MIDCOAST COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Serving the Communities of Princeton, El Granada, Moss Beach, Montara and Miramar

DATE:

January 20, 1993

TO:

Valerie Barone

FROM:

MidCoast Community Council

RE:

Comments on Application USE91-0011/CDP91-0063: Seaside Inn

At its meeting of January 13, 1993, the MidCoast Community Council received a presentation of the Seaside Inn project from the applicant, and has the following comments to forward:

1. Building Form, Materials and Color.

We generally find that the building form is well suited to the site, with the building presenting a two story profile towards Highway 1. The numerous wall planes help add interest and reduce the scale of the structure. The cedar siding and weathered color are compatible with the coastal character.

2. Landscaping.

Parking lot landscaping is very minimal, particularly considering that all but approximately a four foot depth of the front landscaping is within Caltrans' right—of—way. Given the potential for future road widening, the majority of front landscaping should be on the project site. There is no landscaping on either side of the parking lot.

3. Front Facade.

While the building elevation facing the ocean has considerable interest, the other three facades lack detailing. The is particularly important on the front elevation, which would benefit from windows or other architectural features.

4. Bluff Retention.

There was a great deal of concern expressed over the location of the motel with regards to the existing bluff. The cross section diagram suggests that the site would be graded down to the water, eliminating the existing bluff and placing the structure in close proximity to the public coastal trail under construction. The architect has subsequently indicated that the cross section is in error and that the building is located a minimum of 15 feet from the bluff top at the closest corners. The cross section should be corrected (with existing topography indicated) and the structure should be setback an adequate distance with sufficient landscaping to comply with Policy

8.4 of the LCP.

5. Traffic Safety.

Although a grading plan was not presented to the Council, the applicant suggests that landscape berms will be retained along the highway frontage. A traffic study should assure that adequate sight distance is provided for vehicles exiting the site and should also consider the possible need for acceleration/deceleration lanes.

6. Cumulative Development/Community Character.

Concern was expressed by members of the public and some Council members that this and other potential coastside development will result in loss of the rural character of the area. Some Council members felt the building was generally too large and the number of rooms excessive for the size of the site.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Mada Oleasse pag

Chairman

cc: Ed Muffiney, Architect Chris Gustin, City of Half Moon Bay