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CITY OF HALF MOON BAY
PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2018
7:00 PM

Emergency Operations Center (EOC)
537 Kelly Avenue
Half Moon Bay, California 94019

Rick Hernandez, Chair
Brian Holt, Vice Chair
John Evans, Planning Commissioner
James Benjamin, Planning Commissioner
Les Deman, Planning Commissioner

This agenda contains a brief description of each item to be considered. Those wishing to address the Planning Commission on any matter not listed on the Agenda, but within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to resolve, may come forward to the podium during the Public Forum portion of the Agenda and will have a maximum of three minutes to discuss their item. Those wishing to speak on an agenda item are asked to fill out a speaker card. Speaker(s) will be called forward at the appropriate time during the agenda item in consideration.

Please Note: Please Provide a Copy of Prepared Presentations to the Clerk

Copies of written documentation relating to each item of business on the Agenda are on file in the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall and the Half Moon Bay Library where they are available for public inspection. If requested, the agenda shall be available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132.) Information may be obtained by calling 650-726-8271.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, special assistance for participation in this meeting can be obtained by contacting the City Clerk’s Office at 650-726-8271. A 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable accommodations to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II).

http://hmbcity.com/

MEETING WILL CONCLUDE BY 10:30 PM UNLESS OTHERWISE EXTENDED BY SIMPLE MAJORITY VOTE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MINUTES
DECEMBER 12, 2017
FEBRUARY 13, 2018

CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR ELECTION

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

1.A SAN MATEO COUNTY ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) PRESENTATION -
Receive a presentation from San Mateo County staff regarding county-wide research and
efforts to increase the local inventory of accessory dwelling units (also referred to as 2nd
units). No formal action is requested.

MEMO - San Mateo County ADU Presentation

1.B STUDY SESSION
No formal action is requested. This Study Session is an opportunity for the Planning
Commission to review the architectural plan and site design and to provide direction in
advance of formal review. Public comment will be accepted during the Study Session.

LOCATION: 390 Myrtle Street
APN: 064-062-630
PROJECT: Single Family Residence
STAFF REPORT

ATTACHMENT 1 - Design Plans

1.C STUDY SESSION
No formal action is requested. This Study Session is an opportunity for the Planning
Commission to review the architectural plan and site design and to provide direction in
advance of formal review. Public comment will be accepted during the Study Session.

LOCATION: 555 Poplar Street
APN: 064-243-060
PROJECT: Single Family Residence
STAFF REPORT

ATTACHMENT 1 - New Design Plans
ATTACHMENT 2 - New Design Tandem Alt. Design
ATTACHMENT 3 - Previous Design Plans
ATTACHMENT 4 - Previous Staff Report
1.D PLANNING COMMISSION LOCAL COASTAL PLAN (LCP) UPDATE SUB-COMMITTEE MEMO - LCP Update

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT
Vice Chair Holt called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Planning Commission:
PRESENT: Vice Chair Holt, Commissioner Benjamin
TELECONFERENCE: Chair Hernandez
ABSENT: Commissioners Evans and Deman

Parks and Recreation Commission:
PRESENT: Chair Allshouse, Commissioners Eisen, Bacich, Rotty
ABSENT: Commissioner Ramirez

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL
Vice Chair Holt led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

III. ITEM #1 – DRAFT PARKS MASTER PLAN

Mindy Craig, Bluepoint Planning Design presented the draft Parks Master Plan to the Planning and Parks & Recreation Commissions. The intent of this study session was to receive input from the community and the Commissioners on the draft master plan in advance of bringing the Parks Master Plan to the Parks and Recreation Commission for their recommendation to City Council.

PC/PRC Discussion –
• Carter Park – what type seating wall or animal barrier? What would it look like?
• Funding mechanisms – are any of these projects already budgeted?
  o “Getting some points on the board”
• Look forward to seeing what financial impacts will be in relation to the listed projects.
• What about San Mateo County trails, have we looked at them?
  o Bike/Ped Master Plan covers trials
• Study long term maintenance costs and potential relocation of ballpark to area with less drainage issues
• Bike parking should be in every park
• Need a clear definition of “Park.”
  o Purpose for citizens of Half Moon Bay vs. attraction for visitors to Half Moon Bay. Do not treat regional resources as local resources.
  o Trying to find opportunity for a park for Sea Haven.

Public Comment –

1. Marcia Reilly, HMB Dog Park – Understanding of importance of maintenance. Half Moon Bay’s dog park is the only safe and legal off leash area between Pacifica and Santa Cruz. Need for the area to be increased. Important to keep stakeholders involved with the process.

2. Mike Ferreira – With respect to the County Landfill Site, in a past ballot measure, active use lost by 2:1 to passive use concepts. There is an agreement between City and County about definition of passive/active. The speaker noted that Smith Field is an extremely challenging site due to how it has been developed over time. Be careful to preserve the view of the historic Johnston House saltbox in context with its hillside setting; ancillary buildings around Johnston House visible from Highway 1 could detract.

3. Kerry Burke – resident it is critical time with General Plan – Maintenance is so key, it is essential. Like the ideas of having budget and/or set fund. Bathrooms are essential at parks. Kitty Fernandez Park – design elements do not speak to Pumpkin Festival – would need to be able to be available for community events - not a good location for community garden. Smith Field – what could we do better? Redondo Beach – do not short change this area. Proponent for an aquatic center.

4. Jo Chamberlain, Coastside Land Trust – something new has just happened – planning for the Seymour Ditch. Working with the City about how to deal compressively with water. Long term goal is to slow water down, but there is currently poor water quality; would like large/permanent wetlands on Coastside Land Trust Property.

5. Peter Krouse, resident – volunteer with several organizations. Neighbors – concerned about traffic/safety issues that could be created if a park is developed at the POST property next to Cypress Cove. Very excited to read about the Carter Park plans.
6. **John Callan, San Mateo Land Exchange** – Redondo Beach Road – getting a short shrift – County had considered a park in that area. Currently it is a ‘rats nest,’ down there.

**PC /PRC Discussion** –
- Seniors—with limited mobility need a park on the south end of Main Street that satisfies them.
- Johnson House is too far to walk for many. It will need parking.
- The 1/4-mile rule should govern any new Central Park.
- Tourists come for beach or biking, so any park development should target these needs.
- Priorities – future/funding to get Half Moon Bay excited about what can be done here.
  - Operations and maintenance is #1 priority
  - Poplar Beach – in the works
  - Carter Park – move it to #1 priority – would help Shakespeare people – get ball rolling to get people excited –would give people a vision.
- Maintenance is a priority key issue.
- Smith Field is a family park but need to look into a community park that is a family park.
- Dogs – maybe need to increase dog parks – allow for diverse needs of dogs.
- PC – LCP relationship.
  - Ambiguity of visitors vs. residents – funding for Coastal Trail is readily available.
- Do not set stage for development that would be injurious to neighborhoods
- Small inconsistencies (e.g. page 23 trail too close to bluff top)
- Horse trail – a linear function, but promotes erosion at Pilarcitos Creek
- Smith Field – good public comment
- Smith Field continues to be good money spent on bad. Evaluate relocating the entire park to a location more suitable and sustainable for such an active use. This will allow us to expand the park, provide facilities with proper drainage, and improve the view corridor to the Ocean.
- POST-acquisition of Halsted property – wants the plan to be opportunistic
- Trails don’t address erosion
- Johnston House – important for architecture to evoke landscape – Villa Montalvo’s build out crept up
- Community Parks – whatever development is proposed circulation impacts would need to be evaluated
- List of Projects – south of Highway 92 had a bond measure – why would north end of town go for it?
- Agrees with visual elements – fix showing the trail by bluff
- Oak Avenue Park – trash – adjacent property on Jenna Lane
December 12, 2017
Planning Commission Minutes
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- Beachwood – other purposes - parkland challenge
- Love the concept of mitigation bank
- Central park ¼ mile from downtown
- Practicality – long term vision
- Carter Park – make a #1 priority
- Increase Ocean View Park (our children’s park) to higher priority
- Mac Dutra is a “plaza” not a park, define appropriately
- Coastside has 3.8 million visitors per year – 30,000 residents live on the Midcoast including Half Moon Bay and the unincorporated communities – demand will not go down.
  - Don’t limit finance strategies
  - Find creative funding solutions
  - Visitors need to pay
- Restoration = mitigation bank –
  - SB5 – State Parks Bond

Staff reviewed for confirmation of both commissions several of the key points of the Commissioners’ discussion:
- Flexibility
  - Beachwood – could have park components
  - Aquatic Park
- Concept of Community Park as Family Park
- Carter Park to be elevated as a priority
- Smith Field planning to be coordinated with Seymour Drainage planning
- Johnston House – improve the narrative to clarify the intent and protections of the plan
- Need to increase consideration of horses and dogs
- Broaden funding options
- Include and emphasize mitigation bank

Joint Study Session ends

IV. DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Jill Ekas, Community Development Director reported updates to the Planning Commission.

V. PARKS AND RECREATION REPORT
None

VI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS
None
VII. PARKS AND RECREATION COMMUNICATIONS
None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
M/S: Hernandez/Benjamin
Motion carried unanimously.
Meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted: 

Approved:

____________________________ 
Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst

____________________________ 
Brian Holt, Vice Chair
Chair Hernandez called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair Hernandez, Commissioners Holt, and Deman
ABSENT: Commissioners Benjamin and Evans

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL
Chair Hernandez led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes of December 12, 2017
Chair Hernandez made a comment regarding clarification to his comments which he emailed to staff.

Smith Field is going to continue to be good money spent on bad and we should evaluate relocating the entire park to a location more suitable and sustainable for such an active use. This will allow us to expand the park, provide facilities with proper drainage, and improve the view corridor to the Ocean.

Motion: To continue the minutes to include the changes brought up by Chair Hernandez and because there was not a quorum of Planning Commissioner’s present who attended the December 12, 2017 meeting.
M/S Hernandez/Deman
Motion carried unanimously.

Minutes of November 14 & 28, 2017
M/S Holt/Deman
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

IV. Adopt Resolution P-18-01 denying the appeal and upholding the Director’s decision of PDP-17-040.
Project: A new 4,301 square foot two-story residence and associated site improvements

File Number: PDP-17-040
Permits/Approvals: Coastal Development Permit & Architectural Review
Site Location: 525 Railroad Avenue / APN 056-133-350
Applicant/Property Owners: Anthony Taffera / Taffera Family Trust
Project Planner: Scott Phillips; (650) 726-8299; sphiilps@hmbcity.com
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential
LCP Land Use Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Scott Philips, Associate Planner, made presentation to the Planning Commission

Gia Beverati, appellants representative - spoke on behalf of the appellant who could not attend the meeting in person. Written communication from the appellant, dated February 13, 2018, was provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting via email and with a hard copy at the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

The Planning Commission conducted a discussion stating that the character of the Railroad Avenue frontage is two-story homes; that the project conforms with all zoning requirements and the design guidelines and that there was no basis for the appeal.

Motion: To adopt Resolution P-18- denying the appeal and upholding the Director’s decision approving PDP-17-040 an application for a Coastal Development Permit and Architectural Review to allow the construction of a new 4,301 square-foot, single-family residence on a 9,030 square-foot site at 525 Railroad Avenue, based upon the Findings and Evidence contained in Exhibit A of the Draft Resolution, and subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit B with an addendum to Exhibit B.2.b. to read:

Conditions of Approval in Exhibit B:

B.2.b. REQUIRED PLAN REVISIONS. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit revised plans providing the following:
   a) Lot Coverage calculation on the plans shall be modified to include the 74 square feet portion of the front porch beyond the second story balcony.
   b) All landscaping within the following areas of the property shall be limited to 7 feet in height:
      i. within the rear yard,
      ii. within 14 feet of the north side property line,
iii. within 12 feet of the south side property line. (Planning)

M/S: Deman/Holt
Motion carried by Roll Call Vote unanimously.

V. DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Jill Ekas, Community Development Director, reported updates to the Planning Commission.

VI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

VII. ADJOURNMENT
M/S: Holt/Deman
Motion carried unanimously.
Meeting adjourned at 7.58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:                    Approved:

__________________________________________  __________________________
Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst              Rick Hernandez, Chair
MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Chair and Planning Commissioners

From: Jill Ekas, Director

Date: February 27, 2018

Subject: San Mateo County Accessory Dwelling Unit Presentation

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive a presentation from San Mateo County staff regarding county-wide research and efforts to increase the local inventory of accessory dwelling units (also referred to as 2\textsuperscript{nd} units). No formal action is requested.

BACKGROUND:
Throughout San Mateo County, many jurisdictions have recently updated their Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinances or are planning to do so. State law has directed many of the changed regulations; however, of local significance is the Countywide effort to address housing affordability. San Mateo County formed the Home for All Initiative to study housing affordability and establish an action plan that will be of value to all of the jurisdictions in the County. It’s defined mission is: \textit{address the County’s 26:1 jobs/housing gap through collaborative efforts and establishing a climate in San Mateo County where a diversity of housing is produced and preserved}. Home for All is based in the San Mateo County Office of Sustainability and is further supported by the County’s Department of Housing. Cities throughout San Mateo County have partnered and collaborated with Home for All, including the City of Half Moon Bay.

A highlight of Home for All’s most recent efforts include a comprehensive approach to supporting the production of accessory living units. Home for All created a 2\textsuperscript{nd} unit toolkit including an online calculator and other resources to help homeowners who may be considering adding an accessory living unit to their property. San Mateo County has offered to make a presentation to the Planning Commission to share their recent research and review the new resources available to the community for 2\textsuperscript{nd} units.

Recently, City Council directed study and preparation of ordinance amendments for both accessory dwelling units (ADU) and short-term vacation rentals; and thus, staff believes that the County update is timely and will provide a regional context as Half Moon Bay begins updating its ordinances. City Attorney and Community Development staff are working together to prepare materials for the Planning Commission’s consideration at a future study session, tentatively scheduled for March 13, 2018. Current State Law, Coastal Commission guidance, and key policy options will be presented for Planning Commission input. Because there is considerable community interest in both topics, a widely distributed notification will be issued in advance of that session.
MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Chair and Planning Commissioners

From: Jill Ekas, Director
Scott Phillips, Associate Planner

Date: February 27, 2018

Subject: Study Session (PDP-18-001)- New Residence at 390 Myrtle Street (Assessor’s Parcel Number 064-062-630)

RECOMMENDATION:
No formal action is requested. This Study Session is an opportunity for Planning Commission to review the architectural plans, site design and story poles and to provide direction to staff and the applicant in advance of formal review. Public comment will be accepted during the Study Session.

BACKGROUND:
The site is located on the southwestern corner Myrtle Street and Second Avenue, at 390 Myrtle Street. No curb gutter and sidewalk exist along the frontage of this property. The distinguishing feature about this property is the narrowness of the lot (21 feet). Because of the substantially substandard size of the property, there was concern about the legality of the lot. The complete Chain of Title was reviewed in detail, the outcome of this research was that the subject lot was legally created.

Leading up to the project submittal, the applicant considered various design options for the site. Staff advised that any development of the site would need to be scaled to the small lot size and recognized that there variances or parking exceptions might need to be considered. A Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Parking Exception and Street Facing Side Setback Variance was then submitted. A copy of the architectural plans included with the application are included as Attachment #1.

LAND USE:
The subject property is designated as Residential Medium Density in the Local Coastal Plan and is zoned R-1-B-1, Single Family Residential and is located on the corner of Myrtle Street and Second Avenue. Given the small size and narrow dimensions of the legal lot, the subject property qualifies for the Development Standards for Severely Substandard Lots, as identified in Table F of Chapter 18.06 of the Zoning Code. With the exception of the 10-foot street facing side setback and the off-street parking standards related to garage parking, the proposed residence conforms to the development standards applicable to the R-1-B-1 Zoning District for Severely Substandard Lots.
DISCUSSION:
The purpose of this item is to provide feedback on the architectural, landscape, site design, setback variance and parking exception, in advance of the formal consideration of the requested permits. The subject property is one of the smallest legal lots in the City. The new home on the site has the potential to contribute to the diversity of housing stock within the City by providing a more affordable smaller residence while also contributing positively to the character of the surrounding residential neighborhood. The purpose of this review is not to conduct a public hearing on the merits of the project. As such, it is recommended that the Planning Commission provide conceptual guidance on the appropriateness of the home design, appropriateness of the off-street parking facilities proposed and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. Public comment is encouraged as part of the Study Session.

Architectural and Site Design
The proposed project involves the development of Severely Substandard corner lot, in an established neighborhood. A substantial effort has been made to create a home design that is harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood, yet functional and aesthetically pleasing. The site is surrounded by single story residences. The front of the residence includes a large front porch that faces Myrtle Street, with a variety of roof elements, reflecting a cottage vernacular. Both the shed dormer and bay window along the east elevation provides appropriate building articulation that helps to breakup the elongated nature of the residence, especially when viewed from Second Avenue. New curb, gutter and sidewalk is shown on the entire frontage of the property. A new driveway apron would be installed along the Second Avenue frontage to provide access to the two off street parking spaces. Access to the Myrtle Street frontage would include a pedestrian path from the covered porch to the new sidewalk. Due to the narrow site width and potential conflict with the street intersection, a driveway along the Myrtle Street frontage would not be possible.

ATTACHMENT:
1. Architectural Plans, dated February 13, 2018
MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Chair and Planning Commissioners

From: Jill Ekas, Director
Scott Phillips, Associate Planner

Date: February 27, 2018

Subject: Study Session (PDP-17-080)- New Duplex Project at 555 Poplar Street (Assessor’s Parcel Number 064-243-060)

RECOMMENDATION:
No formal action is requested. This Study Session is an opportunity for the Planning Commission to provide feedback regarding preliminary designs for development of a new duplex in advance of formal review at a public hearing. Two design options will be presented:

Attachment 1: New Design Plans
Attachment 2: New Design – Tandem Alternative Plans

Public comment will be accepted during the Study Session.

BACKGROUND:
The site is on the northeastern corner Poplar Street and Cabrillo Highway. A proposal for a single-story duplex on the site was previously reviewed by the Planning Commission. At the hearing on December 13, 2016, the Planning Commission denied the project. A copy of the previous design plans, staff report, and excerpts from the adopted minutes are provided in Attachments 3, 4, and 5 respectively. The Planning Commission noted the following concerns about the previous design:

• Access and Circulation: The previous design included a two-car wide driveway adjacent to the corner of Poplar and Hwy 1 which could pose turning movement conflicts. The on-site circulation included a long driveway along passing along the frontage of both units which could lead to conflicts in access between tenants.

• Grading and Drainage: Preliminary grading and drainage plans were not well developed and there was concern about the extent of paving.

• Open Space and Landscaping: The open space was considered inadequate with respect to area, location, and quality. With a revised site plan allowing for improved open space provisions, a landscape plan, incorporating the sound wall, would improve the overall usability and cohesiveness of the site design.
In summary, the Planning Commission stated that for a redesigned project, they would be supportive of variances and/or exceptions to allow for higher quality open space, improved access, and a reduction in pavement to create a comfortable and safe living environment. Because the project was denied without prejudice, the Planning Commission welcomed the applicant to redesign the project for future Commission review.

In spring and summer 2017, the applicant studied various approaches to redesigning the project. This preliminary review process led up to submittal of an application for a Coastal Development Permit and Architectural Review in January for a new duplex design. The plans attached to this memorandum (Attachments #1 and 2) include two alternative designs. Both of the designs include two story configurations with the individual duplex units stacked one above the other. The primary difference between the two designs is the parking configuration and site circulation. The proposed new design in Attachment 1 contains two separate garages and maintains a driveway along the Hwy 1 frontage of the project site. Attachment 2 includes the tandem alternative with side-by-side, separate two-car tandem garages. The tandem design would require a parking exception.

LAND USE:
The subject property is designated Residential Medium Density in the Local Coastal Plan and is zoned R-2, Two Family Residential. With the exception of the off-street parking standards related to the tandem design, the proposed duplex options comply with the development standards applicable to the R-2 Zoning District. The site located in a developed residential neighborhood.

DISCUSSION:
The Planning Commission is being asked to provide conceptual design guidance rather than absolute determinations on the project. The study session is an opportunity to provide feedback to the applicant on the architectural, landscape, and site design with respect to the two new design options for this project in advance of the formal consideration of the requested permits. Public comment is a welcome part of the Study Session dialogue; noting that this review is not a public hearing on the merits of the project. The plans are not complete; draft findings, conditions of approval and other permit documentation are not presented at this time.

The Planning Commission is encouraged to consider both designs and provide feedback on any preferences or concerns. The Commission is advised that these new designs are not yet fully developed. Following this study session, the applicant will consider the Planning Commission’s guidance in preparation of more fully detailed landscape, preliminary grading and drainage, and site circulation and access plans before scheduling the Planning Commission Public hearing when the plans are fully complete.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Previous Design Plan Set
2. Previous Planning Commission Staff Report, dated December 13, 2016
3. Adopted Minutes from December 13, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting
4. Plan Set for New Duplex Designs, dated January 30, 2018
NEW FRONT (SOUTH) ELEVATION

SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

NEW LEFT (WEST) ELEVATION

SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"
City of Half Moon Bay
PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING
STAFF REPORT
December 13, 2016

RECOMMENDATION

Deny PDP-15-041, an application for a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances, and Parking Exception to allow the construction of a new 2,111 square-foot, single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 064-243-060), based upon the Findings and Evidence contained in Exhibit A of the Draft Resolution.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Owner/Applicant: Paul McGregor

Project Planner: Carol Hamilton, Senior Planner, (650) 726-5836

Requested Permits: Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Variances, and Parking Exception

Site Location: 555 Poplar Street, APN 064-243-060

LCP/Zoning: Medium Density Residential; R-2 Two-Family Residential

Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt pursuant to California Administrative Code Section 15303(a), construction of one duplex consisting of no more than 4 residential units.

Water: The property has an assigned, but uninstalled, 5/8 non-priority water service.

Sewer: The property is located within the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast (SAM) Sewer District. It has four benefit sewer units.

Right of Appeal: Any aggrieved person may appeal the decision of the Planning Commission to the City Council within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision. This project is not located within the Coastal Appeal Zone; therefore City action on the permit is final.
BACKGROUND

Planning Commission Hearing
This item was previously before the Planning Commission on April 26, 2016. At that time, the proposed project consisted of the following:

- Two duplex units connected by a two-car garage with an additional detached two-car garage located five feet from the rear property line;
- A ten-foot wide driveway along the westerly property line providing access to the garages bordered by a six-foot sound fence attached to a low retaining wall;
- Private open space consisting of a patio enclosed by a five-foot fence at the front of Unit A and a patio located behind the detached garage, adjacent to Unit B;
- In addition, the City Engineer had required a raised median island to be installed in Poplar Street to prevent left turns to and from the site.
- The project included Variances to reduce the required minimum rear setback for the garage from ten to five feet and reduce the minimum required length of one garage apron parking space from 18 feet to 16 feet.

The April 26 staff report, plans and other information transmitted to the Planning Commission regarding this item are included as Attachment 3.

In its discussion of the project on April 26, 2016 the Planning Commission raised the following concerns:

1. **Overall Site Design.** The Planning Commission discussion indicated general support for Variances, given the difficult site configuration, but also serious concern regarding the proposed project design. The Commission felt that fundamental changes in the design were needed to achieve a more livable environment on this highly constrained lot - to reduce pavement, improve access and circulation, and provide well-designed open space with protection from traffic noise. Planning Commission suggestions included flipping the site plan to place the driveway along the east property line, exploring a two-story option, or consideration of a single-family residence instead of a duplex.

2. **Site Access**
   The Planning Commission expressed concern regarding the safety of site access, given the proximity to the Highway 1 intersection and requested more detail regarding the design of the driveway and street improvements, including the required raised median island intended to prevent left turns in and out of the site.

3. **Site Drainage.** The Planning Commission expressed concern regarding site drainage and how it would affect adjacent properties to the north and east, and indicated there were insufficient spot elevations on the site survey to clarify on-
site grades relative to the surrounding properties and streets. The Commission noted that although the drainage plan showed a stormwater bubbler, it did not show how it connected to the street or the storm drain system and requested more information about where runoff drains once it leaves the site.

4. **Sound Wall.** The Planning Commission expressed concern about the appearance of the sound wall along the Highway 1 frontage and its effectiveness in reducing noise (i.e., whether the terminus of the sound wall at the front setback would create a sound tunnel).

5. **Unshielded Doors.** The Planning Commission indicated concern that unit entrances facing west and southwest were unprotected from prevailing winds.

6. **Open Space Design.** The Planning Commission indicated that the open space was not well designed or highly useable and needed a more detailed landscape plan. The discussion included flipping the design to put the driveway on the east side and the open space close to the sound barrier.

After consulting with the applicant regarding his willingness to revise the project, the Planning Commission voted to defer the item to a date uncertain to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the Commission’s concerns.

**Communication Regarding Project Design**

On April 28, 2016 staff sent an email to the applicant summarizing the Planning Commission concerns regarding the project design. On May 4, 2016, the applicant submitted an initial sketch of a revised design. Staff responded with a letter dated May 18, 2016 requesting a more fundamental redesign of the project. The applicant’s representative provided a written response to the Planning Commission concerns regarding the original design in an email dated September 28, 2016, and on September 29, 2016, the applicant submitted a revised plan set. On October 5, 2016, in an email to the applicant, the Deputy City Engineer recommended that the revised design include details of a painted median island to prevent left turns out of the site, and suggested contacting Caltrans for feedback on the design of the median. On October 26, 2016, staff sent a letter to the applicant indicating that the revised design did not adequately address the Planning Commission’s concerns. The above correspondence is included in Attachment 5.

**Revised Project**

The applicant has submitted a revised project design that fundamentally resembles the original site layout and access. The applicant has included some additional information and modifications, none of which fundamentally address the Planning Commission issues. The site plan is shown in Figure 1 and the full plan set is included in Attachment 2. The revised project eliminates two garage parking spaces; provides private open space for each unit along the easterly property line; insets the entrance to Unit A and moves it further north to provide a larger landscaped area at the front of the unit; replaces the sound fence with a good-neighbor fence; and includes a revised preliminary drainage plan. The architectural style and materials remain the same.
Site & Surroundings Properties
The project site consists of an irregularly shaped corner lot located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Highway 1 and Poplar Street. The westerly property line follows the sweeping curve of the roadway, resulting in a parcel that is roughly triangular in shape, narrow at the front and wide at the rear. The site is currently vacant and covered with weedy vegetation.

The site is bordered on the north by a single-story, single-family residence and a two-story duplex; on the east by a single-story, single-family residence; and across Poplar Street to the south by vacant land, all located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District. Highway 1 borders the site on the west. Single-family residences are located on the west side of the Highway in the R-1-B-1 Single-Family Zoning District. Poplar Street in this area does not include curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements. The intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 is signalized. An existing crosswalk provides for pedestrian access across Poplar Street; pedestrian access across Highway 1 is provided via a crosswalk on the south side of the intersection.

Story Poles
Story poles installed for the original project remain on the site. They do not reflect the proposed changes in the project design, including the smaller garages and additional open space along the east property line.
Figure 2. View of Site from Highway 1

Figure 3. Site Location
**ANALYSIS**
The following analysis focuses on the revised project’s response to key concerns raised by the Planning Commission, conformance with the General Plan/Local Coastal Program, and conformance with the Zoning Code.

**Applicant’s Response to Issues Raised by the Planning Commission**

**Overall Site Design**
The applicant has not pursued a fundamental redesign of the project and has not explored the design options suggested by the Planning Commission. The applicant’s proposed design makes only marginal improvements in the location of the private open space. Despite elimination of two garage parking spaces, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains very tight, the smaller detached garage continues to provide a substandard setback, and one of the parking spaces continues to be substandard in depth. The current proposal attempts to squeeze too much onto this constrained site, and in the absence of a meaningful exploration of more fundamental redesign options, it is unclear whether a duplex is appropriate for this site. A single-family residence, an allowed use in the R-2 District, may fit better in this location.

**Site Access**
The applicant has discussed the design of the median island and other frontage improvements with the City’s Engineering Division. The engineering staff recommended installation of a painted non-raised median island (per Caltrans specifications) across the site frontage to provide an enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site, and indicated that it would be advisable for the applicant to obtain Caltrans feedback on the design now. The applicant has indicated a willingness to implement the proposed improvements in conformance with City and Caltrans requirements and has placed a note to that effect on the plans, but did not provided civil engineering design details of the design that demonstrates how safe vehicle and pedestrian access will be provided to the site in conformance with Planning Commission direction.

**Site Drainage**
The applicant has provided a revised drainage plan that provides additional detail regarding site drainage as requested by the Planning Commission. The site plan indicates a wood fence attached to a retaining wall (with a maximum height of one foot three inches) along the east, west and north property lines. The drainage plan provides for drainage from the adjacent sites to the north and east through the wall via six-inch drainage pipes (one for the north property line and two on the east property line) connected to detention basins located under the driveway. Overflow from the detention basins drains to a swale located in the Highway 1 right-of-way west of the site. A Caltrans encroachment permit will be required for this drainage. The City’s engineering staff are satisfied with the conceptual drainage solutions.
Sound Wall
The applicant has replaced the proposed sound wall with a 6-foot good neighbor fence attached to a low retaining wall (maximum height of 1.3 feet). This provides less noise protection for the site and makes it more critical that the private open space be shielded by buildings. As discussed below, the applicant’s revised proposal does not adequately shield the private open space for Unit B from Highway 1 traffic noise. The suggested alternative of flipping the site plan and placing the driveway on the east side of the site would have offered additional options to use buildings to shield open space, to tuck private open space close to a sound wall, or to use a combination of buildings and walls along the property line to shield the site from noise. An acoustical analysis would be helpful in assessing these noise attenuation techniques, and staff acknowledges that such an analysis should have been required at the outset. If the applicant chooses to submit a new application for the site, staff will request preparation of a noise report to more fully assess options for sound attenuation.

Exposed Doors
The applicant has moved the door for Unit A slightly to the north and has inset it to provide additional protection from rain and wind as suggested by the Planning Commission.

Open Space/Site Design
The revised design eliminates two garage parking spaces and adds a larger private open space patio to the side and rear of the Unit B garage and a private patio at the rear of Unit A that partially bisects the unit and extends into the side yard. The proposed open space meets the minimum open space area provisions of the Zoning Code, which require private or common open space equal to 15% of the area of the living unit (a total of 317 square feet for this project) and conforms to the minimum required dimension of 6 feet. The proposed patio for Unit A is shielded from Highway 1 noise by the surrounding building. The larger patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise from Highway 1 in that areas on either side of the garage are open to the west. A more detailed landscape plan has not been provided for the private open space areas or other landscaped areas of the site, as suggested by the Planning Commission. Overall, the open space is not well-sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for residents or their guests.

Conformance with the General Plan/Local Coastal Program
The project is consistent with the Medium Density Residential General Plan Land Use Map designation and is consistent with goals and policies of the Housing Element that promote infill housing in existing neighborhoods. The site is not located in a visual protection area or in an environmentally sensitive habitat area and will not affect coastal access. The project is undergoing design review by the Planning Commission consistent with LCP Policy. As further clarified in the Draft Findings (Exhibit A of Attachment1), the site’s private open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for occupants, the plans do not adequately demonstrate how safe access will be provided to the site for vehicles and pedestrians, and despite
removal of two garage parking spaces, the amount of pavement has not been reduce and on-site circulation and vehicle back-up areas remain very tight.

**Conformance with the Zoning Code**
The project is in conformance with some, but not all requirements of the Zoning Code. The proposed duplex is located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District. Duplexes are a principally permitted use in the R-2 Zoning District, and as indicated in Table 1, the project is consistent with the height, FAR (floor area ratio), lot coverage, maximum building envelope, and open space requirements of the R-2 District. The project does not conform to the setback requirements for accessory buildings or to required dimensions for a garage apron or parking space, and provides only two of the four garage parking spaces required for a duplex.

Zoning Code Section 18.06.050.D.2 allows accessory buildings greater than 250 square feet to be located in the rear setback, provided the building is set back 5 feet from the side and 10 from the rear property lines. The proposed detached garage meets the required side setback, but provides a reduced, 5-foot setback from the rear property line, which is the subject of a Variance request.

Zoning Code Section 18.06.040(E) requires that the driveway apron for a two-car garage be a minimum of 18 feet in depth, and Section 18.06.040.D specifies 9 by 20 feet as the minimum dimensions for a parking space. In that the second parking space for each garage is no longer a garage apron space, it is technically subject to the parking space standard. The project includes a 9-foot by 16.5-foot parking space that does not conform to this standard. A parking design Variance is part of the requested actions.

Table A of Zoning Code Section 18.36.040 specifies that single-family dwellings and apartments require two garage parking spaces per unit. Although duplexes are not specifically addressed in this table, the standard for apartments is applied to duplexes in that apartments are the use listed in the table that is most similar to a duplex. Based on this requirement, the project would need to provide four garage spaces. The applicant is proposing to provide two garage spaces and is requesting a Parking Exception to bring the project into conformance with the Zoning Code.
Table 1. Project Conformance with R-2 Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standards</th>
<th>Zoning Requirements</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Site Area</td>
<td>5,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,604 sq. ft. (existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Average Site Width</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>52 ft. (existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Setback</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Interior Side Setback</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Street Side Setback</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Combined Side Setback</td>
<td>20% (10.4 ft.)</td>
<td>33% (17.0 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Rear Setback, Residential Building</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>20.0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Rear Setback, Accessory Building</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. One-Story Height</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>18 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.5 to 1 (3,302 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>0.32 to 1 (2,111 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. One-Story Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50% (3,302 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>32.4% (2,146 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Parking Garage Spaces</td>
<td>4 garage spaces</td>
<td>2 garage spaces**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Space Dimension</td>
<td>9 ft. wide/18 ft. long</td>
<td>9 ft. wide/16.6 ft. long*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Open Space</td>
<td>15% of floor area (317 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>17% of floor area (367 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Envelope</td>
<td>Per Zoning Code</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variance required. ** Parking Exception required.

Variance Findings
In order to approve this project, the Planning Commission will need to make the Variance findings required in Zoning Code Section 18.23.040, for the reduced garage setback and the substandard parking space, as discussed below:

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to the land, buildings and/or uses in the same district;

2. That the granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner;

3. That the granting of such application will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant, and will not, under
the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood.

Discussion
Staff believes that Finding No. 1 can be made for this project site. The triangular shape of the site, its narrow frontage on Poplar Street, and its proximity to Highway one set it apart from most other parcels located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

In regard to Finding No. 2, the granting of the requested Variances, or other Variances are not necessary for development of the site. The Planning Commission has suggested other design options and uses which the applicant has not explored (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence). The applicant has viable options available for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements, and thus the Variance is not needed to preserve property rights of the petitioner (owner).

In regard to Finding No. 3, the Planning Commission raised concerns regarding the project design, including the design of the open space, the amount of pavement, and provision for safe site access. These design issues have not been adequately addressed by the revised project. The revised design makes marginal improvements in the design of the required open space, but does not shield open space for Unit B from Highway 1 noise, does not provide a detailed landscape plan for the open space areas, does not reduce the amount of pavement on the site, and does not improve on-site vehicular circulation. In addition, the project does not include details regarding street improvements requested by the Planning Commission to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Given these deficiencies, the project, as proposed, may be injurious to persons residing or working in the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

Based on the above analysis, staff concludes that the required Variance findings cannot be made for this project. In the absence of affirmative findings, the project does not conform to the Zoning Code.

Parking Exception Findings
In order to approve this project, the Planning Commission will need to make the Parking Exception findings required in Zoning Code Section 18.36.080(B), for the reduced parking requirement as discussed below:

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application, which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to the land, buildings and/or uses in the same district;

2. That the granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and
enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner;

3. That the granting of such application will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant, and will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;

4. That the establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off-street parking facilities as proposed are as nearly in conformance with the requirements of the Half Moon Bay zoning code as are reasonably possible.

Discussion

Staff believes that Finding No. 1 can be made for the project site. The triangular shape of the site, its narrow frontage on Poplar Street, and proximity to Highway one set it apart from most other parcels located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

In regard to Finding No. 2, the granting of the requested Parking Exception is not necessary for development of the site. The Planning Commission has suggested other design options and uses which the applicant has not explored (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence). The applicant has viable options available for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements, and thus the Parking Exception is not needed to preserve property rights of the petitioner (owner).

In regard to Finding No. 3, the Planning Commission raised concerns regarding the project design, including the design of the open space, the amount of pavement, and provision for safe site access. These design issues have not been adequately addressed by the revised project. The revised design makes marginal improvements in the design of the required open space, but does not shield open space for Unit B from Highway 1 noise, does not provide a detailed landscape plan for the open space areas, does not reduce the amount of pavement on the site, and does not improve on-site vehicular circulation. In addition, the project does not include details regarding street improvements requested by the Planning Commission to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Given these deficiencies, the project, as proposed, may be injurious to persons residing or working in the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

In regard to Finding No. 4, the applicant has not explored viable options for duplex or single-family development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements. The project is not as nearly in conformance as reasonably possible with Zoning Code parking requirements.
Based on the above analysis, staff does not believe that all of the required findings can be made for approval of the proposed Parking Exception. In the absence of affirmative findings, the project does not conform to the Zoning Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to California Administrative Code Section 15303 (a), construction of one duplex consisting of no more than 4 residential units. If the Planning Commission chooses to deny the project, CEQA review is not required.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, staff concludes that the proposed duplex is not consistent with the Local Coastal Program and Zoning Code (the LCP Implementation Plan), and that the proposed development is not suitably designed for the project site or surrounding area. Staff recommends denial of the project based on the recommended findings in Exhibit A.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Resolution with Findings and Evidence, Exhibit A.
2. Project Plans
3. Staff Report, Plans and Other April 26, 2016 Packet Information
4. Staff Communication
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION P-16-05
RESOLUTION FOR DENIAL
PDP-15-041

Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances and Parking Exception to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 064-243-060)

WHEREAS, an application was submitted requesting approval of a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances, and Parking Exception to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 064-243-060); and

WHEREAS, the procedures for processing the application have been followed as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly-noticed public hearing on April 26, 2016, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission continued the item to a date uncertain to allow the applicant an opportunity to revise the project design; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly-noticed public hearing on December 13, 2016, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered all written and oral testimony presented for consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that the request for a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances, and Parking Exception for the construction of a new single-story duplex is exempt from CEQA pursuant to California Administrative Code Section 15303 (a) which exempts the construction of a duplex; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made the required findings for denial of the project, set forth in Exhibit A to this resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, based upon the Findings in Exhibit A, the Planning Commission denies application No. PDP-15-041.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City of Half Moon Bay Planning Commission at a duly noticed public hearing held December 13, 2016.

AYES, Deman, Conroy, Evans, Reimer, Hernandez
NOES,
ABSENT,
ABSTAIN,

APPROVED: [Signature]
Rick Hernandez, Chair

ATTEST: [Signature]
John Doughty, Community Development Director
EXHIBIT A
FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE
Planning Commission Resolution P-16-05
PDP-15-041

Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 056-243-060)

Coastal Development Permit – Findings for Denial

The required Coastal Development Permit for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made all of the following findings per Municipal Code Section 18.20.070:

1. **Local Coastal Program** – *The development as proposed or as modified by conditions, does not conform to the Local Coastal Program.*

   **Non-Compliant:** The project is consistent with the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation. It consists of development of a new duplex (i.e. two-family residence) on an in-fill site in a developed residential neighborhood. The site is not located in a visual protection area or in an environmentally sensitive habitat area and will not affect coastal access. The project is undergoing design review by the Planning Commission consistent with LCP requirements, and does not comply with all of the design review criteria identified in Municipal Code Section 18.20.070(F).

   **Coastal Act 30240(b) and Policy 3-3 (b):** *Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.*

   **Compliant:** The subject site is not in or adjacent to a mapped environmentally sensitive habitat area.

   **Policy 7-1:** *The City will establish regulations to protect the scenic corridor of Highway 1, including setbacks for new development, screening of commercial parking and landscaping associated with new development. The minimum standards shall include all areas within 200 yards of State Highway 1 which are visible from the road.*

   **Compliant:** The site is located adjacent to Highway 1; however, Highway 1 is not designated a Scenic Highway within the City limits of Half Moon Bay.

   **Policy 7-5:** *All new development, including additions and remodeling, shall be subject to design review.*
Compliant: The project has undergone design review by the Planning Commission.

Design Review Criteria. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered each specific case and any and all of the following criteria in determining that the following architectural and site design standards as identified in Municipal Code Section 18.20.070(F) have not been satisfactorily addressed:

a. Where more than one building or structure will be constructed, the architectural features and landscaping thereof shall be harmonious. Such features include height, elevations, roofs, material, color and appurtenances.

Compliant: The primary building and detached garage are of compatible architectural design. The garage is lower in height and subordinate in size to the residential structure, and the architectural features of the two buildings, including height, elevations, roof forms, materials and color are consistent in style.

b. Where more than one sign will be erected or displayed on the site, the signs shall have a common or compatible design and locational positions and shall be harmonious in appearance.

Compliant: The project does not include signage.

c. The material, textures, colors and details of construction shall be an appropriate expression of its design concept and function, and shall be compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures and functions. Colors of wall and roofing materials shall blend with the natural landscape and be non-reflective.

Compliant: The proposed craftsman/cottage-style and proposed materials, muted colors, and detailing of the buildings are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

d. The design shall be appropriate to the function of the project and express the project’s identity. The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site shall create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community.

Non-Compliant: Despite the elimination of two garage parking spaces from the site, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains constrained by minimal back-up and turn-around area, and private open space for Unit B is exposed to traffic noise from Highway 1 such that the project does not provide a desirable environment for occupants, and visitors.

e. The design shall promote harmonious transition in scale and character in areas located between different designated land uses.
Compliant: The site is not located between different designated land uses.

f. The design shall be compatible with known and approved improvements and/or future construction, both on and off the site.

Compliant: There are no known approved, but not yet constructed improvements in the immediate area of the project site.

g. Sufficient ancillary functions provided to support the main functions of the project shall be compatible with the project's design concept.

Non-Compliant: The project access, circulation, and open space are not well-designed to support the proposed residential use of the site. Civil engineering details have not been provided to demonstrate safe site access, inadequate vehicle back-up area is provided, and private open space is exposed to traffic noise and lacks appropriate landscaping details.

h. Access to the property and circulation systems shall be safe and convenient for equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Non-Compliant: The proximity of the site access to the intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 presents challenges in regard to safe access to the site. The Planning Commission requested additional detail regarding the street improvements across the site frontage. City Engineering staff recommended that the applicant provide engineering details of a non-raised median island to provide a legally-enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site and that the applicant coordinate with Caltrans regarding the median island design. The project does not provide engineering details regarding a non-raised median island and other street frontage improvements needed to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site.

i. Where feasible, natural features shall be appropriately preserved and integrated with the project.

Compliant: The site contains no notable natural features; existing vegetation consists of ruderal species.

j. Landscaping shall be in keeping with the character or design of the building, and preferably clustered in natural appearing groups, as opposed to being placed in rows or regularly spaced. The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors, shall create a desirable and functional environment and the landscape concept shall depict an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site. Plant material shall be suitable and adaptable to the site, shall be capable of being properly maintained on the site, and
shall be of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance.

Non-Compliant: The Planning Commission identified the need for better-designed useable space and a more detailed landscaping proposal for the open space areas. As revised, the project provides the amount of useable open space specified in Table C of Zoning Code Section 18.06.030; however the open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for residents and their visitors. The private open space consists of hardscape patios, and landscape details have not been provided to show appropriate treatment of these areas. The patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise due to areas on either side of the garage that are open to the west.

k. The design shall be energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:
   1. Exterior energy design elements;
   2. Internal lighting service and climatic control systems; and
   3. Building siting and landscape elements.

Compliant: The project would be required to implement energy efficient measures in conformance with the Building Code and to conform to the Water Efficiency in Landscaping Ordinance prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Policy 7-11: New development along primary access routes from Highway 1 to the beach, as designated on the Land Use Map, shall be designed and sited so as to maintain and enhance the scenic quality of such routes, including building setbacks, maintenance of low height of structures, and landscaping which establishes a scenic gateway and corridor.

Compliant: The proposed duplex is not located along a primary access route from Highway 1 and will not affect coastal access.

Coastal Act 30244: Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

Compliant: The proposed duplex is not located at or near identified archaeological or paleontological resources.

2. Growth Management System – The development is consistent with the annual population limitation system established in the Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Compliant: The proposed site has been granted valid Measure D Certificates for construction of two duplex living units; therefore the project conforms to the requirements of the City’s growth management system.
3. **Zoning Provisions** — *The development is consistent with the use limitations and property development standards of the base district as well as the other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.*

**Non-Compliant:** The project is not in conformance with Zoning Code requirements in regard to the rear garage setback, the length of the driveway parking space, and the number of required garage parking spaces. The Variance and Parking Exceptions findings required to bring the project into conformance with the Zoning Code cannot be made.

4. **Adequate Services** — *The proposed development will be provided with adequate services and infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the Local Coastal Program.*

**Non-Compliant:** The proximity of the site access to the intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 presents challenges in regard to safe access to the site. The Planning Commission requested additional detail regarding the street improvements across the site frontage. City Engineering staff recommended that the applicant provide engineering details of a non-raised median island to provide a legally-enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site and that the applicant coordinate with Caltrans regarding the median island design. The project does not provide engineering details regarding a non-raised median island and other street frontage improvements needed to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site.

5. **California Coastal Act** — *Any development to be located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea conforms to the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.*

**Compliant:** The site is located east of Highway 1 and is not located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea.

**Architectural/ Site and Design Review Criteria** —

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered all of the following criteria as identified in Municipal Code Section 14.37.035 prior to making the architectural and site and design review findings specified in Municipal Code Section 14.37.035:

a. *Where more than one building or structure will be constructed, the architectural features and landscaping thereof shall be harmonious. Such features include height, elevations, roofs, material, color and appurtenances.*

**Compliant:** The primary building and detached garage are of compatible architectural design. The garage is lower in height and subordinate in size to the residential structure, and the architectural features of the two buildings, including height, elevations, roof forms, materials and color are consistent in style.
b. Where more than one sign will be erected or displayed on the site, the signs shall have a common or compatible design and locational positions and shall be harmonious in appearance.

**Compliant:** The project does not include signage.

c. The material, textures, colors and details of construction shall be an appropriate expression of its design concept and function, and shall be compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures and functions. Colors of wall and roofing materials shall blend with the natural landscape and be non-reflective.

**Compliant:** The proposed craftsman/cottage-style and proposed materials, muted colors, and detailing of the buildings are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

d. The design shall be appropriate to the function of the project and express the project's identity. The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site shall create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community.

**Non-Compliant:** Despite the elimination of two garage parking spaces from the site, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains constrained by minimal back-up and turn-around area, and private open space for Unit B is exposed to traffic noise from Highway 1, such that the site does not provide a desirable environment for occupants or visitors.

e. Roofing materials shall be wood shingles, wood shakes, tile or other materials such as composition as approved by the appropriate design review authority. No mechanical equipment shall be located upon a roof unless it is appropriately screened.

**Compliant:** Roofing material consists of asphalt shingles and no mechanical equipment is proposed on the roof of the residence.

f. The proposed development shall be compatible in terms of height, bulk and design with other structures and environment in the immediate area.

**Compliant:** The proposed low profile of the single-story buildings is consistent with the scale of the adjacent single-family residence to the east and compatible with the adjacent one and two-story residences to the north.

g. The proposed design shall be consistent with the applicable elements of the general plan.

**Compliant:** The proposed development is consistent with Housing Element policies that encourage housing on infill sites.
h. If the project site is located in an area considered by the committee as having a unified design character or historical character, the design shall be compatible with such character.

**Compliant:** The project is not located in an area with a unified design or historical character.

i. The design shall promote harmonious transition in scale and character in areas located between different designated land uses.

**Compliant:** The site is not located between different designated land uses.

j. The design shall be compatible with known and approved improvements and/or future construction, both on and off the site.

**Compliant:** There are no known approved, but not yet constructed improvements for the site or adjacent areas.

k. Sufficient ancillary functions provided to support the main functions of the project shall be compatible with the project’s design concept.

**Non-Compliant:** The project access, circulation, and open space are not well-designed to support the proposed residential use of the site. Civil engineering details have not been provided to demonstrate safe site access, inadequate vehicle back-up area is provided, and private open space is exposed to traffic noise and lacks appropriate landscaping details.

l. Access to the property and circulation systems shall be safe and convenient for equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

**Non-Compliant:** The proximity of the site access to the intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 presents challenges in regard to safe access to the site. The Planning Commission requested additional detail regarding the street improvements across the site frontage. City Engineering staff recommended that the applicant provide the engineering details of a non-raised median island to provide a legally-enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site and that the applicant coordinate with Caltrans regarding the median island design. The project does not provide civil engineering details regarding a non-raised median island and other street frontage improvements needed to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site.

m. Where feasible, natural features shall be appropriately preserved and integrated with the project.

**Compliant:** The site contains no notable natural features; existing vegetation consists
of ruderal species.

n. The amount and arrangement of open space and landscaping shall be appropriate to the design and the function of the structures. Landscaping shall be in keeping with the character or design of the building, and preferably clustered in natural appearing groups, as opposed to being placed in rows or regularly spaced. The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors, shall create a desirable and functional environment and the landscape concept shall depict an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site. Plant material shall be suitable and adaptable to the site, shall be capable of being properly maintained on the site, and shall be of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance.

Non-Compliant: The Planning Commission identified the need for better-designed useable space and a more detailed landscaping proposal for the open space areas. As revised, the project provides the amount of useable open space specified in Table C of Zoning Code Section 18.06.030; however the open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for occupants. The private open space consists of hardscape patios and landscape details have not been provided to show appropriate landscape treatment of these areas. The patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise due to areas on either side of the garage that are open to the west.

o. The design shall be energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:

1. Exterior energy design elements;

2. Internal lighting service and climatic control systems; and

3. Building siting and landscape elements.

Compliant: The project would be required to implement energy efficient measures in conformance with the Building Code and to conform to the Water Efficiency in Landscaping Ordinance prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Architectural Site and Design Review Findings—

The required Architectural Review for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made the following findings per Municipal Code Section 14.37.040:

1. That such buildings, structures, planting, paving and other improvements shall be so designed and constructed that they will not be of unsightly or obnoxious appearance to the extent that they will hinder the orderly and harmonious development of the city;
Compliant: Overall, the project is not unsightly or obnoxious in appearance. The scale of the buildings is appropriate to the site, the architectural design is generally compatible with development in the area, and the architectural features are consistent with and support the overall design.

2. That such buildings, structures, planting, paving and other improvements will impair the desirability or opportunity to attain the optimum use and the value of the land and the improvements, or otherwise impair the desirability of living or working conditions in the same or adjacent areas; and

Non-Compliant: The project does not provide sufficient detail regarding the street improvements along the site frontage necessary to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Although the project provides the amount of useable open space specified in Table C of Zoning Code Section 18.06.030, the open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for residents and their guests. The private open space consists of hardscape patios and landscape details have not been provided to show appropriate landscape treatment of these areas. The patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise in that areas on either side of the garage are open to the west and would be subject to Highway 1 noise.

3. The project has been designed in conformance and consistency with the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (where applicable).

Not Applicable: The Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines are not applicable to the Two-Family Residential (duplex) development proposed by this project.

Variance — Findings

This project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the Planning Commission has made the following findings per Municipal Code Section 14.23.040:

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to the land, buildings and/or uses in the same district;

Compliant: The triangular shape of the site, its narrow frontage on Poplar Street, and its proximity to Highway one set it apart from most other parcels located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

2. That the granting of the application is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner;
Non-Compliant: The granting of the requested Variances, or other Variances are not necessary for development of the site. The Planning Commission has suggested other design options and uses which the applicant has not explored (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence). The applicant has viable options available for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements, and thus the Variance is not needed to preserve property rights of the petitioner (owner).

3. That the granting of such application will, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant, and will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood.

Non-Compliant: Planning Commission concerns regarding the project design, including the design of the open space, the amount of pavement, and provision for safe site access, have not been adequately addressed. The revised design makes marginal improvements in the design of the required open space, but does not shield open space for Unit B from Highway 1 noise, does not provide a detailed landscape plan for the open space areas, does not reduce the amount of pavement on the site, and does not improve on-site vehicular circulation. In addition, the project does not include details regarding street improvements requested by the Planning Commission to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Given these deficiencies, the project, as proposed, may be injurious to persons residing or working in the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

Parking Exception – Findings

Prior to making a determination as to the granting or denial of a parking exception based Municipal Code Section 18.36.080 requires the decision-maker to make written finding of facts showing whether the following requirements have been established with respect to the land, building or use for which the parking exception is sought:

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application, which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to the land, buildings and/or uses in the same district;

Compliant. Exceptional circumstances applicable to this parcel include its triangular shape, its narrow frontage on Poplar Street, and its close proximity to Highway 1. These characteristics set it apart from most other parcels located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

2. That the granting of the application is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner;
Non-Compliant. The granting of the requested Parking Exception is not necessary for development of the site in that the applicant has not explored viable design options and uses (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence) for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements, and thus the Parking Exception is not needed to preserve property rights of the property owner (petitioner).

3. That the granting of such application will, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant, and will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;

Non-Compliant. Design concerns raised by the Planning Commission regarding the design of the open space, the amount of pavement, and provision for safe access to and from the site are not adequately addressed by the revised project. The revised design makes marginal improvements in the design of the required open space, but does not shield open space for Unit B from Highway 1 noise and does not provide a detailed landscape plan for the open space areas. Despite the elimination of two garage parking spaces, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains very tight, the smaller detached garage continues to provide a substandard setback, and one of the parking spaces continues to be substandard in depth. In addition, the project does not include details regarding street improvements requested by the Planning Commission to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Given these deficiencies, the project, as proposed, may be injurious to persons residing or working in the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

4. That the establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off-street parking facilities as proposed are not as nearly in conformance with the requirements of the Half Moon Bay zoning code as are reasonably possible.

Non-Compliant. The two garage parking spaces are not as nearly in conformance with Zoning Code requirements as is reasonably possible in that the applicant has not explored viable design options and uses (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence) for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements.

Environmental Review – Finding

CEQA – The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Evidence: The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15303 (a) in that the project consists of the construction of one duplex consisting of no more than 4 residential units.
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION P-16-05
RESOLUTION FOR DENIAL
PDP-15-041

Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances and Parking Exception to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 064-243-060)

WHEREAS, an application was submitted requesting approval of a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances, and Parking Exception to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 064-243-060); and

WHEREAS, the procedures for processing the application have been followed as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly-noticed public hearing on April 26, 2016, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission continued the item to a date uncertain to allow the applicant an opportunity to revise the project design; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly-noticed public hearing on December 13, 2016, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered all written and oral testimony presented for consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that the request for a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances, and Parking Exception for the construction of a new single-story duplex is exempt from CEQA pursuant to California Administrative Code Section 15303 (a) which exempts the construction of a duplex; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made the required findings for denial of the project, set forth in Exhibit A to this resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, based upon the Findings in Exhibit A, the Planning Commission denies application No. PDP-15-041.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City of Half Moon Bay Planning Commission at a duly noticed public hearing held December 13, 2016.

AYES, Deman, Conroy, Evans, Reimer, Hernandez
NOES,
ABSENT,
ABSTAIN,

APPROVED:  

Rick Hernandez, Chair

ATTEST:  

John Doughty, Community Development Director
Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, Setback and Driveway/Parking Design Variances to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot at 555 Poplar Street located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zoning District and the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation (APN 056-243-060)

Coastal Development Permit – Findings for Denial

The required Coastal Development Permit for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made all of the following findings per Municipal Code Section 18.20.070:

1. Local Coastal Program – *The development as proposed or as modified by conditions, does not conform to the Local Coastal Program.*

   Non-Compliant: The project is consistent with the Medium Density Residential General Plan designation. It consists of development of a new duplex (i.e. two-family residence) on an in-fill site in a developed residential neighborhood. The site is not located in a visual protection area or in an environmentally sensitive habitat area and will not affect coastal access. The project is undergoing design review by the Planning Commission consistent with LCP requirements, and does not comply with all of the design review criteria identified in Municipal Code Section 18.20.070(F).

   Coastal Act 30240(b) and Policy 3-3 (b): *Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.*

Compliant: The subject site is not in or adjacent to a mapped environmentally sensitive habitat area.

Policy 7-1: *The City will establish regulations to protect the scenic corridor of Highway 1, including setbacks for new development, screening of commercial parking and landscaping associated with new development. The minimum standards shall include all areas within 200 yards of State Highway 1 which are visible from the road.*

Compliant: The site is located adjacent to Highway 1; however, Highway 1 is not designated a Scenic Highway within the City limits of Half Moon Bay.

Policy 7-5: *All new development, including additions and remodeling, shall be subject to design review.*
Compliant: The project has undergone design review by the Planning Commission.

Design Review Criteria. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered each specific case and any and all of the following criteria in determining that the following architectural and site design standards as identified in Municipal Code Section 18.20.070(F) have not been satisfactorily addressed:

a. Where more than one building or structure will be constructed, the architectural features and landscaping thereof shall be harmonious. Such features include height, elevations, roofs, material, color and appurtenances.

Compliant: The primary building and detached garage are of compatible architectural design. The garage is lower in height and subordinate in size to the residential structure, and the architectural features of the two buildings, including height, elevations, roof forms, materials and color are consistent in style.

b. Where more than one sign will be erected or displayed on the site, the signs shall have a common or compatible design and locational positions and shall be harmonious in appearance.

Compliant: The project does not include signage.

c. The material, textures, colors and details of construction shall be an appropriate expression of its design concept and function, and shall be compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures and functions. Colors of wall and roofing materials shall blend with the natural landscape and be non-reflective.

Compliant: The proposed craftsman/cottage-style and proposed materials, muted colors, and detailing of the buildings are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

d. The design shall be appropriate to the function of the project and express the project’s identity. The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site shall create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community.

Non-Compliant: Despite the elimination of two garage parking spaces from the site, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains constrained by minimal back-up and turn-around area, and private open space for Unit B is exposed to traffic noise from Highway 1 such that the project does not provide a desirable environment for occupants, and visitors.

e. The design shall promote harmonious transition in scale and charater in areas located between different designated land uses.
Compliant: The site is not located between different designated land uses.

f. The design shall be compatible with known and approved improvements and/or future construction, both on and off the site.

Compliant: There are no known approved, but not yet constructed improvements in the immediate area of the project site.

g. Sufficient ancillary functions provided to support the main functions of the project shall be compatible with the project's design concept.

Non-Compliant: The project access, circulation, and open space are not well-designed to support the proposed residential use of the site. Civil engineering details have not been provided to demonstrate safe site access, inadequate vehicle back-up area is provided, and private open space is exposed to traffic noise and lacks appropriate landscaping details.

h. Access to the property and circulation systems shall be safe and convenient for equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Non-Compliant: The proximity of the site access to the intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 presents challenges in regard to safe access to the site. The Planning Commission requested additional detail regarding the street improvements across the site frontage. City Engineering staff recommended that the applicant provide engineering details of a non-raised median island to provide a legally-enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site and that the applicant coordinate with Caltrans regarding the median island design. The project does not provide engineering details regarding a non-raised median island and other street frontage improvements needed to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site.

i. Where feasible, natural features shall be appropriately preserved and integrated with the project.

Compliant: The site contains no notable natural features; existing vegetation consists of ruderal species.

j. Landscaping shall be in keeping with the character or design of the building, and preferably clustered in natural appearing groups, as opposed to being placed in rows or regularly spaced. The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors, shall create a desirable and functional environment and the landscape concept shall depict an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site. Plant material shall be suitable and adaptable to the site, shall be capable of being properly maintained on the site, and
shall be of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance.

**Non-Compliant:** The Planning Commission identified the need for better-designed useable space and a more detailed landscaping proposal for the open space areas. As revised, the project provides the amount of useable open space specified in Table C of Zoning Code Section 18.06.030; however the open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for residents and their visitors. The private open space consists of hardscape patios, and landscape details have not been provided to show appropriate treatment of these areas. The patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise due to areas on either side of the garage that are open to the west.

**k. The design shall be energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:**

1. Exterior energy design elements;
2. Internal lighting service and climatic control systems; and
3. Building siting and landscape elements.

**Compliant:** The project would be required to implement energy efficient measures in conformance with the Building Code and to conform to the Water Efficiency in Landscaping Ordinance prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

**Policy 7-11:** New development along primary access routes from Highway 1 to the beach, as designated on the Land Use Map, shall be designed and sited so as to maintain and enhance the scenic quality of such routes, including building setbacks, maintenance of low height of structures, and landscaping which establishes a scenic gateway and corridor.

**Compliant:** The proposed duplex is not located along a primary access route from Highway 1 and will not affect coastal access.

**Coastal Act 30244:** Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

**Compliant:** The proposed duplex is not located at or near identified archaeological or paleontological resources.

2. **Growth Management System** – The development is consistent with the annual population limitation system established in the Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

**Compliant:** The proposed site has been granted valid Measure D Certificates for construction of two duplex living units; therefore the project conforms to the requirements of the City's growth management system.
3. **Zoning Provisions** – *The development is consistent with the use limitations and property development standards of the base district as well as the other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.*

*Non-Compliant:* The project is not in conformance with Zoning Code requirements in regard to the rear garage setback, the length of the driveway parking space, and the number of required garage parking spaces. The Variance and Parking Exceptions findings required to bring the project into conformance with the Zoning Code cannot be made.

4. **Adequate Services** – *The proposed development will be provided with adequate services and infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the Local Coastal Program.*

*Non-Compliant:* The proximity of the site access to the intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 presents challenges in regard to safe access to the site. The Planning Commission requested additional detail regarding the street improvements across the site frontage. City Engineering staff recommended that the applicant provide engineering details of a non-raised median island to provide a legally-enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site and that the applicant coordinate with Caltrans regarding the median island design. The project does not provide engineering details regarding a non-raised median island and other street frontage improvements needed to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site.

5. **California Coastal Act** – *Any development to be located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea conforms to the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.*

*Compliant:* The site is located east of Highway 1 and is not located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea.

**Architectural/ Site and Design Review Criteria –**

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered all of the following criteria as identified in Municipal Code Section 14.37.035 prior to making the architectural and site and design review findings specified in Municipal Code Section 14.37.035:

a. *Where more than one building or structure will be constructed, the architectural features and landscaping thereof shall be harmonious. Such features include height, elevations, roofs, material, color and appurtenances.*

*Compliant:* The primary building and detached garage are of compatible architectural design. The garage is lower in height and subordinate in size to the residential structure, and the architectural features of the two buildings, including height, elevations, roof forms, materials and color are consistent in style.
b. Where more than one sign will be erected or displayed on the site, the signs shall have a common or compatible design and locational positions and shall be harmonious in appearance.

*Compliant:* The project does not include signage.

c. The material, textures, colors and details of construction shall be an appropriate expression of its design concept and function, and shall be compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures and functions. Colors of wall and roofing materials shall blend with the natural landscape and be non-reflective.

*Compliant:* The proposed craftsman/cottage-style and proposed materials, muted colors, and detailing of the buildings are consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

d. The design shall be appropriate to the function of the project and express the project’s identity. The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site shall create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community.

*Non-Compliant:* Despite the elimination of two garage parking spaces from the site, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains constrained by minimal back-up and turn-around area, and private open space for Unit B is exposed to traffic noise from Highway 1, such that the site does not provide a desirable environment for occupants or visitors.

e. Roofing materials shall be wood shingles, wood shakes, tile or other materials such as composition as approved by the appropriate design review authority. No mechanical equipment shall be located upon a roof unless it is appropriately screened.

*Compliant:* Roofing material consists of asphalt shingles and no mechanical equipment is proposed on the roof of the residence.

f. The proposed development shall be compatible in terms of height, bulk and design with other structures and environment in the immediate area.

*Compliant:* The proposed low profile of the single-story buildings is consistent with the scale of the adjacent single-family residence to the east and compatible with the adjacent one and two-story residences to the north.

g. The proposed design shall be consistent with the applicable elements of the general plan.

*Compliant:* The proposed development is consistent with Housing Element policies that encourage housing on infill sites.
h. *If the project site is located in an area considered by the committee as having a unified design character or historical character, the design shall be compatible with such character.*

**Compliant:** The project is not located in an area with a unified design or historical character.

i. *The design shall promote harmonious transition in scale and character in areas located between different designated land uses.*

**Compliant:** The site is not located between different designated land uses.

j. *The design shall be compatible with known and approved improvements and/or future construction, both on and off the site.*

**Compliant:** There are no known approved, but not yet constructed improvements for the site or adjacent areas.

k. *Sufficient ancillary functions provided to support the main functions of the project shall be compatible with the project’s design concept.*

**Non-Compliant:** The project access, circulation, and open space are not well-designed to support the proposed residential use of the site. Civil engineering details have not been provided to demonstrate safe site access, inadequate vehicle back-up area is provided, and private open space is exposed to traffic noise and lacks appropriate landscaping details.

l. *Access to the property and circulation systems shall be safe and convenient for equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.*

**Non-Compliant:** The proximity of the site access to the intersection of Poplar Street and Highway 1 presents challenges in regard to safe access to the site. The Planning Commission requested additional detail regarding the street improvements across the site frontage. City Engineering staff recommended that the applicant provide the engineering details of a non-raised median island to provide a legally-enforceable deterrent to left turns in and out of the site and that the applicant coordinate with Caltrans regarding the median island design. The project does not provide civil engineering details regarding a non-raised median island and other street frontage improvements needed to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site.

m. *Where feasible, natural features shall be appropriately preserved and integrated with the project.*

**Compliant:** The site contains no notable natural features; existing vegetation consists
of ruderal species.

n. The amount and arrangement of open space and landscaping shall be appropriate to the design and the function of the structures. Landscaping shall be in keeping with the character or design of the building, and preferably clustered in natural appearing groups, as opposed to being placed in rows or regularly spaced. The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors, shall create a desirable and functional environment and the landscape concept shall depict an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site. Plant material shall be suitable and adaptable to the site, shall be capable of being properly maintained on the site, and shall be of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance.

Non-Compliant: The Planning Commission identified the need for better-designed useable space and a more detailed landscaping proposal for the open space areas. As revised, the project provides the amount of useable open space specified in Table C of Zoning Code Section 18.06.030; however the open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for occupants. The private open space consists of hardscape patios and landscape details have not been provided to show appropriate landscape treatment of these areas. The patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise due to areas on either side of the garage that are open to the west.

o. The design shall be energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:

1. Exterior energy design elements;

2. Internal lighting service and climatic control systems; and

3. Building siting and landscape elements.

Compliant: The project would be required to implement energy efficient measures in conformance with the Building Code and to conform to the Water Efficiency in Landscaping Ordinance prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Architectural Site and Design Review Findings—

The required Architectural Review for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made the following findings per Municipal Code Section 14.37.040:

1. That such buildings, structures, planting, paving and other improvements shall be so designed and constructed that they will not be of unsightly or obnoxious appearance to the extent that they will hinder the orderly and harmonious development of the city;
Compliant: Overall, the project is not unsightly or obnoxious in appearance. The scale of the buildings is appropriate to the site, the architectural design is generally compatible with development in the area, and the architectural features are consistent with and support the overall design.

2. That such buildings, structures, planting, paving and other improvements will impair the desirability or opportunity to attain the optimum use and the value of the land and the improvements, or otherwise impair the desirability of living or working conditions in the same or adjacent areas; and

Non-Compliant: The project does not provide sufficient detail regarding the street improvements along the site frontage necessary to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Although the project provides the amount of useable open space specified in Table C of Zoning Code Section 18.06.030, the open space is not adequately sited and designed to provide a desirable environment for residents and their guests. The private open space consists of hardscape patios and landscape details have not been provided to show appropriate landscape treatment of these areas. The patio area for Unit B is not adequately shielded from noise in that areas on either side of the garage are open to the west and would be subject to Highway 1 noise.

3. The project has been designed in conformance and consistency with the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (where applicable).

Not Applicable: The Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines are not applicable to the Two-Family Residential (duplex) development proposed by this project.

Variance — Findings

This project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the Planning Commission has made the following findings per Municipal Code Section 14.23.040:

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to the land, buildings and/or uses in the same district;

Compliant: The triangular shape of the site, its narrow frontage on Poplar Street, and its proximity to Highway one set it apart from most other parcels located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

2. That the granting of the application is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner;
Non-Compliant: The granting of the requested Variances, or other Variances are not necessary for development of the site. The Planning Commission has suggested other design options and uses which the applicant has not explored (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence). The applicant has viable options available for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements, and thus the Variance is not needed to preserve property rights of the petitioner (owner).

3. That the granting of such application will, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant, and will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood.

Non-Compliant: Planning Commission concerns regarding the project design, including the design of the open space, the amount of pavement, and provision for safe site access, have not been adequately addressed. The revised design makes marginal improvements in the design of the required open space, but does not shield open space for Unit B from Highway 1 noise, does not provide a detailed landscape plan for the open space areas, does not reduce the amount of pavement on the site, and does not improve on-site vehicular circulation. In addition, the project does not include details regarding street improvements requested by the Planning Commission to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Given these deficiencies, the project, as proposed, may be injurious to persons residing or working in the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

Parking Exception – Findings

Prior to making a determination as to the granting or denial of a parking exception based Municipal Code Section 18.36.080 requires the decision-maker to make written finding of facts showing whether the following requirements have been established with respect to the land, building or use for which the parking exception is sought:

1. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application, which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to the land, buildings and/or uses in the same district;

   Compliant. Exceptional circumstances applicable to this parcel include its triangular shape, its narrow frontage on Poplar Street, and its close proximity to Highway 1. These characteristics set it apart from most other parcels located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

2. That the granting of the application is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the petitioner;
**Non-Compliant.** The granting of the requested Parking Exception is not necessary for development of the site in that the applicant has not explored viable design options and uses (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence) for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements, and thus the Parking Exception is not needed to preserve property rights of the property owner (petitioner).

3. *That the granting of such application will, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the property of the applicant, and will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood;*

**Non-Compliant.** Design concerns raised by the Planning Commission regarding the design of the open space, the amount of pavement, and provision for safe access to and from the site are not adequately addressed by the revised project. The revised design makes marginal improvements in the design of the required open space, but does not shield open space for Unit B from Highway 1 noise and does not provide a detailed landscape plan for the open space areas. Despite the elimination of two garage parking spaces, the amount of pavement has not been reduced, vehicular circulation remains very tight, the smaller detached garage continues to provide a substandard setback, and one of the parking spaces continues to be substandard in depth. In addition, the project does not include details regarding street improvements requested by the Planning Commission to demonstrate how safe pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to the site. Given these deficiencies, the project, as proposed, may be injurious to persons residing or working in the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

4. *That the establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off-street parking facilities as proposed are not as nearly in conformance with the requirements of the Half Moon Bay zoning code as are reasonably possible.*

**Non-Compliant.** The two garage parking spaces are not as nearly in conformance with Zoning Code requirements as is reasonably possible in that the applicant has not explored viable design options and uses (including a two-story design, placing the access driveway on the east side of the site, and a single-family residence) for development of the site in conformance with Zoning Code requirements.

**Environmental Review – Finding**

**CEQA** – The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

**Evidence:** The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15303 (a) in that the project consists of the construction of one duplex consisting of no more than 4 residential units.
Chair Hernandez called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners Hernandez, Reimer, Evans Conroy and Deman
ABSENT: None
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I. OLD BUSINESS

Owner/Applicant: Paul McGregor
Project Planner: Carol Hamilton, Senior Planner
Site Location: 555 Poplar Street, APN 064-243-060
APN: 064-243-060
Recommendation: Denial without prejudice.

Carol Hamilton, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report

Paul McGregor, Applicant spoke regarding the project requesting that the Planning Commission defer the project to another meeting. He indicated that he was not prepared to have this project on the agenda.

Staff Responded to Planning Commission via Memo provided at the meeting that applicant received adequate notification and was aware of proposed project being on the 12.13.2016 Planning Commission Meeting agenda.
Public Comment:

- Carlos Ruiz, HMB resident and neighbor expressed concern about Fire Dept. review, CalTrans Assessment, and drainage.

Paul McGregor, applicant responded to comments stating that drainage was addressed in the new plans.

Commissioners discussed the proposed changes, including Planning Commission direction from previous meetings which wasn't fully addressed.

Commissioner Conroy made a motion deny the Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review, and Setback and Driveway Design Variances to allow the construction of a single-story duplex on a 6,604 square-foot lot.
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Vice Chair Reimer seconded the motion. Motion carried by a roll call vote 5-0; Deman, yes; Conroy, yes; Evans, yes; Vice Chair Reimer, yes; Chair Hernandez, yes.

Planning Commission requested that the applicant remove the story poles.
MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Chair and Planning Commissioners

From: Jill Ekas, Director

Date: February 27, 2018

Subject: Local Coastal Program Update – Planning Commission Subcommittee

RECOMMENDATION:
Make a motion to establish and appoint a two-member subcommittee of the Planning Commission to work with staff to complete the update to the Local Coastal Program.

BACKGROUND:
Drafts of the remaining chapters of the Local Coastal Land Use Plan update, which constitutes the policy component of the Local Coastal Program, are nearing completion. Special consultants to the City have been providing policy guidance to staff from the context of the Coastal Act and other federal and state requirements. Staff has been utilizing their guidance to properly frame the LUP chapters and cover mandatory policy components while also incorporating community input, General Plan Advisory Committee direction, and Planning Commission oversight. At this time, some of the most complex portions of the work are coming together.

DISCUSSION:
In 2017, the Planning Commission considered formation of a subcommittee twice, but decided that it was not necessary at that time. City Council and staff request that the Planning Commission reconsider forming a subcommittee at this important juncture in the update process to support finalizing the draft LUP.