



**AGENDA NO: C-1**

**MEETING DATE: June 4, 2024**

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

Fw: correspondence for agenda item c-1

Kim Fowler <kfowler@morrobayca.gov>

Tue 6/4/2024 10:39 AM

To: Angie Buoncristiano <abuoncristiano@morrobayca.gov>



**Kim Fowler, Interim Planning Manager**

Phone: 805-772-6277 | Email: [kfowler@morrobayca.gov](mailto:kfowler@morrobayca.gov)

**City of Morro Bay | Community Development Department**

955 Shasta Avenue | Morro Bay, CA 93442

[www.morrobayca.gov/planning](http://www.morrobayca.gov/planning)

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, June 3, 2024 11:25 PM

**To:** Bill Roschen <broschen@morrobayca.gov>; Joseph Ingrassia <jingrassia@morrobayca.gov>; Mike Rodriguez <mrodriguez@morrobayca.gov>; Asia King <aking@morrobayca.gov>; Eric Meyer <emeyer@morrobayca.gov>

**Cc:** Kim Fowler <kfowler@morrobayca.gov>

**Subject:** correspondence for agenda item c-1

You don't often get email from winholtz@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Planning Commissioners:

1. ) The staff report states:

*"Categorical Exemption: The proposed project may be categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines 15301 (Class 3 –New Construction of Limited Small New Facilities) and 15332 (In-fill Development Projects in Urban Areas)."*

It also states:

*"A new water area will include one (1) new floating dock, (3) new finger slips, and one (1) finger dock space with a low floating dock for a kayak rental business. A new Harborwalk connection is proposed to connect pedestrians along the Embarcadero to Tidelands Park."*

I think that "A new water area" does not qualify for an environmental Categorical Exemption because it is Harbor not Urban. Whether or not you agree, there are eelgrass and other water impacts that must be addressed due to the over the water development. In addition, is there remediation that needs to be addressed due to the nature of the previous business?

This concern is in addition to the historical questions.

Exhibit E

2.) To exceed the 17-foot height limit, what is the justification or "significant public benefit" for allowing the proposed new building at 451 Embarcadero to be 24 feet? Also, the proposed roof area requirement is unknown; make this known.

3.) In the table on page 7 of 8, what does this mean: Lot Coverage land side of lease. 90% lot coverage for land side and 70% lot coverage on waterfront side. (Not differentiated between land v. water)

4.) Off-street parking has been required on all Embarcadero hotels until the last 2 buildings, i.e. Harborwalk Inn and Libertine. The Embarcadero's south end, which is where this proposal is located, has a number of "unhosted hotels," each of which provides off-street parking. Being in the same area, this development should also provide off-street parking. Even the businesses on the east side of the Embarcadero in this area provide off-street parking. Parking is limited in this area; street parking should not be impacted with 11 more spaces, a minimum of 8 of which will be 24 hours for the duration of the visitors' stay. If off-street parking is not required, the 8 hotel rooms will take away from recreational parking at Tidelands 24 hours a day for the extent of their stay. How will the police know to differentiate between legal and non-legal over-nighters in the Tidelands parking lot or on the street? Is no parking required for the boat slips? Please don't create parking problems.

5.) What makes this proposed development "meeting the requirement for low-cost visitor serving accommodations?"

6.) I find it harmful for a new hotel to block the views of an existing hotel. While private views are not protected, allowing new 2 stories on the west side, which should be kept to 17 feet, will impact the financial productivity of the established hotel across the street, 456 Embarcadero Inn. Is that what the City should participate in? **An option:** redesign the new building to put off-street parking underneath, as other developments have done. This can address both the height exception and parking requirements. The 2-story building could also be turned into hotel rooms, maybe with a public coffee bar; more retail, and eating and drinking establishments are not needed: the Embarcadero is flooded with these types businesses.

7.) My first choice would be to see the one-story buildings stay as STRs and the 2-story building turned into the hotel. Parking can go in between the buildings and to the south of the one-story buildings.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz