



AGENDA NO: B-1

MEETING DATE: November 19, 2024

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

Angie Buoncristiano

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2024 5:48 AM
To: Bill Roschen; Joseph Ingraffia; Mike Rodriguez; Asia King; Eric Meyer
Cc: Planning Commission; Kim Fowler
Subject: agenda item b-1

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

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I have these queries regarding the staff report.

1. This question was not answered at the last hearing: street numbers for the 2 bungalows are given in 2 different ways on the first page of the staff report: 431 and 451 **and** 451 and 471. This inconsistency is not corrected or explained in the current staff report.
2. The paragraph summarizing the **June 4, 2024** Conceptual Review Meeting implies that suggestions were made by the 3-member Commission, when in fact, they made an explicit point to make no recommendations because they had more questions than comments, including: digesting materials submitted just that afternoon, anticipating a July meeting on community benefits, meeting with or hearing from the Harbor Advisory Board first who would be convening the first week of August. Neither of the latter 2 items occurred.
3. The paragraph summarizing the **October 29, 2024** public hearing states that modifications to the project were made for the October 29 Hearing based on the Conceptual Review of June 4. I could detect no changes between what was proposed June 4 and what was proposed on October 29.
4. The developer is proposing to violate the height restriction of 17 feet. Suggested trade-offs in the form of **public benefits** are questionable. Some are required and **not benefits**: curb and street improvements, 8' sidewalk, Harborwalk, elevator (for the convenience of hotel guests). Some are **rejected by the public**: second floor deck and observation deck (what's the difference)? Others are **insufficient** to offset the height: a pocket park (next to a park) with seating amenities, bike rack, and a publicly accessible dock. There are 2 more suggested benefits: replacing the **wharf**; why? The current wharf is for the use of the water-dependent business. If the water-dependent business no longer has a shop in the building, how will it remain a viable business? Who is the new wharf for? The second item is adding a **tiny building** on the south end of the property "to attract tourists." A fake old, tiny house will attract no one. Leaving the current southern house as part of the hotel would make money.

I inquired at the October 29 hearing if this project was offering **lower-cost rooms**. I did not receive an answer. If this project does not, then some of its community benefits are no longer benefits but requirements under the *General Plan*:

IMPLEMENTATION ACTION LU-17

"Require new hotel and motel projects that do not have lower-cost accommodation options to incorporate non-overnight facilities and amenities, either within or as a component of the, development, which will be generally available for passive public use. Such amenities may, include public plazas and spaces, restaurants, retail units, gardens, viewing areas, free Wi-Fi, bike parking facilities, or other day-use features that may be used by the public at no or relatively low cost."

5. Rather than add **lighting**, which is disruptive to the nocturnal nature of the area, remove the overhead walkway and deck, so it is unnecessary.

6. I'm glad eliminating onsite **parking** based on a transit stop was dropped from current staff report for the following reason:

"California Assembly Bill 2097 (AB 2097), signed by Governor Gavin Newsom on September 22, 2022, is a California state law that prohibits a public agency from imposing or enforcing any minimum automobile parking requirement on a residential, commercial or other development project located within one-half mile of a major transit stop."

"'Major transit stop' means a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. (CA Pub. Res. Code § 21064.3)" A major transit stop does not exist in Morro Bay.

However, to eliminate the onsite parking requirement, "historical credit" is being employed: "A marine repair shop with a permanent dock, floating dock, and water slip was approved by the city in **1974. The following year, office space was approved on the second floor.** In **1976**, an existing residence was demolished, and the Planning Commission approved a two-story building with a dock and floating dock, with a **workshop on the ground floor and retail on the upper floor.** Associated Pacific Constructors, Inc. **currently occupies the building as office space.**"

The current misuse of the building's 3200 sq ft as office space was not permitted, does not align with current zoning, and should not be used as a standard for calculating parking. Before 2007, 1 space per 1,000 square feet was required for coastal dependent industrial; post-2007, no spaces are required. Historically then, 7 stalls are credited, leaving 5 stalls out of the 12 stalls are needed.

7. I have recopied quotes from the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance that allow the Planning Commission to preserve at least one if not both of the bungalows. Protect our

City culture and character. Notice how many "shall"s there are. Also, there are quotes related to other topics raised above.

General Plan: "Morro Bay's downtown and the waterfront Embarcadero areas are the commercial and cultural core of the community." **The history and culture of Morro Bay is a priority in the community, and the built environment should reflect this importance.** This objective can be achieved through adaptive reuse, wherein the City can encourage development projects that preserve historical and cultural legacies. Older buildings that may be considered significant resources can be repurposed for use by the community. **This approach is considered more sustainable and culturally sensitive than simply constructing new buildings. (4-27)**

POLICY C-2.3: Protection of Cultural Resources. Ensure the protection of historic, **cultural**, and archaeological resources during development, construction, and other similar activities. **Development shall avoid**, to the maximum extent feasible, adversely impacting historic, **cultural**, and/or archaeological resources, and shall include adequate BMPs to address any such resources that may be identified during construction.

POLICY C-9.1: View Enhancement as a Priority. Enhancing all public views and the **scenic qualities of the coastal zone shall be a priority** in all City actions and decisions. Development shall only be allowed that protects, preserves, and enhances the coastal zone's scenic and visual qualities consistent with the Coastal LUP.

POLICY C-9.2: Public View Protection. and Public views to and along the ocean and **scenic coastal areas shall be protected and enhanced**, and alteration of natural landforms shall be minimized.

POLICY C-9.7: Massing, Height, and Orientation Requirements. Require massing, height, and orientation of new development or construction **to be sited and designed to preserve public coastal views to and along the ocean and scenic areas.**

Zoning Code

17.11.030 Land Use Regulations

A. Additional Use Allowances and Limitations

2.WF District

b. Development Priority. **Development priority shall be given to coastal-dependent uses.**

17.11.050 Supplemental Regulations

A. Architectural Treatment.

1. The **architectural and landscape design of a project, including materials, shall be consistent with the character of a working fishing village**

Chapter 17.14 Coastal Resource Protection (CRP) Overlay District (IP)

17.14.010 Purpose and Applicability

B. Protection of coastal resources shall be a priority in all City actions and decisions, and development **must conform** to all applicable LCP policies related to hazards, water and marine resources, scenic resources, biological resources and environmentally sensitive habitat areas, **cultural resources**, and public access and recreation.

7.14.040 Land Uses

A. Visitor-serving uses shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, **but not over** agriculture or **coastal-dependent industry**.

C.3.a.ii. New low cost visitor overnight accommodations shall be provided on at least a rate of one new low cost accommodation for every four new high cost accommodations....A request for a reduction in the number of low cost accommodations is not allowed on State tidelands.

17.14.050 Community Design

In order to **protect and maintain the City's unique natural setting and character**, to promote orderly development, and to maintain consistency with the LCP's Land Use Plan (LUP), development shall conform to all applicable LUP Community Design and Visual Resources and Viewsheds policies.

A. Design and Siting. Development shall be sited and designed to maintain public views and **community character**.

B. Coverage. Building and other site coverage shall be limited to the degree necessary to protect and maintain existing public views, maintain adequate open space to preserve small-scale visual landscapes, protect water quality (including by limiting impervious surfaces), and **maintain community character**.

C. Heights. Building and other structure heights shall be limited and upper-story step backs shall be provided to the degree necessary to maintain existing public views, pedestrian scale, and community character.

E. Off-Street Parking. Off-street parking spaces shall be required in the number necessary to ensure that residential, customer, and employee parking needs are provided on-site and do not conflict with public parking needs, including for public coastal access. Factors to consider when determining Off-street parking requirements include the size of the lot, proximity to the shoreline, and adequacy of public parking opportunities for public coastal access in the vicinity.