March 17, 2016

Mr. James Caruso
County of San Luis Obispo Planning & Building Dept.
976 Osos St., Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Dear Mr. Carusco,

I am writing this letter in support of Mr. Dan Lloyd's proposed project for 399 E Street in Cayucos, CA. I am a Cayucos resident and not a business associate of Mr. Lloyd's.

I believe Mr. Lloyd's proposal of building seven single-family residences would be a welcomed addition to the surrounding neighborhood, as opposed to multi-family rental buildings. The neighborhood is a mixture of single-family homes along with a huge storage garage for school buses on E street. Single-family residences would be attractive for the area. I have seen the drawings for the houses and find that they are aesthetically designed with a craftsman bungalow look which would be a good look for that location. And, there seemed to be a concern for the total appearance of the neighborhood – in that the houses did not have a "cookie cutter" look and were very much individual in design, while being compatible. Placing the garages in the rears of the houses which would face E Street is a clever idea because it beautifies the visual appearance of the houses from the street view since passersbys don't have to look at garages and cars parked in driveways. I also liked the addition of the extra parking spaces along E Street which are recessed back from the street and looked very useable while being attractive, instead of having cars randomly parked every which way in the neighborhood. Having the electrical and telephone lines underground would also improve the appearance of the neighborhood.

In conclusion, I am wholeheartedly supporting Mr. Lloyd's proposed project for 339 E Street. In my opinion, these thoughtfully designed single-family homes will benefit the neighborhood along with all the parking considerations.

Sincerely,

Anonymous neighbor

P.S. I chose to sign as "Anonymous" because I have friends on both sides of this issue and I want to keep them as my friends. Thank you for your consideration.

Kathleen Oliver 24 Cypress Glen Ct. Cayucos CA 93430 805 710-1031

James Caruso, Senior Planner

San Luis Obispo Co Dept. of Planning and Building

796 Osos St. Room 200, San Luis Obispo 93408

Re: Campbell-Sheppard Tract Map ED15-063 SUB 2015-00001

Dear Mr. Caruso,

I have examined the preliminary staff report for the above project and note 2 exceptions:

a) The project size is almost exactly the same (29,820 vs 30,000) as neighboring project DRC2015-00022 on Birch Stet which was appealed to the Costal Commission and approved by both bodies with 3 houses vs the proposed 7 houses on the above Tract. The precedent was established with both your commission and the planning commission by the Birch Street project. This proposal is 4 houses above that precedent. I request that you recommend reduction of the number of residences in the proposed application to match precedent.

b) The biological report for the above Tract Map concludes that there is no suitable aggregation site for the monarch butterfly within the area although one was found approx. 400 ft. downstream in Little Cayucos Creek. However, page 12-13 of the costal commission report (attached) for the adjunct Birch St project declared that aggregation area as a **substantial issue** because overwintering habitat is rare and important to the butterfly ecosystem. It said that this historic overwintering site has been subject to the pressure of development and is degraded. I believe that these findings would be applied to the current proposal by the costal commission upon appeal.

Please consider my exceptions in your final report.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Oliver

Kathleen Oliver

by CZLUO 23.07.174.d.2 (i); or that the adjustment is necessary to allow a principal permitted use of the property CZLUO 23.07.174.d.2 (iii). Therefore, a substantial issue is raised with respect to conformance with the CZLUO riparian setback adjustment requirements. Finally, as discussed in more detail in the de novo findings (incorporated herein by reference), it appears that there are alternative routes and project designs that would provide for a principally permitted use and that would better protect riparian ESHA on the site. Therefore, the project raises substantial issues with respect to LCP policies and standards that protect riparian ESHAs.

Monarch Butterfly Habitat

Monarch butterfly habitat is located on Lots 3 & 4 of the site and directly adjacent to the project site. It is comprised of several large eucalyptus and cypress trees that are a component of the riparian habitat discussed above. Although Monarchs are not globally threatened their range is restricted in California. Monarch overwintering habitat is listed at a G4S3 level in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) maintained by the Department of Fish and Game. The S3 designation is defined as "restricted range, rare" habitat area statewide; further defined as 3,000 – 10,000 individuals or 10,000 – 50,000 acres of occupied habitat (DFG, 2006). Further, in 1984, the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources classified the Monarch migration and the overwintering behavior of the Monarch butterfly a "threatened phenomenon."

Monarch experts are increasingly concerned about the impacts of development and changing ecosystem dynamics on historic overwintering sites. Many formally large sites have slowly deteriorated due to a lack of protection from human influences. Monarchs have highly specific habitat requirements that include the need for wind-protection, buffered temperatures, high humidity, filtered sunlight, proximity to water and nectar sources and habitat heterogeneity (Bell, 2002). These specific requirements make Monarch habitat extremely sensitive to human induced habitat alterations.

Monarch butterfly overwintering habitat in California is listed as "rare" by the CNDDB and it is important to the ecosystem because it provides important feeding and resting opportunities for butterflies during a migratory stage of their life cycle. In addition, the habitat is documented to be extremely sensitive to disturbance or degradation caused by human activities and development. Monarch habitat meets the general LCP definition of ESHA. The Commission also has generally protected significant Monarch sites as ESHA. Further discussion of Monarch habitat as ESHA can be found in the de novo findings below (incorporated herein by reference).

The historic overwintering site adjacent to the proposed project site has been subject to the pressures of development and, because of inadequate protection for the habitat in the past, is degraded. In past years new residential developments have removed trees from along the outer grove boundary, altering the wind dynamics and thus disturbing the microclimate that the overwintering Monarchs had previously relied on. Before these developments, populations ranged from 20,000 to 60,000 butterflies per season, placing the site among the largest in California. The population has significantly declined due to these human activities. In 2002, Dr. Kingston Leong, a Monarch specialist and professor of biology at California Polytechnic, State University, conducted a study of the site and obtained data that showed

that the site, while no longer suitable as an overwintering site, was still a valuable site for autumnal Monarch roosting. Richard Little, a consulting project biologist and Monarch expert, reviewed Dr. Leong's study and concurred that "the site is still used by Monarchs and should be protected (Little, 2003)."

Based on biologist recommendations a sufficient setback that protects the driplines of the habitat trees and the surrounding ecosystem is necessary for Monarch protection. The approved project allows development within 10 ft of the dripline of the largest eucalyptus tree, based on an adjustment of the minimum setback of 20 feet for this riparian area. This minimal setback endangers the ESHA and is inconsistent with LCP policies that are intended to protect terrestrial habitat and therefore raises a substantial issue.

3. Substantial Issue Conclusion

As discussed above, the project as proposed raises substantial issue concerning compliance with the LCP polices and standards to protect riparian and other ESHA resources. As approved, it allows a riparian setback adjustment without the proper findings and lacks adequate protection of Monarch habitat by allowing insufficient buffers. The Commission finds that the proposed project **raises substantial issue** because it lacks provisions to ensure there will be no significant impact on ESHA at the project site. Further, as detailed above, the project as approved lacks adequate protection measures for the ESHA located on and adjacent to the project site and is inconsistent with the specific policies applicable to these areas requiring setbacks. Lack of adequate setbacks could result in the further degradation and disturbance of the site.

VI. De Novo Findings and Declarations

Because the Commission has found that the project raises a substantial issue with respect to conformance with the certified LCP, the California Coastal Commission takes jurisdiction over the coastal development permit for the proposed project. The standard of review remains the certified LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

A. Project Location and Description

SLO Land Corporation applied to the County for a Minor Use Permit/Coastal Development Permit to allow the construction of three new two-story single family residences on four legal parcels (APN(s) 064-112-020 & 064-112-021). The project site is located in the town of Cayucos, west of Highway 1 in San Luis Obispo County, adjacent to and south of Little Cayucos Creek. The project included: a 2,656 sq ft single family residence with a 550 sq ft garage on merged Lots 3 & 4[1]; a 2965 sq ft single family residence with a 528 sq ft garage on Lot 5; a 3102 sq ft single family residence with a 540 sq ft garage on Lot 6; access improvements on Birch Ave; grading with a total disturbance area of 15,691 sq ft and

[1] Lots 3 & 4 were merged by a voluntary merger document on March 5, 2005 (Exhibit N).

J. H. EDWARDS COMPANY
A REAL PROPERTY CONCERN
Specializing in Water Neutral Development

March 18, 2016

San Luis Obispo County Planning and Building Department
County Government Center, Room 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Attention: Planning Commission

RE: CAMPBELL-SHEPPA/DANIEL R. LLOYD for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (Tract 3074) and Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

By way of introduction, my name is Jeff Edwards and my firm represents two neighbors of the above referenced proposed development. My clients reside on Cypress Glen Court and oppose the project as currently configured. They reside at 24 Cypress Glen Court and 401 E Street on the northwest corner of E Street and Cypress Glen Court. They are the Roach and Main families respectively. These families are likely the most affected neighbors by the proposed project during construction and following completion.

On their behalf, I have reviewed the staff report for the project and wish to share with the Commission their concerns and requests in an effort to strike a balance between the rights of existing homeowners and the applicant. If the neighbor requests are incorporated into the conditions of a project approval by your Commission, my clients would withdraw their opposition to the project.

In general, the concerns fall into the following categories:

a. Traffic and circulation (triple dead end/induced traffic)
b. Noise and Safety
c. Future improvements to Cypress Glen Court (realign to true centerline)
d. Mass and Scale (project design)
e. Little Cayucos Creek Setback (no yards in setback)
f. Overall neighborhood compatibility (blends in or sticks out?)
g. Reduction in property values
h. Diminution of quiet enjoyment
i. Significant grading and land form alteration

In summary, the above referenced concerns may be addressed with the following action:

1. Allow only two (2) homes within Tract 3074 to gain access via Cypress Glen Court.

P.O. Box 6070, Los Osos, CA 93412 (805)235-0873 jhedwardscompany@gmail.com
ACQUISITION MARKETING LAND USE REDEVELOPMENT

2. Condition improvements to be made to Cypress Glen Court that would realign the new roadway to the true centerline of the 70' wide right-of-way.

3. Ensure no parking or driveway blockage impacts on neighbors from subcontractors during all phases of construction.

4. Two-story maximum (i.e. no 3-story structures).

5. No portion of yard area to be within 20 ft. wetland setback. Please note typical riparian setback in urban area is 50 ft. The entire riparian area and setback should be included in the open-space parcel with only allowed uses to be permitted.

6. Require amended easement and road maintenance agreement including all parcels to be served by Cypress Glen Court.

Please consider an important procedural matter that poses the question, of whether, or not, this application is properly before this Commission. The Real Property Division Ordinance (RPDO) under Section 21.03.010 (d) (7) which expressly limits the use of a private easement to serve no more than five (5) parcels at full build out. Cypress Glen Court is a private easement and presently provides access to four (4) parcels. The proposed project intends to use Cypress Glen Court exclusively for all access (residential and emergency vehicle) adding seven (7) new parcels to a private driveway. Please see the Pinnacle Traffic Engineering letter dated February 29, 2016, Attachment 7, page 11 of 20, Table 2-Project Site Trip Generation Estimates. As such, the proposal before you is inconsistent with the applicable section of the RPDO.

An applicant may request an adjustment to the above referenced RPDO section in accordance with Section 21.03.020. However, the applicant has failed to conform to the provisions of the section in two important ways. One, Section 21.03.020 (a) authorizes your Commission to consider Adjustments "in cases where an undue hardship would result from the application of the regulation established in this title, …" To date, the applicant has not made a showing of undue hardship or in any way demonstrated or even addressed a hardship. Secondly, and more perplexing is the fact that Subsection (b) requires "Requests for adjustment to the standards set forth in Section 21.03.010 of this title shall be submitted in writing to the planning department at the time the applicant submits the application for land division." The application was filed in July of 2015 and the applicant submitted the response to the deficiency is dated February 8, 2016. The most problematic aspect of this is that when the primary public discourse occurred for this proposal before the Cayucos Community Advisory Council (CCAC) in late 2015, the inconsistency with Section 23.030.010 was not known and consequently, neither CCAC nor the public had any opportunity to comment on the inconsistency with the RPDO or the adjustment that is required. The most appropriate remedy is to send the application back to CCAC for further consideration. Since CCAC did not take an action when the

matter was considered in December, continuing the Planning Commission hearing would allow the entire project to be more fully vetted by the public on all of the salient issues.

Neither staff nor this commission is responsible or obligated to address the inconsistency with the RPDO, the applicant must perform and make the case in accordance with all applicable sections of the RPDO, and to date has failed to do so. Until the applicant makes the case for an "undue hardship", I submit it is premature for your Commission to consider the required findings that must be made pursuant to Section 21.03.020 (c) (1) (2) (3). The applicant did submit proposed findings on February 8, 2016 as referenced above and included in the staff report as Attachment 5. Unfortunately, the suggested findings are superficial at best and appear to make the case that any benefits from more unrequired parking on E Street outweigh the significant impacts to the neighbor's quiet enjoyment from increased vehicular traffic nearly three (3) times current conditions. Creative site design and planning should not be realized at the expense of the existing residential neighborhood. My clients strongly object to the applicant prepared findings in connection with Section 21.03.010 that have been incorporated into Exhibit C, Tract Map Findings J., K. and L by staff as shown in Attachment 3.

Please see the following proposed modifications to the findings conditions to address General Plan, Local Coastal Plan and CEQA issues that are outstanding and inconsistencies.

Exhibit A shown as Attachment 1 in the staff report for Development Plan/CDP Findings.

My clients disagree with a number of the findings, however particular exception is taken to findings D., E. and F. The use of Cypress Glen Court to serve the entire project will likely "be detrimental to the health, safety or welfare" of persons residing in the neighborhood and particularly those on Cypress Glen Court. Please see Attachment 7, a letter from a traffic engineer discussing the traffic and circulation limitations of the proposed project. Furthermore, the design of the project, specifically the homes fronting E Street, have garages and tandem carports facing my client's property in a three-story configuration. The location of the garages induces the unwanted traffic and creates a visual appearance of the proposed project that is clearly inconsistent with the existing predominately single-family residential neighborhood.

Exhibit B shown as Attachment 2 in the staff report for Development Plan/CDP Conditions of Approval.

Condition 2. Require final site plans to remove any unpermitted uses within the Little Cayucos Creek setback areas such as private yards, storage areas or parking.

Condition 8. Appears to be an impossible condition to satisfy in that my clients refuse to provide the needed modification to accommodate the project as proposed.

Condition 63. (b.) Request language be added requiring Cypress Glen Court to be constructed along the true centerline of the right-of-way

Please add a condition to limit all structures to two-story.

Exhibit C shown as Attachment 3 in the staff report for Tentative Tract Map Findings.

As stated above, particular exception is taken to findings J., K. and L. as provided by the applicant. The applicant makes a number of conclusionary statements in his proposed findings, however they are not substantiated with any traffic analysis or expert opinion. For example, it is common sense, that taking access to the parcels in the project fronting E Street would be safe considering E Street has limited traffic being a dead end road. This assertion would have merit if access where be taken from a collector of arterial road, which is not the case. Also, how important is providing excess on-street parking along E Street when the cost is an inordinate amount of traffic, noise and disruption of my clients' quiet enjoyment of their property. Overall the proposed findings are either irrelevant or lack a factual basis to make such a claim. I respectfully request that your Commission reject these findings on their face.

Exhibit D shown as Attachment 4 in the staff report for Tentative Tract Map Conditions of Approval.

Condition 2 (b.) Request road improvements to be made to Cypress Glen Court follow the true centerline of the right-of-way.

Please add a condition to limit access to the project from Cypress Glen Court to two (2) single-family residences.

On behalf of my clients, I respectfully request a continuance of the hearing for the proposal before you until several key issues can be addressed.

1. Properly address RPDO Section 21.03.010.

2. Determine the legal ramifications of securing proper easements for access and the right to use Cypress Glen Court and to what extent by the proposed project.

3. Confirm locations of edge of riparian vegetation and resulting setback and verify the applicant's ability to remove any unpermitted uses within the setback area.

4. Re-refer the proposal to the CCAC for further review and a decision.

5. Verify with Cal Fire, the appropriate requirements for the project. It appears the local Cayucos Fire Department may not have reviewed the project in sufficient detail and/or had the benefit of understanding all of the applicable requirements.

In conclusion, one of the fundamental precepts of the planned development regulations is to achieve "compatibility with land uses on adjoining properties" in allowing flexible and creative designs of projects. I respectfully submit, the current proposal has requested the attendant flexibility, however has failed to demonstrate how neighborhood compatibility has been achieved. Quite to the contrary, the proposal as presented does not blend in with the residential surroundings and has concentrated vehicle traffic in a manner that especially burdens my clients. Please continue the matter following public testimony and direct staff to review the points raised in this letter and other issues as your Commission deems appropriate.

Sincerely,

Jeff Edwards

c- Eileen Roach
Kevin and Kathi Main

Mr. James Caruso
Senior Planner
County of San Luis Obispo

March 19, 2016

Dear James:

I'm writing to add my name to the list of local Cayucos residents in favor of the proposed Cypress Glen development.

My wife, two boys and I moved to town two years ago. We have been renting (63 Pacific Avenue) while looking for housing to buy. Our preference is to purchase something near the downtown area. So far, the options have been limited. Currently there is only one property for sale in the downtown area for under $1 million -- a $925,000 teardown on Ash.

I have attended the community hearings about the development and am encouraged by what I've learned to-date. I especially like the location and overall design of this development, the fact that it will be single-family homes instead of apartments, as well as the open space and creek restoration efforts.

I think it's important that the county and our community support developments of this type to encourage more families and full-time residents to move and remain here. Cayucos is a special place, and the county and town have done a good job of supporting developments that fit and enhance the unique character here. It's why we moved here in the first place and why we plan to stay.

Thank you in advance for taking my views into consideration.

Sincerely,

Franz Wisner
63 Pacific Avenue
Cayucos, CA 93430
frwisner@yahoo.com

Fw: Development of 399 E Street, Cayucos CA

James Caruso to: Ramona Hedges 03/21/2016 08:17 AM

Ramona:

For Item 4 on March 24th

James Caruso
San Luis Obispo County
Department of Planning and Building
Senior Planner
(805) 781-5702
www.sloplanning.org

----- Forwarded by James Caruso/Planning/COSLO on 03/21/2016 08:16 AM -----

From: James Cromis <bluecromison@yahoo.com>
To: "jcaruso@co.slo.ca.us" <jcaruso@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 03/21/2016 08:11 AM
Subject: Development of 399 E Street, Cayucos CA

Hello Mr. Caruso, My name is James Cromis and I am a 10 year year long resident at 321 E street in Cayucos. This home of mine is the property directly west of the proposed 7 building, 3 story development at 399 E street. That being said, I am writing this evening to plead with you to consider the diminutization or outright decommissioning of this proposal. There are larger questions that this kind of development raises, much larger than simply the code or legality of the matter. How much of our character-as one of the last quaint beachtowns in this state; is being destroyed by this kind of precedent? Is it fitting to add 7 buildings to a dead end street that hardly has 7 homes in this part of the community already? I would like to also point out a sacred place in my heart: which is the unimaginable beauty of Little Cayucos Creek (picture attached). This creekside is home to many wondrous species of birds and wildlife, that of which I cannot begin to describe. Many even say an endangered green tree frog lives in there!? However emotional this is to my life and many other community members is beside the main focus of my argument; which is the fact that this is a unfitting example of a healthy model of development for our street. And furthermore a bad example going forward for our town! The traffic that speeds over this blind hill has already presented me with concern, as many small children live in this community. It will certainly increase drastically, with the potential of this property to house more of the population that already resides here. I am trying to present some facts to you, but the simple truth is my heart takes over on this matter of home ground. This is not the right choice for the property at 399 E street. I know this by observing all of the vacant vacation homes and ugly new unsold condominiums that I see on my daily bike rides. Many say new development will raise community standards and hence real estate prices. I doubt this is accomplished when the surrounding community is diminished by 7 buildings with 3 stories each, a small metropolis by E street standards. Do the people of this community want this town to look like Orange County in

10 years? There are plenty of places in CA that already mirror this sprawlmart model. Those who do want this dynamic..well they don't usually live here as year round residents, and they see dollar signs in their eyes when seeing a vacant lot in Cayucos.

In concluding Mr. Caruso, I want to thank you for your time. I would have loved to be at the meeting to voice my concern, but this letter will have to suffice. If allowed to build I simply ask that it be a building considerably less aggressive and intrusive to the creekside community that is being developed. My peaceful porch setting will undoubtedly be altered regardless of whatever construction is approved and proceeds. But I more selflessly petition for the rights of the land, the status quo of the community, the health of the wildlife, of Little Cayucos Creek, and the serenity, the peace of mind that these ever disappearing open spaces bring.

Sincerely, James Cromis

Dear Mr. Caruso,

Is am a Cayucos resident writing in response to the proposed project at Tract 3074.

I disagree with Development Plan/Coastal Development Findings Exhibit A states that the project is consistent with immediate neighborhood. The proposed project is completely inconsistent with the immediate neighborhood:

1) This project is a subdivision with a common driveway while all other homes on Cypress Glen Court and E street have individual driveways.
2) This project includes 5 three story homes while all other homes on Cypress Glen Court and E street are a maximum of two story homes.
3). This project does not include any open space/set backs between each home as all other houses do in the immediate area.

I also disagree with many of the the findings of the Negative Declaration. Here are some of my concerns:

4) This project creates a significant aesthetically incompatible public view for the immediate neighbors.
5) As the report states, red-legged tree frogs have been reported 1/4 mile from the area.
6) A Monarch butterfly aggregation area exists less than 100 feet down Little Cayucos Creek.

A full Environmental Impact Report is required based on these issues alone.

In addition, this project would significantly increase traffic and noise on a private road which would disrupt the current quiet enjoyment of the neighborhood.

This project is not compatible with the neighborhood and needs to be re-designed accordingly!

Sincerely,

Dave Scholl
P.O. Box 354
Cayucos

James Caruso
County of San Luis Obispo Planning & Building Dept
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

RE: CAMPBELL-SHEPPARD/DAN LLOYD E Street Project

Dear Mr. Caruso,

My name is Kathi Main and my husband and I have lived at 401 E Street in Cayucos since 1981.

I am writing to express my opposition to the project as proposed at 399 E Street. The density of the subdivision is completely out of character with the surrounding neighborhood which, if visited you would know, are unique in appearance and have significant set backs from each other.
I was quite disappointed to see the number of "insignificant impacts" noted on the Negative Declaration and Notice of Determination Report.
In particular, #12 Transportation/Circulation is of grave concern to me because the substantial increase of vehicles will make ingress and egress increasingly difficult; and #8 Noise, the increase in noise will echo in what a southerner would refer to as a "hollar" and greatly impact the quality of living in our neighborhood.

This project as proposed, without requiring the road to be

moved to the true center of the roadway, gives an unfair financial advantage to the developer. It is not acceptable to essentially give land to the developer that truly belongs to the current adjoining homeowners; especially since the homeowners are asking for the road to be moved to the true center so they can use their land.

Lastly, the requirement that a private road provides access to no more than 5 houses should be upheld. Allowing an adjustment would definitely have an adverse affect upon the safety of the bicycle and pedestrian traffic of those residing in the neighborhood, and would be financially detrimental to my property since it is undesirable to live right across the street from the entrance to a subdivision.

I would not be opposed to a more appropriate lower density project.

Thank you for your time.

Kathi and Kevin Main
401 E Street
Cayucos, CA 93430

(T) 805-995-1394
(C) 805-471-7831

March 17, 2016

James Caruso
Department of Planning and Building
County Government Center
976 Osos Street, Room 300
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Re: CAMPBELL-SHEPPARD/ DAN LLOYD E-Street Project

Dear Mr. Caruso:

I am writing this letter in support of the project at 399E Street, Cayucos. The project meets all of the requirements, and is recommended for approval by your staff.

I have followed this project with some interest. My wife and I lived in the adjacent project designed by George Nagano, some 35 years ago. We came to know the adjacent land owner, Mr. Merl Molinari and his Mother, and remember his garden and house. This is the site for the proposed project. Although we might all like to go back to those simpler times, the past decades have seen several multi-unit projects in the area, and the proposed project fits. Indeed, newer requirements have brought forth this project which provides enhanced features of access, parking, safety, environmental awareness.

I urge the approval of this project per your staff report.

Thank you

Jeffrey C. Barker
PO Box 223
Cayucos, CA 93430

Fw: Comments for the Planning Commission Hearing : File No. **SUB2015-00001, March 24, 2016; Campbell-Sheppa/Daniel Lloyd**

James Caruso to: Ramona Hedges 03/23/2016 08:08 AM

Ramona:

For Item 4 on March 24th

James Caruso
San Luis Obispo County
Department of Planning and Building
Senior Planner
(805) 781-5702
www.sloplanning.org

----- Forwarded by James Caruso/Planning/COSLO on 03/23/2016 08:08 AM -----

From: "William S. Walter" <wwalter@tcsn.net>
To: <jcaruso@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: <walterassistant@tcsn.net>
Date: 03/22/2016 06:53 PM
Subject: Comments for the Planning Commission Hearing: File No. SUB2015-00001, March 24, 2016; Campbell-Sheppa/Daniel Lloyd

---

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am writing as a property owner in Cayucos since 1988, who has followed many projects both as an owner and as an owner representative. I would like to be present at your hearing, but "Spring Break" means that we travel as a family with young kids.

I am not sure that I can remember a "cleaner" project than this one after following Cayucos land use issues after more than 30 years. The environmental review raises no concerns that are not mitigated. The Staff Report addresses the policy issues in great detail and seems to me to demonstrate no policy conflicts.

To me these things indicate a project that has been conceived in a thoughtful, considerate, and reflective manner by the owners to minimize impacts, enhance design qualities which will benefit the community, compliment the neighborhood while creating compatible homes for new neighbors, and reduce the allowable
density to levels which strike the right balance.

Personally, I am impressed by the following:

- The density is less than allowed. Up to 13 units would be allowed, and the 7 lots are less than the ten dwelling units per acre standard. The owner is being considerate and not greedy.
- The units are not attached, but single family homes on small lots. This is the Cayucos tradition and pattern of development.
- There are no garages facing the street, but are instead by design in the rear of the lots accessed by a drive court. This creates a pleasing design and is a concept to be emulated in the future by others.
- The project also provides 6 new parking spaces on the street -- where none now exist. The owners' concept proposes more parking than is otherwise required.
- 70% of the Site is open space. When a regulatory agency can get that much open space, it is the

type of development which should embraced.

- My reading indicates that the project meets all of the CZLUO and Estero Plan standards for the property.
- The project creates homes which reflect the neighborhood's single family character. I would think that it benefits the existing home values.
- The Creek restoration plan is a real plus -- the things I read indicate that it enhances the habitat qualities of what seems to be a degraded riparian zone.

A project which is consistent with certified LCP standards, including the Estero Area Plan standards, and has this type of administrative record should be affirmed.

When good development proposals come along, they should be embraced and praised in order to set examples for others to follow. Besides, it's the right thing to do.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bill Walter