



LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MAY 7, 2018

6:30 pm

Sea Pines Golf Resort – Large Conference Room

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

LOCAC Members:

Margaret Mayfield – Chairperson
Lynette Tornatzky (LT) – District One
Yael Korin (YK) – District One
Larry Bender (LB) – District Three
Tim Carstairs (TC) – District Four

Public Members:

Julie Tacker (JT)
Linde Owen (LO)
Robert Mayfield (RM)
Paul Hershfield (PH)
Trish Bartel (TB)

1. GREETINGS AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. ROLL CALL

Absent: Tim Carstairs, Trish Bartel

3. CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

4. MEMBER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

5. AGENDA ITEMS, INCLUDING PUBLIC COMMENT:

A. DRC2018-00031 LANDRY Proposed Minor Use Permit for a 480 sf garage addition to existing guest house at 1480 Hollister Lane in Los Osos.

Discussion:

The owner and his agent were there to describe their project and answer any questions. The project is for the addition of a 480 sf garage to an existing guest house on the property, separated by a covered breezeway. The lot is about 1 acre and has several outbuildings.

The committee had no major concerns or comments, and the project was unanimously voted to be placed on the consent agenda for the next LOCAC meeting.

B. DRC2017-00094 LEE: Proposed Minor Use Permit for landscaping and boardwalk encroaching into First street, located at the south end of First Street.

The owner's agent, Bob Crizer, was present to discuss the project and answer any questions. The plan has been reviewed by Public Works and found in compliance with their requirements for maintaining the public-right-of-way, and the plan shows the required clearances for vehicular and pedestrian access. It has also been reviewed by Cal Fire and meets their fire, life safety requirements.

Questions and comments from the public and committee members included the following:

1. The plan shows only 5 parking spaces. Mr. Crizer responded that the plan originally included 15 spaces but the project has been scaled back to the east side only - on the undeveloped west side of the street you could park 10 cars. Public Works has approved of the parking layout.
2. The issue of water supply for the plants has not been addresses by Mr. Lee and is a concern. Has there been any water offsets as part of the project? Mr. Crizer replies that water offsets are required only for building construction, not landscaping projects.
3. There are numerous public events on Mr.Lee's property, but he does not provide the required parking for those events.

4. First St. is the only way to access the 1st St. beach, and there is currently 80' available for plenty of parking.
5. The 80 foot width of 1st St. has served the community for decades- his project restricts use of the street.
6. Would like to see documentation that shows Mr. Lee has the consent of the owners of the adjacent properties his project fronts.
7. There should be a better parking plan for that area.
8. Improvements such as those proposed can have both commercial and community benefits. Such projects help make the area more family friendly, more attractive to visitors and make our town a better place for residents as well.
9. The plan looks reasonable and meets the County's requests. I live by Sea Pines, and the concerts can be noisy but I deal with it. I think it is an improvement over a dirt road.
10. This is public land- how is it ok that he can do this?
11. What about all the other items on the plan, showing future development? 5' walkways etc. Mr. Crizer explained that these do not denote future development but were required by the County to be on the plans to show that there is still room in the public right of way for required vehicular and pedestrian access with the proposed improvements.
12. The bark made me feel like I was trespassing- like it was private property.
13. The LUC should recommend the project be stopped and the land restored. The boardwalk is restricting access.
14. Lisa Denker provided a history of the 1995 development efforts of the Back Bay Inn, and also stated the proposed plan does not comply with conditions of compliance placed on the property by the Coastal Commission.
15. There needs to remain a buffer between the business and residential zones of the neighborhood.
16. Bob Crizer stated he has lived on first street, and this is far better than when it was just a dirt road- a dirt road is not beautiful, and there is still public access to the water and the beach and no wetlands have been encroached upon.
17. Parking is an issue- 2nd street is under parked, this area could be developed for needed parking.
18. In 1990 there was an effort to make it into a park- the County turned it down.
19. PH- Why isn't the public a part of the process for developing the plan? Doesn't seem a public benefit, and he should keep his improvements on his own land.
20. YK- Public Works told him to remove all illegal encroachments and he did not. Chair replies that Public Works did not require him to remove the items that he planned on including in his encroachment permit application, and that that is standard procedure pending a decision on the permit application.
21. JT- Is concerned that this is becoming a popularity contest and wished that Mr. Lee had applied for a permit first before doing the work, and that with all the development he has done he should have known a permit was required. Also, the plans should call for native, drought tolerant landscaping.
22. LT- It was an ugly dirt road before- this is just an encroachment permit so if the County wants to take it back they can. LT also brought a copy of the comments posted on Next Door, pointing out most of them were in support of Mr. Lee's improvements.

23. LB- Mr. Lee needs to stop encroaching whenever he wants- there are rules and T23 sets the rules. Change doesn't have to happen- it can stay the way it is. There are also many statements on the permit application that seem intended to deceive, such as answering 'No' to the question asking if there are any springs, streams, lakes or marshes on or near the site.
24. LO- Mr. Lee should have consulted the public on his plans and had he done so he could have arrived at something both would have liked. If he is doing it for the community, he should have talked to them.
25. LT- This is the beginning of the process and conditions can be attached to his permit that provide for what others would like to see in the plan.
26. PH- We should pretend as if nothing is there and work with the community to arrive at a plan everyone likes.
27. Mr. Crizer- that would be great and he is willing to work with the community and listen to their ideas.
28. YK- makes a motion to recommend denial of the permit and that Mr. Lee be required to remove all planting and other improvements back to the property line before being allowed to proceed with an encroachment permit application. Motion fails.
29. LB- Asks if we might consider postponing a vote and continuing the discussion to the next LUC meeting. Mr. Crizer objects to the idea, as well as some others on the LUC, as it the LUC's role to provide a recommendation in a timely manner. LB then makes a motion to recommend denial of the permit request. The motion fails with a 4-4 vote.

6. PUBLIC OR MEMBER COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

7. ADJOURN