

Ciampa, John

From: Pechous, Jim
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 10:56 AM
To: Anne Blemker (ablemker@mccabeandcompany.net)
Cc: Megan Lawson (mlawson@dudek.com); Ciampa, John
Subject: FW: LUP
Attachments: SC BufferTh13a-10-2008.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI public comments for tonight's meeting

From: Mark McGuire [mailto:mrmcguirelaw@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 10:44 AM
To: Pechous, Jim
Subject: LUP

Hi Jim.

The SCHS Boys Volleyball team (which my son plays on) has a CIF match tonight so I can't make the PC meeting re the LUP. Here are my comments:

1. Page 2-1 reference to Marblehead Coastal references 600,000 plus square feet of commercial, but most is outside of CZ. I think about 120K in CZ.
2. Figure 2-1a—there is a small part (the northernmost tip) of the Shorecliffs property that is (I think inadvertently) not shown as RH, and I can't tell whether the southern edge is the same as shown in prior exhibits. The total acreage designated RH is just over 6.0 acres (I can send you the exhibits Planning Systems was using during the GP process to arrive at the 6.02 acre total).
3. Table 2-1 shows density ranges as the gross max and the net max—this is not how the density ranges have been characterized in the past. Also, still has the two Light Industrial categories with different FARs. I was under impression City was going to eliminate the L1 designation.
4. What are the hours for Parks within the Coastal Zone? I could potentially see different hours for different parks (Linda Lane v. Leslie Park, for example). Also, Marblehead Parks not mentioned in parks section.
5. Policies on page 4-30 relating to Wetland buffers have to be very carefully thought through. RES-36 is internally inconsistent. Says wetland buffer shall not be less than 100 feet except where one demonstrates that a setback of 50-feet is not feasible and the resource can be adequately protected with the lesser setback. The 100/50 numbers need to be either 100/100 or 50/50 for this to read correctly.
6. In my opinion, given the remaining wetlands in the CZ (i.e., not including Marblehead where we worked hard to arrive at site specific setbacks—some greater than 100 feet and some closer than 100 feet), 50 feet is a good distance for a "default" setback, and projects should have an opportunity to seek lesser setbacks if circumstances warrant. The reason I say this is that the wetlands remaining are generally going to be in our canyons where adjacent development is already extensive (indeed the reason wetlands may be there rather than ephemeral drainages is because of urban runoff). For example, City should measure the distance from

some of the drainage courses to existing homes, existing decks, existing fences (all of which would be development that this policy would say has to be set back at least 100 feet in most cases). The proposed exemption for less than 50% remodels is better than nothing but if a 50 foot setback is generally okay (and in a particular case a lesser distance might be fine also given the resources involved), then why develop a policy that prohibits more extensive remodels simply because an existing house is within 100 feet of a drainage course?

7. Attached is the CCC staff report for the small subdivision near Shorecliffs Middle School that had a small drainage on it. I think the situation presented there is very similar to the types of things the City might see in the future (infill development or redevelopment near urban runoff fed wetlands). CCC agreed that 40-50 foot setbacks worked for the project, and reference the existing LUP's "50-foot from riparian" setback as part of the thought process. So I respectfully submit that the City should explain in the LUP why generally 50-feet will work but in some cases a smaller setback may work. If there is anyplace the City thinks a larger setback is needed, it should call that out now.
8. The City staff should consider preparing some exhibits to show the implications of the Canyon setback policies on existing homes. It appears to me that some lots are entirely within Coastal Canyons and as a result may become legally non-conforming homes once the LUP is adopted (because setback policies would not allow them to be built). Good example are the homes along Ola Vista near/within Riviera Canyon. Public and decision-makers need to have a clear understanding of the implications of coastal canyon policies that on the surface may seem fine but as applied create unnecessary hardships.

Thanks for considering these and hope the meeting goes well.

Mark

Ciampa, John

From: Cheryl Moe <cmoearchitecture@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2015 7:29 AM
To: Pechous, Jim
Cc: Ciampa, John
Subject: Honoring prior CDP Setbacks in LCP

Good Morning,
I wanted to follow up on our meeting yesterday. This is a draft of the idea we spoke of yesterday. Thank-you for your help in clarifying this for future planners and commissioners.
Cheryl

Honoring prior CDP Setbacks. Include something like Policy LU-97.

2-33 The Alessandro Development shall be consistent with CDP 5-97-122 as currently amended and as it may be amended in the future. The setbacks established in this CDP will override other setback criteria.