

September 26, 2017

Owen Lawlor
Moss Beach Associates, LLC
612 Spring Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Lawlor:

SUBJECT: Coastside Design Review
Vallemar Street at Juliana Avenue, Moss Beach
APNs 037-086-230.-240,-250,-260,-270,-280, & -290;
County File No. PLN 2015-00380

At its meeting of September 14, 2017, the San Mateo County Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC) considered your request for a Design Review (DR) recommendation for each of four new homes on four reconfigured lots as follows:

LOT 1: A new 4,740 sq. ft., 3-story single-family residence (includes a 408 sq. ft. 3rd story mezzanine area), with a 576 sq. ft. detached 2-car garage, located on a (proposed) 23,473 sq. ft. parcel*, including removal of one (1) significant (Monterey cypress) tree and associated grading (250 cu/yds of cut and 400 cu/yds of fill; net import 150 cu/yds).

LOT 2: A new 4,859 sq. ft. 3-story single-family residence (includes a 776 sq. ft. 3rd story mezzanine area), with a 585 sq. ft. attached 2-car garage, located on a (proposed) 22,220 sq. ft. parcel*, including removal of nine (9) significant and two (2) non-significant (Monterey cypress) trees and associated grading (300 cu/yds of cut and 500 cu/yds of fill; net import 200 cu/yds).

LOT 3: A new 4,740 sq. ft. 3-story single-family residence (includes a 408 sq. ft. 3rd story mezzanine area), with a 576 sq. ft. detached 2-car garage, located on a (proposed) 24,211 sq. ft. parcel*, including removal of nine (9) significant (Monterey cypress) trees and associated grading (0 cu/yds of cut and 1100 cu/yds of fill; net import 1100 cu/yds).

Lot 4: A new 4,740 sq. ft. 3-story single-family residence (includes a 408 sq. ft. 3rd story mezzanine area), with a 576 sq. ft. attached 2-car garage, located on a (proposed) 32,324 sq. ft. parcel*, including removal of eleven (11) significant (Monterey cypress) trees and associated grading (50 cu/yds of cut and 1100 cu/yds of fill; net import 1050 cu/yds).

All four proposed residences are on a 2.48-acre site (zoned: RM-CZ/DR; located within a County Scenic Corridor), and are part of a broader project consisting of Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Resource Management and Grading Permit on 4 reconfigured parcels (*via a



proposed Lot Line Adjustment which will adjust the existing 7 legal lots down to 4 lots) on a 2.48-acre site (zoned: RM-CZ/DR; located within a County Scenic Corridor). A hearing before the Planning Commission for the entire project will take place at some point after the CDRC Meeting. The associated CDP is appealable to the CA Coastal Commission.

The CDRC was unable to make the findings necessary for the Design Review recommendation based on certain design deficiencies. In order to resolve these deficiencies in the project's design, a more thorough review of the "Standards for Design for One-Family and Two-Family Residential Development in The Midcoast" manual is required, specifically on Section 6565.20, Subsections (B), (C), (D), (E) and (F), as further discussed below. The references to the DR standards below refer to all four property plans presented collectively on the four proposed lots, whose boundaries would be adjusted from the currently existing seven parcels

Application Submittal Deficiencies

- a. The revised total square footage submissions on the Application for Design Review are not consistent with plans figures. In addition, agenda descriptions are still incorrect and inconsistent. The revised applications contain inconsistent information. The square footage has been manually changed but the project description is unchanged and reflects the original square footage (using different calculations).
- b. The project description on the drawings/plans submitted for review references five dwellings rather than four.
- c. Total floor area (gross) is calculated differently on the new set of plans vs. the original. The original square footage (cited in the July DR submittal documents) included that of the lower/main/mezzanine levels and the garage and garage storage areas. The revision calculations on the submitted plans is for the lower and main floor areas only and does not include the dormered/mezzanine space. This creates a misrepresentation (or misleading) of the overall square footage reduction and the effort to reduce the overall size/mass/bulk of these projects.

Inconsistencies with Cited Design Review Standards

References to applicable DR standards below refer to all four property plans presented collectively on four (4) vs. seven (7) lots, unless otherwise specified.

Section 6565.20(B). NEIGHBORHOOD DEFINITION & NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER.

For the purpose of Design Standards (1. and 2.), the proposed project meets few of the consistency qualities of this single family residential neighborhood definition. While the planned structures are proportionate to each other, they are outside of the current aesthetics and size of the immediate neighborhood context.

Section 6565.20(C) SITE PLANNING & STRUCTURE PLACEMENT. d. Ridgelines, Skylines and View Corridors: While the “low single story entrance facades allow white water ocean view corridors between” houses, the height of all four houses is extreme and renders a looming and massive appearance from the open space bluff and trail. Structures should blend with existing landforms and tree canopy rather than create ridgeline silhouettes. The Design Standards ‘Discussion’ section cites that the Local Coastal Program (LCP) may require the maximum building height for structures located on ridgelines (in this case, the “ridgeline” being the top of the Cypress tree canopy, looking easterly from the bluff top trail) in the Cabrillo Highway Scenic Corridor to be lower than the maximum allowed by the Zoning Regulations.

Section 6565.20(C) e. Relationship to Open Spaces. The structure should harmonize with the natural setting with regard to massing and special attention should be paid to where residential and open space land uses meet.

Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN: 1. Building Mass Shape and Scale: The average size home in the surrounding area and immediately adjacent properties is 2200 sq. ft. The proposed structures exceed scale by an average MINIMUM of 70% and are disproportional in size to the neighborhood STANDARD (1). Although there is exterior wall articulation “adding visual intrigue to the property,” the proposed structures include 3rd story mezzanine areas that add excessive height STANDARDS (1-2). While there was some adjustment to the roof lines, only minimal height reductions were re-submitted. Project size of each individual structure still far exceeds neighboring homes.

Section 6565.20(E) ADDITIONAL SITE PLANNING & DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS. The “variable color scheme” is a colored panel insert but the overall structure is the identical across the contiguous projects. The structures’ design style, exterior detail and roof height is repetitive in all respects and wholly isolated from other neighborhood structures and appear as a tract development STANDARDS 1.a-c.

Section 6565.20(H) SECOND UNITS: No second units are allowed in RM/CZ zoning districts.

Recommended Changes:

1. Lots 1, 2, 3, 4: Eliminate 3rd story non-integrated dormers.
2. Lot 1, 2, 3, 4: Vary protrusions, roofs and decks on façade at the gathering room.
3. Lot 1: Introduce a shed roof at the west corner and 3rd level roof deck to reduce the impact of the vertical corner element.
4. Lots 1, 2, 3, 4: Oceanside variations shall include a window corner wrap on the NW corner in an effort to reduce the vertical bulk/mass appearance from the coastal trail side and neighboring home to the north.

5. Lot 1: Present an option for a 10 to 12-footss tree to be located in the NW corner of the property, but behind biotic easement boundary line.
6. Lot 4: Change the façade protrusion to a box window in the gathering room.
7. Grape stake fencing shall not exceed 30 inches on the easterly side of the bluff trail; materials transparency shall remain at a minimum 50%.
8. Exterior lighting is limited to single dark-sky compliant fixtures at the garages and other openings as required by building code. Actual placement of all fixtures should be prevalent on the revised plans. No additional site or landscape lighting is proposed.
9. Provide actual samples of exterior materials and colors. Refrain from color coding the structures. Weathered wood color shades vs. paint color/tone or stucco or cementitious hardy are acceptable options.

At the meeting, you were presented with the following available options at the end of the CDRC's deliberation of the project: 1) request for a recommendation from the CDRC on the plans presented, or 2) request that the project be considered at the next meeting to provide you with ample time to consider and incorporate the elements recommended for project redesign. You chose the second option, and the CDRC directed staff to schedule your project for consideration at a later date.

Please contact Dennis P. Aguirre, Design Review Officer, at 650/363-1867, if you have any questions.

To provide feedback, please visit the Department's Customer Survey at the following link: <http://planning.smcgov.org/survey>.

Sincerely,



Dennis P. Aguirre
Design Review Officer

DJH:DPA:aow - DPABB0563_WAN.DOCX

cc: Dianne Whitaker, Member Architect
Stuart Grunow, Member Architect
Melanie Hohnbaum, Moss Beach Community Representative
Beverly Garrity, Montara Community Representative