

County of San Mateo  
Coastside Design Review Committee

*The Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC) is appointed by the Board of Supervisors to ensure that new development is compatible with the physical setting of the site and the visual character of the communities of Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Miramar and Princeton.*

Katie Kostiuk, Architect

Rebecca Katkin, Architect

Beverly R Garrity, Chair/MontaraRep

Christopher Johnson, ElGranadaRep

**vacant, MiramarRep**

**vacant, MossBeachRep**

John Steadman, PrincetonRep

**vacant, AltArchitect**

Mark Stegmaier, AltMontaraRep

Doug Machado, AltElGranadaRep

Linda Montalto-Patterson, AltMiramarRep

**vacant, AltMossBeachRep**

**vacant, AltPrincetonRep**

---

**DEMONSTRATION OF SCALE/STORY POLES**

CDRC cannot require Story Poles as a Policy, though could require Story Poles if adopted as an Ordinance. Story Pole Policy has been modified to a Policy to Demonstrate Project Scale using Story Poles or other options. Until further notice, CDRC will use the May 28, 2020 doc until a new Story Pole Ordinance is adopted.

Future Direction - CDRC prefers for story poles to be a *“requirement”*. A Draft Story Pole/ Demonstration of Scale Ordinance is in process. See CDRC approved 7/9/2020 doc (ATTACH B) sent with a letter (on Oct 7 2020) to Staff requesting the doc be used in the formal Public Process for the new Ordinance.

Ruemel Panglao has drafted the new Ordinance requiring a Demonstration of Scale, a change to Design Review Regulations, included in the application for Design Review. Staff intends for a broader public access process to include developers, homeowners, design professionals, and others. **Ruemel to distribute the Work Plan to CDRC after the Draft has been approved by Steve Monowitz. Ruemel to ask Joe LaClair if the CDRC and public can provide input to the approved Draft (i.e., ref letters from the public sent to CDRC for specific projects in Design Review , esp July 9 2020).**

**DESIGN STANDARDS, UPDATE**

C-1/Midcoast package has been passed to County staff. Planner III, Ruemel Panglao is assigned to the Project, and is in the process of drafting a C-1/Midcoast Work Plan.

**Camille Leung suggested:**

**Discussion of Timing and Process for Design Review Regulation Update**

The CDRC expansion of its purview to projects in the C-1 be addressed with the Long Range New C-1 Ordinance Project

- The purview to expand the CDRC’s review to non-residential projects in the LCP MidCoast Project Area be included in the DR Standards update (as led by CDRC), as both would require an amendment to the DR Regulations
- In regards to the DR Standards update, the County recommends that the CDRC put together a work plan for Public Outreach, standards drafting process, meeting platform,

etc., for review and feedback by the County. **Ruemel to provide the CDRC with a Workplan template.**

- **CDRC to review Kris Lang's presentation: Midcoast Design Review Standards Update distributed for 14Jan2021 CDRC meeting.**

**Noted:**

**May 2020: County has added C-1/Midcoast along with Residential Design Guidelines and Height Limit Amendments to the County 2020-2021 Long Range Work Plan.**

**CDRC would like to discuss prioritization of changes to Design Review Ordinance(s) as follows:**

**1. Demonstration of Scale Ordinance, 2. Expand CDRC Purview, or include expanded purview into C-1/Midcoast Ordinance 3. Changes to Commercial Standards Ordinance. 4. Update Residential Guidelines Ordinance.**

**Architect/Katie Kostiuk & CDRC Chair/Beverly Garrity to gather related Design Standards Subcommittee work documents for CDRC review and consideration.**

**Discussion regarding formal or informal CDRC participation in MCC's effort to review all discretionary SMC Planning Permits within the unincorporated MidCoast Area:**

**MCC members Dave Olsen, Claire Toutant, and Michelle Weil of the MCC Architectural Interest Group met with CDRC members Beverly Garrity, Katie Kostiuk, and Chris Johnson in a January 19th 2021 Zoom meeting (see **Attach C Meeting Notes**) to discuss how MCC members track projects, which projects they track, what the MCC criteria is for evaluating their level of participation, and any other related topics.**

**CDRC POSTIONS** (See vacancies top of page 1.)

**Duties of the Vice Chair have been split amongst Sr Planner Camille, Sr Planner Ruemel, and Chair Beverly Garrity. Camille to maintain the CDRC membership roster and contact list, and send out term notification letters. Ruemel to forward to Beverly (who in turn will forward to CDRC members) notice of CDRC reviewed projects going before the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and the Zoning Hearing Office:**

**PLN2019-00485 Approved by the Planning Commission 1/13/2021**

**Ruemel to confirm the number of projects that received Building Permits in 2020, and to verify the qty limit (40?).**

#### **PLANNING INSPECTION REQUESTS**

**Katie Kostiuk noted a vacant parcel at 498 Avenue Portola with a wood fence in process, and a parking pad installed. Staff reports no current permits. **Katie sent photos to staff. Ruemel to forward photos to Code Compliance.****

---

#### **DISCUSSION: CDRC TELEVISED MEETINGS**

**Request for CDRC meetings to be televised on PCTV. How can anyone gain access to the audio recordings?**

---

## DISCUSSION: GEOTECH DOCUMENTATION

Chris Johnson noted - The Geotech documentation included in the docs submitted to CDRC, the geotechnical is out of CDRC's purview, creates confusion for the Public interested in the project. Since no other Public Meeting exists, the public wants to know when it is appropriate to discuss Geotech issues? Katie Kostiuk and Rebecca Katkin suggest - creating a metric regarding slope/cut/fill to trigger a requirement for Civil to be processed by the project's CDRC Review. Camille Leung noted - Planning relies on Civil docs for design issues related to CDRC and thinks Civil should be included in docs submitted to CDRC.

---

## DISCUSSION: ADU's

At the 10 Sept 2020 CDRC Meeting County Staff and Counsel gave an overview of the California State current requirements and changes to the ADU Ordinance. At the 8 Oct 2020 Staff clarified that there is legally no public notice or appeal allowed for ADU's. Neither the public nor CDRC has the legal right to comment on ADU's. This is to incentivize ADU's per the Calif State mandatory requirements, allowing the County staff to do a compliance check using the "objective" zoning standards" \* only. Communication in response to the ADU Regulations should be directed to California State Representatives.

\* The existing "objective vs subjective zoning standards" are yet to be indicated. Camille has asked Will Gibson about the wording: "shall" (objective) vs "should" (subjective).; especially regarding scale and mass, and articulation, but not style. Ref: look at other Bay Area Planning Depts for more objective criteria (i.e., S.F., Stinson Beach, Palo Alto).

---

## CHAIR REPORTS

Dec 2020 Chair Report has been approved.

## NEXT CDRC MEETING Feb11 2021 via ZOOM

---

Refer to the links or emails sent to CDRC members for resources as follows:

### 1. Link from Ruemel:

The Coastside Design Review Committee checklist can be found here: <https://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/documents/files/Coastside%20DR%20App%20Packet%202020%20wo%20Scale%20and%20Drainage%20Memo.pdf>

### 2. Email from Lisa Ketcham 1/14/2021: Annual residential growth tally & Study Session update

**END  
CDRC CHAIR RPT**

---

ATTACH A

**HISTORICAL: RECORD RE DESIGN REVIEW UPDATES:**

The meeting with Don Horsley, Steve Monowitz, Joe LaClair, Camille Leung, Katie Kostiuk, Beverly Garrity to discuss Questions/Goals/Next Steps (see below) that emerged from the Nov 4 meeting Katie Kostiuk & Beverly Garrity had with Don Horsley & Brae Hunter to be rescheduled from its third rescheduled date in April 2020 to a future date (TBD).

- Questions:
  - *What is the process to add the one clarifying sentence on how building height is measured in the Midcoast to the three zoning ordinances where it is lacking (S-3 overlay, PAD, RM/CZ)?*
  - *To better understand the resources required and timeline: What are the Planning Department processes for the Design standards updates and the C-1/Midcoast ordinance effort?*
  - *What are the qualifications for which Planning management would like CDRC Architects to demonstrate?*
  - *What does County planning envision for the public engagement effort toward creating a C-1/Midcoast ordinance?*
  - Goals:
  - Expedite C-1 building height measurement in Midcoast change.
  - Support from County Planning to focus on C-1/Midcoast ordinance prior to the Design Standards Updates.
  - Add C-1/Midcoast ordinance to County long range planning schedule.
  - Next Steps:
  - Meeting with Don Horsley, Joe LaClaire, Steve Monowitz, Camille Leung, Beverly Garrity and Katie Kostiuk to discuss these questions & goals, and to review the progress drafts for the following:
    - C-1/Midcoast Purpose
    - C-1/Midcoast Permitted Uses
    - C-1/Midcoast Development Standards
    - C-1/Midcoast Performance Standards Updated notes per the meeting, below:
- 

**HISTORICAL: Chair Report Record**

Request for method of measuring Building Ht was raised re: LCP Ordinance for MidPen Project PUD in Moss Beach at Jan 8th & 22nd Planning Commission Mtgs, subsequently approved at

the 10June2020 Planning Commission Mtg. Planning Commission approved: PUD description to include - Building Ht to be measured from Finished Grade (vs. the lower of Finished or Original Grade), not to exceed 28 FT.

See Staff Report :

[https://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/events/Cypress%20Pt%20SR%206.10.20%20PC.docx\\_revised.pdf](https://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/events/Cypress%20Pt%20SR%206.10.20%20PC.docx_revised.pdf)

**END  
ATTACH A**

---

**ATTACH B**

**STORY POLES: Updated (7/9/2020) notes per CDRC meeting, below:**

**CDRC requests this draft be an option to review with the Public for feedback during the public outreach effort for the new Demonstration of Scale Ordinance.**

**Purpose**

Story poles provide a critical three-dimensional preview of planned development. They are used to depict the elevations and silhouette of a proposed structure or an addition to an existing building, and they convey the height, bulk, scale, and massing of a project in context. Story poles are intended to aid neighbors, staff personnel, and members of the decision-making bodies in their evaluation of a project application by providing an idea of how the finished project will effect the project site, adjacent properties, and the neighborhood in general, specifically with regard to possible impacts to views and privacy.

- **Factors triggering story pole requirement:**
  - **All new construction triggers story poles (i.e. one and two story etc)**
  - **Single story additions: Square footage of addition - currently considering 25% of percentage of (E) square footage (TBD)**
  - **Second story additions, regardless of square footage**
- **Story Pole Plan:**
  - **Graphic standards that relate to the required story pole materials with legend (see example from Town of Hillsborough)**
  - **Spot Elevation and height in feet above natural grade for each point where poles are located to be shown on the plan.**
  - **Part of the list of requirements for application to be deemed complete by Planning in order to be scheduled for CDRC review.**
- **Material Specification: Prohibit the use of PVC pipes for structure and prohibit flags for netting. Use 24" orange netting.**
- **Height verification:**

- County to possibly provide a standardized, durable tape measure to add to poles? Something that will not litter the neighborhood and will stand up to the elements.
- Photos of installation to be provided to Planning showing heights on poles and overall installation pics.
- Project does not get scheduled to be seen by CDRC until this is approved.
- **Exemptions:**
  - Topography or vegetation makes installation impractical or unsafe.
- **Alternative for exemptions:**
  - **Rendering(s) in lieu of story poles:**
    - **Rendering view(s) would be from street level and include houses on all sides of the project.**
    - **Diagrammatic site plan showing where perspective views are taken from and where they are facing. This would be approved by Planning prior to renderings being provided.**
    - **Streetscape elevation(s) to scale.**
    - **Part of the list of requirements for application to be deemed complete by Planning in order to be scheduled for CDRC review.**
- **Sequencing of installation and removal:**
  - **Installation timing in relation to project being agendaized. Projects that have not installed story poles will be automatically continued. Discuss whether late or inadequate installations would be reviewed and continued automatically.**
  - **Removal - same terms as current policy, but continued projects may be required to modify story poles at the CDRC's discretion if the massing will be changing significantly.**

**END**  
**ATTACH B**  
**ATTACH C**  
**Meeting Notes**

**DATE:** 19JAN2021MEETING

**SUBJ:** Process of MCC's Discretionary Review of County Projects

**ATTENDEES:** MCC, Architectural Interest Group and CDRC Interested Members

---

- 1. Who receives notification and how? MCC receives notification emails from various county staff for Midcoast projects. The delivery is not consistent: Not all Midcoast project notifications are sent, and sometimes notification is sent to randomly to individual MCC members.**
- 2. When is notification sent? Notification is sent when a Planning Application is deemed complete enough to send the project out for Agency Referrals. MCC is on the Agency Referral List. MCC is not bound by the comment deadline.**
- 3. What is sent with the notification? Referral Documents and Plans.**
- 4. MCC process once notification is received:** MCC distributes the project to all MCC members, requesting any responses. The (3) members of the MCC Architectural Interest Group attempt to respond to the Planner (cc'ing Joe LaClair) for all projects, even if it is a "no comment" response. MCC will, on occasion agendaize a project if deemed appropriate (i.e., Big Wave and the Harbor RV Park) - mainly driven by the assessed need for public comment. MCC maintains a tracking spreadsheet of all Midcoast projects on the MCC website:  
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1on10porRjMK3t2HNYWElyDpN0ArVxXI-aEPfLlgOUSE/edit#gid=0>

**Note** - *Instead of prioritizing to expand the CDRC purview to include non-Residential Midcoast projects, County Staff has suggested the MCC notify the CDRC of these projects as the MCC receives notification, and CDRC can provide input as members of the public. Note - MCC cannot notify the CDRC requesting a response without violating the Brown Act, unless the project is on the MCC Meeting Agenda; in which case CDRC members can only comment as members of the public.*

## QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. What was the original intention for the County to put the MCC on the Agency-Referral-List? Would it be appropriate to add the CDRC to the Agency-Referral-List for non-Residential Midcoast Projects?
2. How is the Public expected to comment on County Planning Midcoast Projects that are not reviewed by CDRC, and are not agendized by MCC?
3. Is there a way to streamline the Midcoast project notification process so that the MCC receives notification (to their central email) of **all** Midcoast projects?
4. Will non-Window users be able to access "Bluegreen", the Accela replacement for tracking County Midcoast Projects?