



## MEETING MINUTES

# CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING

6:00 p.m., Thursday, January 11, 2018

Council Chambers – City Hall – 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA

### 1. Call to Order - 6:00 p.m.

### 2. Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Robin Aeschliman, Bill Bluhm (Vice-Chair, arrived 6:58 p.m.), Jeanne Byrne, Mark Chakwin (Secretary), William Fredrickson (Chair), Steven Lilley, Donald Murphy.

Commissioners Absent: none.

### 3. Approval of Agenda

**On a motion by Commissioner Chakwin, seconded Commissioner Lilley, the Commission voted 6-0-1 (Vice Chair Bluhm absent) to approve the agenda. Motion passed.**

### 4. Approval of Minutes

None

### 5. Public Comments

#### a. Written Communications

None

#### b. Oral Communications

The Chair opened the floor to public comment. *(Please refer to the audio recording for more details.)*

- Mathew Schultz, resident, stated that the residence at 615 Junipero Street runs an animal rescue service and expressed concern about it not serving as a professional office use. He opposed any proposed expansion of services to keep dogs there overnight. He stated it would be noisy, problematic and an expansion should not be allowed.
- Luke Coletti, resident, noted the anti-short-term rental ballot initiative kickoff party will be on January 20<sup>th</sup> at [Jewell] Park.
- Robert Carswell, owner of a professional building at 621 Forest Avenue, stated that he did not want the veterinary center at 615 Junipero Street in the R4 zone. He is against the proposed expansion of that facility, and stated it would be dangerous, hurt property values, and would make sleeping difficult.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

## 6. Consent Agenda

None.

## 7. Regular Agenda

### a. **Description:** Local Coastal Program Update - Draft Implementation Plan

**CEQA Status:** Statutory Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15265, Adoption of Coastal Plans and Programs

**Staff Reference:** Anastazia Aziz, AICP, Principal Planner & Mark Brodeur, Director of Community and Economic Development

**Recommendation:** Recommend to City Council adoption of the California Coastal Commission's November 17, 2017 Local Coastal Program - Implementation Plan (IP), with modifications to critical issues

*(Please refer to the audio recording for more details.)*

Principal Planner Anastazia Aziz, AICP, provided a staff report and answered questions.

Commissioner Lilley reported his conversation with the Monterey Plaza Hotel's Executive Secretary regarding the low-cost housing mandate and the Coastal Commission's actions with the City of Monterey.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment.

- Ingrid Lorentzen Doemer stated that zoning limits are unfairly changed in the revised plan. The height standard in her R4 district had been in place, but new changes to reduce height are inappropriate and are not favorable.
- Janet Cohen expressed concern about the elimination of zoning district details in the IP. She also noted the special topography of the Asilomar area, and reaffirmed that protections for the rural character of the area need to be included.
- Lisa Ciani stated that essential natural and coastal resources protections were missing from the revised IP. She noted her discussions with Coastal Commission staff, but neither Coastal nor City staff have taken appropriate steps to maintain these protections.
- Tiffany Cieslak, property owner in the Asilomar Dunes neighborhood, noted that the Coastal Commission recommendations will create challenging problems to build her planned home at 1635 Sunset Drive. She stated that the proposed language would degrade aesthetics, result in more visible vehicles, and put houses closer to the road. She favored the original draft.
- Kathryn Poling, property owner in the Asilomar Dunes neighborhood, recommended rejecting the Coastal Commission (CC) modifications of the original Pacific Grove IP. She felt that the CC proposal overextended its reach. She referenced her letter for changes and inconsistencies that still existed in the Land Use Plan.

*Secretary Chakwin noted that Commissioner Bluhm arrived at 6:58 p.m. The public comments continued.*

- Richard Reimer stated that the proposed new height limits for Sunset Drive are

unreasonable. He felt that the new proposal would create bigger, one-story structures that would cover more landscape. He expressed concerns regarding limiting visibility as well.

- Stephanie and Greg Edenholtz, property owners in the Asilomar Dunes neighborhood, requested the Planning Commission ensure that the IP considers local Asilomar residents' needs and situations. They felt that adding new restrictions on an established, living community is wrong and not needed.
- Dale Ellis, representative of the Russell Service Center (RSC), suggested applying the new policies to current projects to better understand the proposed changes. He provided several examples of how the proposed design standards would render current structures as non-conforming. He stated that the new standards would create difficulty for maintaining existing structures or creating new buildings.
- Karen Locke noted that she was speaking for the environment and environmental justice. In the Asilomar area, people live with nature, and residents have a responsibility to maintain the beautiful area with care and without fences.
- Anne Russel Rudolph, representative of the RSC, expressed concern about the proposed designed standards changes. She noted RSC won the current industrial zoning designation in a lawsuit with the City in 1975. She requested the City to not accept the Coastal Commission proposal.
- Marc Mizgorski, Hayward Lumber President, stated the draft LCP was created locally, but now, Coastal Commission staff proposed a severely different document. He expressed that the law states that the City, not the Coastal Commission, should draft our plan. He requested the City to reject this new proposal, and noted that the new standards penalize Hayward Lumber for its prior land donation to the City for a recreation trail.
- Luke Coletti expressed frustrations about complaints regarding compliance with the Coastal Act. He recommended that people should not live in the Coastal Zone if they do not want to comply with the Coastal Act. He also stated that voter initiatives are not a concern within the Coastal Zone, but the high number of zoning districts is an issue.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Commission discussed the Draft Implementation Plan

**On a motion by Commissioner Byrne, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, the Commission voted 7-0-0 to recommend that the original Implementation Plan, presented December 8, 2016, be updated with corrections offered by Kathryn Poling's letter, and then be presented to the City Council for reconsideration; and that the City employ outside counsel to be representatives in LCP hearings with the California Coastal Commission. Motion passed.**

The Commission discussed the following three additional recommendations.

(1) That the LCP for the City of Pacific Grove be named "The Dr. Julia Barlow Pratt Local Coastal Plan for the City of Pacific Grove," in recognition of her civic and scientific contributions to preserving our Coastal City's marine environment.

**This recommendation was supported by voice vote of 7-0-0. Recommendation passed.**

(2) That text in the draft LUP, Ch 2.1.1 Background - Coastal Hazards and Sea Level Rise on page 29, sentence four, beginning with “As a result...” be amended to render a more accurate descriptive summary of the conditions by adding the words “preserved, but” after the words “with the City has been.” The full sentence will then read:

“As a result, the natural character of the Bay shoreline within the City has been [preserved, but] altered to some extent by shoreline armoring that has been installed between Point Pinos and the Monterey Bay Aquarium at the City’s eastern boundary.”

**This recommendation was supported by voice vote 6-1-0 (Commissioner Murphy dissenting). Recommendation passed.**

(3) That text in the City-Staff recommended modification to Coastal Commission Draft LCP IP, January 2018, Section 23.90.180 Community Design, on page 31 paragraph D.a. be changed to eliminate an unfair condition where some owners, with less than ½ acre, would be allowed 33% more permissible lot coverage than some owners, who had more than ½ acre but less than 2/3 an acre. This change annuls this math penalty.

Original language:

“In no case shall the Primary Coverage Area exceed 15 percent of the total lot area for lots that are greater than one-half acre and 20 percent for lots that are less than one-half acre,”

Modified to

Proposed language:

“In no case shall the Primary Coverage Area exceed 15 percent of the total lot area or 4,356 sq. feet, whichever is greater, for lots that are greater than one-half acre with; and 20 percent for lots that are less than one-half acre with the base maximum.”

**This recommendation was supported by voice vote 6-1-0 (Commissioner Murphy dissenting). Recommendation passed.**

## **8. Presentations**

None.

## **9. Reports of PC Subcommittees**

None.

## **10. Reports of PC Members**

None.

## **11. Reports of Council Liaison**

City Councilmember and Mayor Pro Tempore, Dr. Robert Huitt provided an update on City Council meeting that occurred the previous day. *(Please refer to the audio recording for more details.)*

**12. Staff Announcements**

None.

**13. Adjournment.**

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:40p.m.

---

**APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

---

Mark Chakwin, Secretary

---

Date