

MINUTES OF THE MONTHLY MEETING OF THE
TRINIDAD PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, September 16, 2015

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL (6:05pm)

Commissioners Present: Espejo, Johnson, Lake, Pinske, Stockness
Commissioners Absent: none
Staff: Parker, Caldwell

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 20, 2015

Page 4, paragraph 7: Commissioner Lake has an issue with "...agrees that a 75% standard would be better..." because she does not agree. That sentence was removed. Commissioner Lake also notes that as part of their motion, the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Council to consider this amendment along with a future cap discussion rather than piecemealing the VDU issues. ***Motion (Johnson/Stockness) to approve the minutes as corrected. Passed unanimously (5-0).***

July 15, 2015

Due to Commissioner Vanderpool leaving the Commission, these minutes will remain unapproved due to the permanent lack of a quorum.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion (Johnson/Stockness) to approve the agenda. Passed unanimously (5-0).

IV. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR

Commissioner Pinske welcomes Lisa Espejo as the new Commissioner relieving Commissioner Vanderpool. He thanks her for her time and commitment, and relays that it is a rewarding and challenging job.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

1. **Hinderyckx 2015-08:** Design Review and Coastal Development Permit to construct a 1,134 sq. ft., two-story addition to an existing 1,449 sq. ft., 2-bedroom, single family residence. The project includes an additional bedroom, but the property is already served by a 3-bedroom septic system; a new reserve area will be required. A 45 sq. ft. addition to the existing garage is also proposed. Located at 334 Wagner St.; APN: 042-102-50

The architect placed full-sized plans on the wall; it was noted that the proposed reserve area (outlined in red) is included on those plans (it was not included on the plans in the packet). The reserve field is a tight fit for the site, but deemed adequate by DEH.

Planner Parker summarized the staff report.

Commissioner Stockness explains that she does not need to recuse herself even though her property is located just to the northwest of the project parcel, because she has no financial gain or loss from this project. The project is not located on her street and will not affect her views.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Johnson asks for clarification as to why this project is appealable to the Coastal Commission and Planner Parker explains that it is because the project is within 300' of a bluff and also because it is between the sea and the first public road.

Commissioner Johnson confirms that S. Pennisi and other close neighbors do not have any objections to the project, and asks if there have been any other comments from residents or tribes. Parker notes that she sent out notices to the neighbors and the TAS. Commissioner Pinske has a letter from M. Reinman, a neighbor to the north, stating that he has no objections to the project.

Commissioner Pinske notes that the lot slopes to the east (under site characteristics) rather than west as stated in the staff report.

Planner Parker discusses the history of Wagner Street and explains the public and private portions; most of the road is private with ownership going to the center of the road with easements for ingress and egress. The road was dedicated to the City many years ago, but that was never recorded; the City Attorney has stated that the road is still publically accessible.

The following details of the project are discussed:

- The color of the new roof will match the existing roof.
- The attic space is discussed in terms of whether it should be counted towards the floor area. The space is mostly unfinished and all less than 7 ft. in height.
- Commissioner Stockness is concerned about safety and the high traffic volume of the road (no center line, three vacation rentals, lack of turn-around etc.).
- Parker Creek is more than 100 ft. away from the existing leachlines and proposed reserve area.
- There are no City storm drains on Wagner Street. Regarding drainage on the property, the City Engineer will review the plans and the Building Inspector will approve them. The project does not meet the threshold of requiring additional review under the City's stormwater ordinance.
- The City Ordinance requires two 18' x 8.5' parking spaces, and this project will more than meet that requirement with two spaces shown on the plans and the possibility of an additional parking space in front of the garage, on the street or in the southeast grassy area and an additional tandem parking on the left side of the garage.
- The applicant mentions that because they are at the end of the private road and they are almost the only residents that have room for a vehicle to turn around, they perform road maintenance that benefits themselves and other residents / vacation rentals.
- Commissioner Stockness inquires about undergrounding the utilities and Planner Parker explains that the existing lines are above ground. The proposed utilities might not be as obtrusive because of the angle. Undergrounding utilities is not required in the Zoning Ordinance but encouraged as part of the Design Review findings. The project is in a view sensitive area, but the utilities on Wagner St. are all above ground, and it would be very expensive to underground the utility lines, so it is generally not required for properties that are already developed.

Public Comments

The applicants, Chris and Lauren Hinderyckx, state that they moved up here, bought the property sight unseen and have been fixing it up as they can. The 2-bedroom, 1-bath house with a small galley kitchen is now too cramped for a family with two young boys. They took the design seriously and tried to minimize privacy and view issues, including lowering the roofline and avoiding

windows that looked into the neighboring homes, while including architectural features that enhance the aesthetics.

The architect, Julian Berg, states that the goal of the design was to harmonize with the local context while adding space so the family can grow. Building code doesn't allow habitable space to be less than 7' in height, which the attic is. Planner Parker adds that space in the attic that is less than 7' should not count toward the total square footage. From the mean ground elevation, the roof is less than the 25' maximum, and the ridgeline of the addition is not readily visible. The purpose of the dormer on the front is to make sure the addition blends in and lets in natural light.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Stockness is curious about accommodating the parking and tight turns for construction trucks and the consequential safety issues. The applicant notes that the construction trucks will utilize the driveway. There is also a potential secondary access to the rear of the property from Parker Creek Dr. that could be utilized if necessary. The applicants are aware of all the parking issues and noise from the recent construction on View Street.

Commissioner Pinske notes that the second level extension is towards the east, and with the downward slope, the two-story addition blends in almost as if it is one level. The architect agrees and notes that it's not dramatically higher than the existing roofline with its steep pitch.

Commissioner Johnson gets clarification that the 3-bedroom septic system is sized correctly even with the existing downstairs music room, which qualifies as a bedroom. Parker affirms that that is the case.

Commissioner Espejo visited the project site and is satisfied with the proposed addition, especially after a neighbor she spoke to endorsed the project. She states that a family needs room to grow.

Commissioner Lake likes the design and notes her concerns about meeting General Plan goals of scale and mass, setbacks and underground utilities. But she thinks those have been adequately addressed, and that it is a good project.

Commissioner Pinske also likes the design, and if the utility lines do not currently affect the neighbors views and don't change the feel of the neighborhood, he does not see them remaining above ground as an issue. He understands that people must use their driveway as a back-up space, but this is probably the nature of the narrow street.

Motion (Johnson/Espejo) that based on application materials, information and findings included in this Staff Report, and based on public testimony, I move to adopt the information and required Design Review and View Protection findings in the staff report and approve the project as described in this staff report and as conditioned therein.

Passed unanimously (5-0).

- 2. Rheinschmidt 2015-07:** Design Review, Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit (for the tree removal only) and Grading Permit to construct a 1,408 sq. ft., one story, 3-bedroom, single-family residence and 440 sq. ft. attached garage. One tree over 12" DBH is proposed to be removed, which requires a Use Permit. The residence will be served by a new gravel driveway, and a new mound sewage disposal system. Located at Berry Road (address not yet assigned); just north of the Trinidad Living Christian Church, between 12 Berry and 56 Berry

Commissioner Comments

Planner Parker introduces the project. She notes that property now has an address: 32 Berry Rd. This is a new house on a vacant lot outside of the Coastal Commission appealable area. This is the first newly developed site since the adoption of the City's Stormwater Ordinance. Because the driveway is proposed to be gravel, the square footage of new impervious surfaces is below the threshold for stormwater review. However, the project still requires a Grading Permit and soils report, which are available in the project file.

The original project submittal included an impervious paved driveway. Projects with more than 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces, but less than 5,000 sq. ft., are classified as a small project. In order to comply with small project requirements, some kind of LID or stormwater improvements, such as rain barrels, drainage swales, etc. are required to mitigate for the impervious surfaces. In the final plans, the driveway was changed to gravel--which is not impervious. Parker suggests that the Commission add a condition of approval to the project to subject it to small project requirements if the driveway is paved in the future to discourage piecemealing.

Planner Parker explains that, due to drainage issues on the site, a mound septic system was required for this project. Mound systems require more inspections and maintenance. The lot is mostly flat but slopes off to the south. Several properties below this one have drainage issues, which is why the soils report was required. Drainage issues will be further addressed in the Building Permit.

The Commission discusses the water meter location being so far from the property (180' up Berry Rd.) and the City Engineer's comment that the water meter needs to be installed adjacent to the property. The applicant explained that it was already installed many years ago as the result of a previous subdivision and lot line adjustment. The applicant's preferred solution is to leave the meter in the current location 180' up Berry Road and run a trench to it so that he does not have to pay for a new water hook-up. Commissioner Johnson inquires about the comment that the meter has to be on City right-of-way and Planner Parker explains that the City Engineer probably did not know that the meter had been installed or why.

The applicant further explains about the new water service application and the challenge of meeting the new fire suppression requirements. It costs \$4,800 to pay for a new service hookup. He plans to install a 750-gallon holding tank to meet flow and pressure requirements and he's spoken with the neighbors (Kitchens) who are fine with him digging up the driveway to connect to the existing meter. Parker stated that the applicant's plan is fine in terms of planning review as long as Bryan Buckman, the Public Works director, who is in charge of water connection approvals, approves it. The Commission adds this as a condition of approval regarding the water meter.

Public Comment

G. Reinschmidt (applicant) explains that he has lived in the area since 1981 and the family bought the property in 2005. He plans for his house to be a subtle addition to the neighborhood. He has spoken with the neighbors and assured B. Twoomy that he will not move the hedges that he (Twoomy) planted as a screen) and that he will underground the utilities. Planner Parker notes that the subject of undergrounding is up for discussion as with the last project. She notes that although Berry Rd. is not a particularly view sensitive area, it does appear that the utilities along the road are underground for existing development, and therefore it was suggested as a condition of approval in the staff report.

The applicant is worried about the cost of undergrounding utilities because it is such a long distance from the pole to the house. He is hoping to come down the powerline and then mount a panel / meter on a short pole 10-15' away and then he can trench the rest of the way to the house himself rather than having PG&E do it. Commissioner Lake is concerned that such a proposal may not be to code. The applicant notes that he will have to consult with both the Building Inspector and PG&E, and states that his method will depend on their approval. Planner Parker thinks that this meets the requirements, and if it can't, the applicant can come back for an amendment. After finding that it is 150' from the house to the pole, Commissioner Pinske sympathizes and knows this is expensive from personal experience. He mentions that PG&E does a standard cost/foot for their work and suggests that the applicant do some research to find the most financially feasible option that is aesthetically pleasing. The Planning Commission generally agrees that this should not be a condition of project approval.

Commissioner Espejo enquires about the tree that is proposed to be removed. The applicant explains that it's a large alder that is leaning toward the house. Planner Parker adds that the tree removal is the reason for the Use Permit because it is greater than 12" DBH.

Commissioner Comments

The Commission discusses the conditions of approval. Commissioner Johnson points out that since the word "should" is in the Design Review findings regarding undergrounding utilities, the applicant does not have to underground the utilities. Planner Parker agrees that it is not an actual requirement in the Zoning Ordinance, just a finding which is up for discussion. There are considerations such as the expense and convenience of undergrounding and the aesthetics and past precedence. Commissioner Johnson notes that there may be aesthetic concerns, but Berry Road doesn't have ocean views and the wires don't cross the road. He suggests defining an undergrounding policy as a City.

Commissioner Lake likes that the applicant has been talking to the neighbors and thinks this project meets the goal of the General Plan.

Commissioner Stockness requests an email notification regarding the result of the undergrounding utilities. Planner Parker notes that she will reword the finding, and not include a condition. She suggests checking in with Gabe for an update and thinking about this issue for the General Plan update.

The conditions of approval are further discussed. A condition that this project will be subject to the small-project stormwater requirements should the driveway be paved in the future is added. Condition #9 that the residence must be moved 2' to the east to meet setbacks was removed because it referred to a different project and had been inadvertently included here. Condition #8 referring to the City Engineer's recommendations was reworded to give approval authority for the water meter location and configuration to the Public Works Dept.

Motion (Johnson/Stockness) based on the information submitted in the application, included in the staff report and public testimony at the hearing, that I move to adopt the information and Design Review, Grading and Use Permit findings in this staff report and approve the project as submitted and with the conditions therein as amended during the hearing.

Passed unanimously (5-0).

VI. CITY COUNCIL REPORT

A new VDU Committee, made up of two City Council members, was appointed to discuss options for capping the number of VDUs in town. They held several public meetings and made

recommendations at the City Council meeting. The Council has also made their recommendations and has passed the issue on to the Planning Commission to address VDU issues and consider an amendment to the existing VDU ordinance.

VII. STAFF REPORT

Planner Parker mentions the Sebring application and states that there will be some big issues to discuss with that project and that she would have the VDU cap issue on the next agenda.

Commissioner Stockness will be here for the next meeting; Commissioner Espejo probably will not.

Planner Parker has not received an arborist's report or any correspondence regarding the recent View Restoration Permit application..

Parker is working on both the LCP grant and the Clean Beaches grants.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Sarah Caldwell

Secretary to Planning Commission

Approved by:

Mike Pinske

Planning Commission Chair