



AGENDA NO: B-1

MEETING DATE: February 18, 2025

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

Angie Buoncristiano

From: John Erwin [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2025 3:02 PM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: 460 Errol Development hydrology study

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

I request that a hydrology study showing that development will not cause water levels to increase up and downstream in Morro Creek for a 200 year storm. This should have been done for the development downstream.

John Erwin [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

Angie Buoncristiano

From: betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 10:40 PM
To: Eric Meyer; Joseph Ingraffia; Asia King; Tony DeFazio; Mary Witkowski
Cc: Kim Fowler; Planning Commission
Subject: agenda item b-1

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

Dear Planning Commissioners,

In addition to the questions I have per bolded page below, I am concerned that I cannot find the specific category of Recreational Vehicle Park, RV Park, in the new Zoning Code. Whether it is missing or difficult to locate, is up to staff to say. Without it, where is the standard to compare this project to?

In particular, it is uncommon in my experience to park one's car away from the RV, which is the dominant theme here in spaces 4-8. If I'm camping, I'm not parking my bike at a bike rack away from my camper.

Also, Silver City has been notorious for converting RV spaces to more "permanent" mobile home spaces in its Park. What condition will prevent conversion from happening in this Park?

Finally, are certain lengths of RV's prohibited? Is tent camping allowed?

Regarding the staff report for this project:

page 16 *Additional Regulatory Documents Applicability*

It is puzzling that this table is listed since all documents are irrelevant.

Page 16 *Surrounding Land Use*

I believe the East and West designations are flipped because Silver City is to the East and Residential housing is to the West.

Page 26 *Findings*

This sentence needs correcting: "As an RV park located within Highway 101,"

Page 27 3. *Habitat Protection.*

The following quote is from the report, "This property is located within a mapped known environmentally sensitive habitat but meets or exceeds the required buffer requirement and therefore is not expected to compromise existing vegetation, natural habitats or natural resources with proper erosion control measures." The ESH buffer is reduced, so it does not "meets or exceeds" required buffer. Rather, has the buffer been reduced to allow for more RV spaces? There is no LCP Consistency Finding because of this quote:

The General Plan states on Page 4-22,

“For aquatic resources and wetlands the buffer shall be the following, whichever is wider, on both sides of the stream:

a. For rivers, streams and riparian areas, the required buffer shall extend at least 50 feet from the outer edge of the riparian vegetation on both sides of the river, stream, and/or riparian area or 50 feet itself [measured perpendicularly from the top of the river, stream, or measure from riparian area bank for areas without riparian direction of the vegetation]”

Page 28 *10. Hazards.*

The staff report states, “The proposed development is consistent with the LCP’s coastal hazards provisions....This project, however, is not located along the coast and therefore is not subject to the LCP’s coastal hazards provisions.” Agreed, this project is not along the coast. However, there are other kinds of Hazards. The south boundary of the property is Morro Creek, infamous for flooding. If this boundary has not been classified as a Hazard, has it been sufficiently evaluated to prevent flooding on the property? How is the proposed fencing evaluated for preventing flooding either on this or adjacent properties?

Page 50 *12-1-23 Biological Letter*

This letter identifies only 6 RV spaces. This proposal is for 8 spaces plus parking spaces. As a matter of information, how much time was spent on the property?

Page 56 *Tree species*

No diameter size given per tree. Usually, a report identifies how many trees there currently are on the property, what size they are, how many are marked for removal, and how many required replacement trees will be planted and where. It is questionable whether large trees should be removed.

Page 84 *Plants*

In spite of 26 plants ranked #1 as rare in CA, and 10 ranked #1 Global and State critically imperiled, nowhere in the report is this addressed or mitigated.

Page 90 *Animals*

Similarly 5 of 48 animals identified are ranked #1 as Global and State critically imperiled, yet this is not mitigated.

The CEQA Determination on page 14 is flawed because it ignores the Plants and Animals identified on the property. Where are the tree, plant, animal, and hazard mitigations or preventative measures?

Finally, I believe the Planning Commission should be privy to at least landscaping and lighting proposals when evaluating a project. It use to be so.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz