

From: [Randall Cohen](#)
To: [CLAIRE TOUTANT](#); [MCC](#)
Cc: edwardclovearch@gmail.com; [Javier Mercado](#)
Subject: RE: PLN2024-00099 - - APN:048014100
Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 1:59:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good day MCC,

Thank you for the comments. I have replied to each comment below, and I have copied the Applicant Ed Love and Owner Javier Mercado here for transparency.

1.

Comment from MCC:

“Thanks for sending this referral for a new house and attached ADU in Miramar to the MCC. We are always concerned, although this is essentially in-fill development at this point, about new construction in this area near the ocean. It is, in fact, in an area near where traffic is already being impacted by erosion, and sea level rise will only complicate the current situation. A solution to development in this area, including consideration of managed retreat policies, should be considered by the county planners.”

Randall Cohen, Planner:

There are areas closer to the shore that are considerably more challenging to build on that are impacted by erosion of the shore, and other geologic hazards. The proposed property was reviewed by The County of San Mateo for geologic hazards, where a full liquefaction analysis will be required. Drainage review is still in process.

2.

Comment from MCC:

“...we are uncertain if the size of the ADU complies with standards.

Randall Cohen, Planner:

Per the Coastal Zone ADU regulations SECTION 6439.5 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

Floor Area: The allowable floor area of an accessory dwelling unit shall be calculated in the manner described in Sections 6439.5, 6439.6, 6439.7, 6439.8, and 6439.9, but in no case shall these regulations be applied in such a way as to preclude an attached or detached accessory dwelling unit of at least 800 sq. ft. in size that meets all other relevant standards.

Here are the calculations provided by the Applicant:

	EXISTING		PROPOSED		TOTAL		ALLOWED				
	AREA (SQFT)	%	AREA (SQFT)	%	AREA (SQFT)	%	AREA (SQFT)	%			
LOT AREA	7045				ADU HOUSE	500 1821					
LOT COVERAGE	0	0.0	1821	25.8	1821	25.8	2467	35.0			
FLOOR AREA			1ST FLOOR 2ND FLOOR GARAGE ADU	1088 1472 491 500	1ST FLOOR 2ND FLOOR GARAGE ADU	1088 1472 491 500					
	Total	0	Total	3051	43.3	Total	3051	43.3	Total	3735	53.0

3.

Comment from MCC:

“We also do not see any provision for parking for the ADU”.

Randall Cohen, Planner:

There are 2 off street covered parking spaces proposed for the house inside the garage, and there is technically parking on the drive way for the ADU. Furthermore, the proposed development qualifies for a parking exemption as it is located .15 miles from a public transportation line.

Hwy 1 & Medio Ave

Stop ID: 314013

Bus stop – SamTrans

SECTION 6439.5 DEVELOPMENT STANDARD Parking Requirements; Section 13.b.1

Accessory dwelling units located within one-half (1/2) mile of a public transit stop or station, measured as a direct line from the transit stop. Public transit stops must be served by a transit line serving the public, and not solely by specialized, private, or limited population services such as school buses, privately run shuttles, or other services that cannot be used by all public riders.

4.

Comment from MCC:

“Management of drainage (and related seismic issues) and light are especially important in this location and we do not see detailed consideration given to these factors”.

Randall Cohen, Planner:

Geo review is complete with comments, see item #1. Drainage is wrapping up their review – hope to have it soon.

5.

Comment from MCC:

“A stark white color of the house will compound lighting issues.”

Randall Cohen, Planner:

Thank you for this comment. The Applicant is copied on this email, and will have an opportunity to discuss final color as they get closer to the Coastsides Design Review Committee community hearing, if they so choose. I have provided this excerpt from the Mid Coast Design Review Standards:

“4. Exterior Materials and Colors Discussion: Exterior materials and colors should complement the style of the house and that of the neighborhood, and blend with surrounding natural features when viewed from a distance. These standards are not intended to interfere with individual initiative, but rather to encourage compatibility within neighborhoods and with the natural setting. When selecting materials and colors, consider the type and character of materials and colors, number of different materials and colors, the quality of materials, and how ornamentation is applied. While no building material or color is prohibited as a matter of policy, as with other design elements, the neighborhood context provides direction for the choice of materials and colors. Use of complementary materials and colors will help a house appear compatible with its neighbors and blend with its natural setting including surrounding vegetation and landforms. Darker rather than lighter exterior colors may be used to reduce the apparent mass of a home.

Standards: a. Compatibility (1) Use non-reflective exterior materials and colors that complement and improve the neighborhood and are compatible with the architecture of the house. (2) Consider the exterior materials and colors used on neighboring houses; strive for complementary materials and colors on new and remodeled homes; avoid the use of materials and colors that are too similar, repetitive, or clashing. (3) Use warm, muted colors and natural appearing materials on the house that blend with the surrounding natural features when viewed from a distance. While earth-tone colors are encouraged, along with darker colors used to reduce apparent mass, other colors may be appropriate based on the architecture, neighborhood and surrounding natural features. b. Quality - Use exterior materials and colors that are of a similar or better quality of those used in the neighborhood and are consistent with the architecture of the house; avoid T-111 siding unless necessary for additions to match the existing house. c. Quantity (1) Use a number of exterior materials and colors that is consistent with the neighborhood and the architectural style of the house. (2) Encourage the use of three or more colors on larger houses to reduce the appearance of bulk by emphasizing architectural features and trim. (3) Discourage the use of a single exterior material or color in a large unbroken surface.

6.

Comment from MCC:

“Given the need for more detail and the location of the property, we urge you to ask for a full CDP, not just staff-level.”

Randall Cohen, Planner:

The Applicant is proposing to develop the land under ordinances and guidelines in place. The proposed

development is within the building envelope allowed. I cannot require further in-depth analysis if it is not stipulated to do so by the code.

7.

Comment from MCC:

“And why is it not appealable to the CCC, given its proximity to the shore?”

Randall Cohen, Planner:

Projects between the shoreline and the first public road may be appealed. The grounds for an appeal of a denied permit for projects located between the shoreline and the first public road parallel to the shoreline are limited to whether the project conforms to the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

<https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/cdp/appeals-faq.pdf>

If I can provide any further clarification (MCC), or if I have misrepresented anything here (Ed), please let me know.

Thank you for your time.

Thank you,

Randall Cohen

From: CLAIRE TOUTANT <midcoast.claire@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2024 11:28 AM

To: Randall Cohen <rcohen@smcgov.org>; MCC <midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: PLN2024-00099 - - APN:048014100

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Thanks for sending this referral for a new house and attached ADU in Miramar to the MCC.

We are always concerned, although this is essentially in-fill development at this point, about new construction in this area near the ocean. It is, in fact, in an area near where traffic is already being impacted by erosion, and sea level rise will only complicate the current situation. A solution to development in this area, including consideration

of managed retreat policies, should be considered by the county planners.

That being said, we are uncertain if the size of the ADU complies with standards. We also do not see any

provision for parking for the ADU.

Management of drainage (and related seismic issues) and light are especially important in this location and we do not see detailed consideration

given to these factors. A stark white color of the house will compound lighting issues. Given the need for more detail

and the location of the property, we urge you to ask for a full CDP, not just staff-level. And why is it not appealable to

the CCC, given its proximity to the shore?

On Wed, Aug 14, 2024 at 2:46 PM Randall Cohen <rcohen@smcgov.org> wrote:

Good day,

For review, and comment a proposed CDP (staff-level), Merger, & Coastside Design Review for a new two-story 2,560 sq. ft. single-family residence with attached 491 sq. ft. garage and attached 800 sq. ft. ADU on a 7,048 sq. ft. parcel; minimal grading and no tree removal. (PRE2023-00042). Pending Lot Merger under PLN2023-00283. The CDP is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission.

Please let me know if you would like to provide any comments, or have any questions.

Thank you,

Randall Cohen
PLANNER II
SMCGOV.ORG

--

Claire Toutant
Midcoast Community Council
midcoastcommunitycouncil.org