdivisions etc.