



AGENDA NO: C-1

MEETING DATE: APRIL 4, 2023

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE PLANNING
COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC REVIEW
PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

From: [Cindy Jacinth](#)
To: [Christina Azevedo](#)
Cc: [Scot Graham](#)
Subject: FW: agenda item c-1
Date: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:36:22 AM

Please post this with Agenda Correspondence. Thank you.

Cindy

From: betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2023 2:39 AM
To: wroschen@morrobayca.gov; Joseph Ingraffia <jingraffia@morrobayca.gov>; Mike Rodriguez <mrodriguez@morrobayca.gov>; Asia King <aking@morrobayca.gov>; Eric Meyer <emeyer@morrobayca.gov>
Cc: Cindy Jacinth <cjacinth@morrobayca.gov>
Subject: agenda item c-1

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Planning Commission:

Please include my questions and comments in your advice to the developer for the Concept Review.

1. Teresa Drive is a private road. Teresa Drive will lead into another private road, Sea Shell Cove. What impact if any does this have for Circulation? What does *Plan Morro Bay/General Plan* have to say about private roads? Private roads has been used several times in Morro Bay--in the Colmer development on Main, in the new Cloisters addition, proposed for 3300 Panorama. My observation is that private roads are used as a technique that allows developers to not have to give neighborhoods standard width roads, street parking, and sidewalks. Do we want to be a city of private roads? Should homeowners be responsible for the condition of our streets rather than the City?

2. Why does the Chamber of Commerce--2 board members plus Chamber staff--get to have seats at the table for this housing project? How is it that they are more special than the public? We are all concerned about housing; do I need to form a club to have a seat at the table? If this is going to be a pattern with housing projects, then residents should have 2 seats at the table as well. Otherwise, it is inappropriate.

3. Under the section Property History, quite a bit is omitted. My point in listing all the items is to demonstrate that the Commission is missing pertinent information that would serve them in making recommendations

to the developer.

A. There was a hearing before the Planning Commission on this property June 1, 2009. However, there is no staff report or documents attached to the Agenda item.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/238>

B. There are Minutes from that hearing beginning on page 3 of 5.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/556>

C. The hearing was continued to the following meeting on June 15, 2009. Again, there is no staff report or documents accompanying the Agenda. <https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/301>

D. There are Minutes for June 15, 2009.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/557> These Minutes refer to a city council meeting on April 13, 2009.

E. The City Council meeting Agenda of April 13, 2009 offers real information.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/107>

Page 38 of 89, Agenda Item B-3.

F. City Council Minutes of April 13, 2009 begin on page 5.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/214>

G. All of the present Planning Commissioners except Mr. Meyer attended the June 7, 2022 public hearing. The Agenda item begins on page 20 of 114.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5934> Though the 2009 meetings were referenced, no data was offered to the Commissioners regarding the discussion or findings of the 2009 City Council and Planning Commissions at their 2022 hearing.

H. The Minutes for the Planning Commission June 7, 2022 hearing begins on page 2.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5986>

I. The City Council Agenda for August 23, 2022 looked at the zoning for this property as a Business Item rather than a Hearing. The staff report begins on page 145 of 243.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5979>

J. City Council Minutes for August 23, 2022 begin on page 5 of 9.

<https://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5999>

4. The developer is taking advantage of the State law that allows him to subdivide 1 lot into 4 units, giving him a maximum of 40 units. If the City and the Chamber, since they were the decision makers on the sub-committee, were serious about workforce housing, they would not be recommending all multi-family, 3-bedroom units. What Morro Bay lacks is one- and two-bedroom units for a single person or a couple. Morro Bay doesn't lack market rate housing. It lacks low and very low income units. What is being offered here meets neither need.

5. What does the developer want for 70 units? What would that look like?

6. If these units are 2-story, why do they need to be 29.5 feet tall?

7. Nothing has changed in the last 14 years to support a new or updated environmental study. Do not re-subdivide the tract map. Have the developer honor the conditions currently on the property. For those conditions, you will have to read the April 13, 2009 City Council Agenda and Minutes and June 15, 2009 Planning Commission Agenda and Minutes.

8. The developer is not addressing City needs with his proposal. The City's 2022 Housing Goals are not consistent with the City's Housing Element. The proposal meets neither the kind of housing Morro Bay needs (1 and 2 bedroom) nor the income level (low and very low). It does not help with where the City lacks meeting the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 2019. SLOCOG's RHNA asks Morro Bay to provide a total of 391 units with 97 at very low, 60 at low, 70 at moderate, and 164 above moderate. If you ask anyone on the street, they will tell you the City *does not* need above moderate and maybe not even moderate if the City is sincere about supplying workforce housing. Our workforce is composed of minimum wage earners in restaurants, stores, hotels, vacation rentals, and landscaping. These workers fall into the low and very low income brackets.

9. My comments in this email do not begin to address environmental concerns, starting with serpentine naturally occurring asbestos and a known landslide area right under high power lines. Where are the engineer's stamped and signed maps to show this project is even feasible?.

If you don't discourage this concept plan immediately, then at least continue it while you investigate the wealth of information you don't have.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz

P.S. Is there a reason why the "Initial Study and Checklist" Form does not have a space for a date?

From: [Dana Swanson](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Subject: FW: Agenda Correspondence - Plannin Commission Item C-1; 4/4/23
Date: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 8:40:00 AM

Good morning Commissioners,

Please see the correspondence below from Mr. Heller for tonight's meeting.

Dana Swanson
City Clerk
City of Morro Bay
Phone (805) 772-6205
dswanson@morrobayca.gov

From: Jeffrey Heller <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2023 10:39 PM
To: Dana Swanson <dswanson@morrobayca.gov>
Cc: Heather Goodwin <hgoodwin@morrobayca.gov>; Greg Anderson <ganderson@morrobayca.gov>
Subject: Agenda Correspondence - Plannin Commission Item C-1; 4/4/23

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Please issue to Planning commissioners.

Morro Bay's greatest housing need is for families with **extremely low, very low, and low incomes as calculated on annual income.**

Yet our current ordinance requires that 10% of a multifamily project provide deed restricted units in the very low, low, and moderate income levels--with no required percentage for each level, and no requirement to provide units at the "extremely low" income level. Often this results in all of the 10% required units are for the "moderate level", which leaves the lower levels out.

Some cities require that each of their preferred income levels have units built for that level, and require a greater percentage of affordable units in general.

Developers who pay the "in lieu" fee instead of building affordable units, certainly help the overall effort to increase the number of units available over the long haul--but the City needs more affordable units built now, so the \$/sq. ft. in lieu fee option should be avoided by the Planning Commission and City Council whenever possible.

If Morro Bay is serious about building deed restricted affordable housing, our Zoning Code needs to updated as soon as possible. I suggest the following revisions:

1. Multifamily projects must include 25% deed restricted affordable units. 10% - extremely low, 10% very low, and 5% low--based on annual income calculations.

2. All development types (industrial, commercial, residential, etc.) should pay affordable housing in lieu fees, if unable to include affordable units in their project. For example--our current ordinance allows SFR's less than 2,500 sq. ft. to pay \$0 in fees, while a 2,500+ sq. ft. SFR must pay \$62,500+ in fees. This inequity needs to be resolved.

3. In lieu fees should be calculated on the quantity of each income level the City wants built, and how many years it will take to build them. In other words, the in lieu fees need to be sufficiently funded so affordable units actually get built over a specific period of time, rather than always "playing catch up"

It is my hope that the Planning Commission and City Council will make these zoning code changes a top priority an implementation action. These need to be enacted ASAP so the City can confidently upzone properties to generate the affordable housing we all want.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeff Heller

