City of Pacific Grove Local Coastal Program Update Process (LCP)

Summary Notes for Public Workshop #3
Draft Implementation Plan and Implementing Ordinances
Wednesday, February 10, 2016  6:00 - 8:30 p.m.
Pacific Grove Community Center


Workshop #3 Meeting Description
The meeting began with a brief review of background information about the LCP Update purpose and process within the context of preparing required Local Coastal Program documents: an Updated Land Use Plan (LUP) and an Implementation Plan and then presented information specific to the Implementation Plan (ordinances). The presentation was followed by table discussions focused on community input regarding zoning for 3 specific areas - Beachcomber Inn, Asilomar Conference Grounds, and American Tin Cannery. Results of the discussions were then provided through a summary "reporting out" from each of the table groups. All comments are welcomed and encouraged as part of the workshop process. Comment cards were provided at the workshop and can also be obtained from the City or comments can be submitted by mailing or emailing directly to the City or to Anastazia Aziz, Senior Planner at aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org.

All comments will be reviewed by the City's Economic Development & Planning staff and by EMC Planning Group, Inc. (the consultants hired to assist the City with preparation of the Land Use Plan Update and Implementation Plan). Comments will be carefully considered during the plan-making process but will not be individually responded to during the LCP process due to time and budget constraints.

Background Information

A. Local Coastal Program Overview
A Certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) is required by the Coastal Act. Cities are encouraged to adopt Local Coastal Programs. The Coastal Act notes that "... [the] local community has a better understanding of how to best manage the area's unique coastal resources...".

The Local Coastal Program consists of two components: a Land Use Plan and an Implementation Plan. The City is in the process of Updating its Land Use Plan (which provides policy for the City) and preparing an Implementation Plan (ordinances providing direction to enact the policies). The LCP Update process is a 2-year process (2014-2016).

Once an LCP is approved by the City and the Coastal Commission, the approved/certified LCP will allow local jurisdiction (City) review for projects within the designated coastal zone rather than having to take all projects to the Coastal Commission for approval consideration. The Coastal Commission will retain jurisdiction for appeals of local decisions should that need arise. A certified LCP can also allow for administrative and procedural efficiency and potential cost savings when processing projects.
B. The Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan Process for the Local Coastal Program Update

An update to the current Draft Land Use Plan already adopted by the City is in process now. The process has included preparation of a background report and a "vulnerability assessment" document to describe areas at risk from climate change effects (such as gradual seawater rise and changes in wave action) to assist in informing the LCP update. These reports were completed and approved by coastal commission staff in January 2015.

The City is working closely with Coastal Commission staff during the update process and is engaged in numerous efforts to inform and include the public during the update process including: holding community meetings, walks and workshops; reports and discussions during Planning Commission and Council meetings and study sessions; regularly posting information on the City's website; having staff available to respond to questions and comments; and, incorporating community comments and feedback during the document preparation process.

Preparation of the Implementation Plan includes City staff and the EMC consultant team working together to update the 1999 Draft Implementation Plan previously prepared by the City. That update process is also underway and involves Planning Commission and City Council study sessions and review and public meetings and workshops during the next few months. The revised Final Implementation Plan will then be presented to the City's Planning Commission and City Council for consideration and adoption prior to submitting both the revised Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan to the Coastal Commission for its consideration and certification in Spring 2016.

Once certified, the Local Coastal Program components (Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan) will again come before the City Council for final acceptance. Upon final acceptance by the City, authority for issuance of permits will be transferred from the Coastal Commission to the City.

Workshop #3 Topic: Draft Implementation Plan - Zoning Anomalies

The Land Use Plan provides land use designations throughout the City. Focus of Workshop #3 was to discuss three areas and the current zoning and potentially posed zoning for those areas: Beachcomber Inn, Asilomar Conference Grounds, and the American Tin Cannery (ATC). At the workshop, a map was provided defining and noting current zoning. A handout about existing development standards for C-2 and C-V zoning was provided regarding the ATC.

The Beachcomber Inn area is currently zoned C-2 and also shows Visitor Accommodation in the Land Use Plan. The discussion topic posed to the group for this area was: Should the area separately remain C-2 or be included as part of the Sunset Service Commercial (SSC) designation?

The Asilomar Conference Grounds are currently zoned for commercial and multi-residential uses and are indicated as Open Space Institutional and Open Space Recreational in the Land Use Plan. The discussion topic posed was: Should zoning be changed from Commercial (C-1-T) and Residential (R-1-B-3 and R-3-M) to Unclassified (U), keep R-3-M, or keep existing zoning? [Note: C-1-T = Light Commercial/Hotel/Condominium District; R-1-B-3 = Single Family Residential, and R-3-M = Multiple Family Residential].

The American Tin Cannery (ATC) is noted as Visitor Commercial in the Land Use Plan (LUP). The current zoning is C-V and C-2 (Visitor Commercial District and Heavy Commercial District). The discussion topic posed was: Current ballot language proposes to rezone the site C-V ATC and craft site specific
development standards, as none are outlined in the LUP. If the ballot measure fails, the Implementation Plan proposes to zone the property V-C with a notation that hotel use requires voter approval to permit the use and shall be obtained prior to submitting an application for a Use Permit.

Community Workshop # 3 -- Report of Table Discussions
Three discussion tables had an average of 4 participants and one facilitator. Participants discussed the proposed three topics and then reported out to all in attendance at the workshop. The following comments were noted at the various tables:

1. Topic: Area A - Beachcomber Inn

Table 1
- Put in Sunset Service Commercial
- Graduate height and coverage
- Contact property owner to see if receptive to change

Table 2
- It is the City’s obligation to contact the property owner and see if owner is receptive to including in the Sunset Service Commercial area
- Put in Sunset Service Commercial area

Table 3
- Was it in the City originally?
- Should be in Sunset Service Commercial area

2. Topic: Area B - Asilomar Conference Grounds

Table 1
- Use Unclassified for large portion of area and R-3-M for smaller portion

Table 2
- Facilitate existing uses
- Map approved in 2013 --- how did C-1-T get on map?
- Prefer Unclassified and R-3-M zoning

Table 3
- Need more information
- Like current use and facility as it is

3. Topic: Area C - American Tin Cannery

Table 1
- ATC standards in Code, Table under C-V -- Unit count

Table 2
- Zone C-2 on back portion and C-V on front portion
- Or have whole area as C-2 or C-V ATC
Table 3:
- Questioned accuracy of city attorney statement regarding C-V Zone as C-V - ATC
- Have consistency in approach
- Note "Ciani vs San Diego Trust 1991 regarding "Special Community"; look at Coastal Act sections 30251 and 30253(e) -- 1975 Coastal Plan defines special communities and neighborhoods -- implement the Coastal Plan
- Look at Trail System -- consider affordable homes in duets with trail

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE COMMENT PERIOD TO FEBRUARY 29

1. Unsigned: Provided list of questions: 7-day limit in permit process? In Hazard and Scenic overlays, what criteria would be used? Specific requirements via building code and construction standards? Requirements regarding wall and overcropping of bluff areas? Planning process if community is going to relocate certain properties/areas?

2. L Ciani: Comments regarding items in labeling, content and formatting of documents, consistency between maps and documents in the LUP and IP, zoning, various maps, wildlife corridors, building heights, Coastal Act references, "special communities", Black Oystercatcher nesting areas, erosion, sea level rise, Coastal Commission appeal areas, sensitive coastal resource areas, fire and flood hazard zones, locations of public utilities, and LiMPETS program.

3. A Ciani: Comments and citations regarding "Special Communities", samples of definitions and suggested changes to materials and LUP and IP documents. Preparing detailed listing of various policy corrections, definitions, possible implementing actions and ordinances, maps and diagrams to assist in the LUP and IP effort.

4. L. Coletti: Comments regarding Local Water Project, sea level rise, potential hazards, updating zoning for the Vista Point Apartments parcel as part of LCP process, and including the back nine of the Golf Links as a scenic area.

5. J. Haines: Comments related to ice plant.

6. J. Bridges: Suggested including the back nine as a designated scenic area, and offered specific wording of "Business support services" and P/3 rather than UP in the Sunset commercial area.

7. T. Akeman: Comments regarding harbor seal pupping area protection and fencing/policy language suggested in the IP.

8. K. Wilde: Questions regarding fencing language in IP, and whether vacation rentals will be addressed in the IP.

9. A. Jeffers: Comments relative to identified specific west-side parcels and fencing/language in IP.

10. L. Lawrence: Information related to identified specific west-side parcels and fencing/language in IP.
11. A. Rudolph: Comments and background information regarding zoning designation for Russell Service Center.

12. M. Flaig: Background information regarding C-1-T zoning in area B.