

Exhibit A

This page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT A PROJECT DISCUSSION

Land Use & Development Standards

The property is zoned Low Density Residential, one unit per 1.5 acres with a Design Control overlay district in the Coastal Zone or “LDR/1.5-D(CZ)”. This zoning allows the first single family dwelling on a plot of land. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable development standards for LDR Zoning. The applicant proposes a height of 26 and a half feet for the main structure, consistent with the allowable 30 feet maximum. The proposed structure meets all of the required setbacks exceeding the required 20-foot setback, 20-foot side setbacks and 20-foot rear setback. The home will be positioned over 50 feet from the front property line, over 21 feet from each side property line and over 150 feet from the rear property line. The property is allowed a 15% (22,101 square feet) site coverage and a 17.5% (11,051 square feet) floor area ratio (FAR). Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan (DMF LUP) Figure 2b illustrates that this property is located within the Pescadero Watershed. In accordance with DMF LUP Policy 77 and Del Monte Forest Coastal Implementation Plan (DMF CIP) section 20.147.030.A.1, development in this area is limited to a maximum 9,000 square feet of impervious coverage. The proposed 2 story single family dwelling will have a total FAR of 10.12% (6,396 square feet) and a site coverage of 8.8% (5,570 square feet). Consistent with the Pescadero Watershed limitation, total impervious coverage (both structural and flatwork) will be 8,367 square feet. Tree removal is allowed subject to approval of a discretionary permit.

Health and Safety

The property would receive water via public utilities:

- The applicant provided correspondence the California American Water and the Pebble Beach Community Services District detailing their ability and willingness to provide the proposed project with potable water and sewage services.
- The Pebble Beach Community Services District reviewed the site plans and application materials for compliance with the fire safety regulations and found the project consistent.

Visual Resources and Design Review

The site is subject to the policies of the Design Control “D” zoning district, which establishes design review requirements to assure protection of the public viewshed and neighborhood character. The development’s design, size and placement are consistent with the goals and policies of the DMF LUP and the surrounding neighborhood character:

- The proposed colors and materials are consistent and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood character. Colors and materials include light beige lap siding and stucco for the exterior walls of the home, brown asphalt shingles and copper-like standing seam metal roofing, black window and door frames and vertical stained wood accent beams.
- The applicant proposes a 6-foot heigh deer fence that surrounds the property. This fence will be comprised of wire and wood and will be consistent with the deer fences on neighboring properties.
- The proposed development is approximately 0.4 miles from 17 Mile Drive and will not be visible due to the intervening development and dense pine forest. Consistent with the DMF LUP, the proposed development will not have adverse impacts on the view from 17 Mile Drive.

- Condition of Approval No. 6 requires an exterior lighting plan be provided and approved before the issuance of building permits; this condition shall ensure compliance with the DMF LUP, DMF CIP and Title 20.

Tree Removal

The 1.45 acre property is a heavily forested lot containing over 150 trees and no natural clearing to site the development. The applicant proposes to remove 58 Monterey pines, 10 of which are dead, and have provided an arborist report (see **Exhibit C**) evaluating potential impacts from the proposed tree removal. As sited and designed, approximately 33 of the protected trees are located within the proposed development footprint and six are located within five feet of the footprint and must be removed for over-excavation and soil recompaction purposes, per the geotechnical engineer's recommendation (see file LIB220353). The arborist identified thirteen dead trees on the property. Four of the dead pines are within the construction footprint, nine of the dead pines are outside of the construction footprint and only four of those could potentially pose a hazard to nearby structures. There are five dead trees located on the rear half of the property that are far from any structures or roads. It may cause more damage to the forest to cut down and haul off the trees than to leave them where they are. Since these trees do not pose an immediate threat to danger to life, health, property or essential public services and were not identified as an infection hazard to the rest of the forest, removal is unnecessary.

The applicant wishes to remove approximately 17 protected Monterey pines that are located outside of the construction footprint and that could be retained during construction. The applicant has expressed concerns of the mature pines falling over and potentially impacting the proposed single family dwelling or neighbor's home. Although these trees were listed as candidates for removal within the arborist report, they were determined to be in fair health and were not considered hazardous. Staff reached out to the arborist for clarity on why the trees had been listed for removal and the arborist stated *"For the record, the property owner requested that the trees be removed, though I tried to talk him out of it and recommended retention and pruning, but he was adamant about removal. You can try and have the property owner try to retain them as I am not an advocate of tree removal, but caution that removal was for liability purposes"*. The follow up conversations with the arborist made it clear that the additional trees were not recommended for removal by the arborist due to their condition or ability to survive through construction, but for liability reasons. The goal of the DMF LUP is to retain forest resources and discourage tree removal. The County Code does not list "liability" as a reason to support tree removal; therefore, staff has identified that there is inadequate evidence to support the required finding for the removal of the additional trees (approx. 17) at this time. If the trees were to die or become hazardous in the future, the applicant has the ability to apply for a hazardous tree waiver.

Although staff had communicated the above to the applicant, they request the Planning Commission consider the removal of the additional 17 trees. As discussed above, the arborist recommend their retention due to the health of the trees and removal is not needed to maintain the health of the forest. Even so, the applicant is fearful of the large trees falling on their proposed house or their neighbor's house. The arborist did mention that earth movement and construction have the potential to weaken the root system of the forest as a whole. Again, even with this knowledge, the arborist did not deem the trees hazardous or found they will fail due to the proposed construction. The subject property does not contain steep slopes and the applicant

has designed their project to minimize ground disturbance and mitigate cut and fill. The trees with critical root zones that extend into the construction footprint have been recommended for removal. Therefore, staff recommend removal of the trees within the development footprint, within 5 feet of the development or are dead near the development (approx. 41) is this would be the minimum amount of tree removal in this case.



Figure 1. Photo of staking and flagging from staff's site visit

Biological Resources

County GIS data identified the lot as being within potential Monterey Pine Forest habitat. Other sensitive species such as yadon's piperia, march microseris and Hickman's onion are often found in Monterey Pine forests, therefore, a biological report was prepared to address potential impacts to sensitive status species (see file LIB220352). The biologist completed a site survey in November 2022, and did not identify any special status species onsite. However, it found that due to the time of year, certain species that only bloom in the springtime could not be confirmed absent. The biologist completed an additional survey in May 2023, and was able to rule out the presence of all special status plant species. No endangered or sensitive animal species were observed onsite during either site visits.

Cultural Resources

The project site is not within 750 feet of a known archaeological resource, however, the DMF CIP requires an archaeological survey to be completed for all development within all known or potential archaeological resource areas. The archaeological report (see file LIBB230102) prepared for the project resulted in a negative survey and no further investigation was recommended by the archaeologist.

This page intentionally left blank