



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Inter-Departmental Correspondence
Planning and Building



Date: October 7, 2013
Board Meeting Date: October 22, 2013
Special Notice / Hearing: 300 Feet
Vote Required: Majority

To: Honorable Board of Supervisors

From: Jim Eggemeyer, Community Development Director

Subject: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Public hearing to consider an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to deny a design review permit to construct a new 2,583 sq. ft., three-story single-family residence, plus a 584 sq. ft. two-car attached garage on a 6,000 sq. ft. legal parcel, located on Twelfth Street in the unincorporated Montara area of San Mateo County. This project is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

Deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Planning Commission to deny the project, based on the findings contained in Attachment A.

BACKGROUND:

Proposal: The applicant requests design review approval to construct a new 2,583 sq. ft., three-story single-family residence, plus a 584 sq. ft. two-car attached garage on a 6,000 sq. ft. legal parcel.

Setting: The parcel is located east of Cabrillo Highway in an area of predominantly two-story single-family structures of various architectural styles. The general vicinity has mildly sloping topography, including an 8% slope for the subject site. The parcel is bounded by Twelfth Street northward, East Street (unimproved) and lower density residential development eastward, and developed residential parcels southward and westward that are similar to the subject property.

Coastside Design Review Committee Action: The applicant submitted a design review application to construct a new single-family residence on May 10, 2012. The Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC) initially reviewed the project on July 12, 2012. Based on the CDRC's requirements for corrections on the project plans, and recommendations for redesign, two subsequent meetings were held on December 13, 2012 and January 10, 2013, culminating in a decision to deny the project at this latter

meeting. On January 11, 2013, the applicant filed an appeal to the Planning Commission requesting for reversal of the denial.

Planning Commission Action and Subsequent Appeal: The Planning Commission considered the appeal on April 24, 2013 and denied the project. On May 6, 2013, the applicant filed an appeal to the Board of Supervisors challenging the Planning Commission's decision to deny the project.

Submittal of Redesign: On August 13, 2013, the applicant requested an October hearing date, in order to provide ample time to develop a redesigned version of the project that would address the issues identified by the Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION:

The applicant's appeal to the Board of Supervisors requests project approval and reversal of the Planning Commission's denial, contending that project approval is warranted based on compliance with Zoning Regulations and all design review standards including the one relating to neighborhood scale.

The Planning Commission determined that although the project complies with the R-1/S-17 Zoning Regulations, it does not comply with the required design review standards. Specifically, the overall three-story appearance of the proposed residence is inconsistent with the neighborhood scale, which primarily consists of two-story homes. The three-story configuration at the rear of the structure makes it appear massive and bulky. Also, neighborhood views are partially blocked by the massive rear cross-gable roof configuration. The garage location at the rear of the site contributes to the need for excessive grading, both on-site and partially on East Avenue, while excessive hardscape areas are also proposed on-site. The Planning Commission was unable to make the required findings that the project complies with the design review standards relating to the mitigation of mass and bulk, neighborhood scale, minimizing the effect on views from neighboring homes, excessive grading and outdoor hardscape areas. Also, the project does not conform to the General Plan Policies relating to responsible development in the area via proper management of the structure's location and appearance.

A redesigned version of the project was submitted on August 30, 2013. Staff reviewed the revised design and concludes that there were no substantial changes incorporated into the redesigned project to warrant reconsideration of the recommendation for project denial.

Alternatively, if your Board deems that the project should be approved; staff has prepared the necessary findings and conditions to reflect project approval in Attachment J.

County Counsel has reviewed and approved the materials as to form.

The denial of the Design Review Permit to construct a new single-family residence ensures that the 2025 Shared Vision outcome of a Livable Community is substantiated by preventing the development of projects that do not promote and enhance good design, nor contribute to the improvement in the appearance and visual character of development in the area, as otherwise stipulated in General Plan Policies 4.14 and 4.35 and the Standards for Design for One-Family and Two-Family Residential Development in the Midcoast.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No fiscal impact.