



Monterey County

168 West Alisal Street,
1st Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
831.755.5066

Board Report

Legistar File Number: RES 18-050

May 15, 2018

Introduced: 4/27/2018

Version: 1

Current Status: Agenda Ready

Matter Type: BoS Resolution

PLN170535 - HEVRDEJS (Continued from April 17, 2018)

Public hearing to consider an appeal by Joel and Dena Gambord from the February 8, 2018 decision of the Zoning Administrator to approve an application (PLN170535/Hevrdejs) for a 10,417 square foot single-family dwelling, attached and detached accessory structures, and an accessory dwelling unit.

Proposed CEQA Action: Categorically Exempt per Section 15302 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Project Location: 1691 Crespi Lane, Pebble Beach, Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt a resolution to:

- a. Deny the appeal of Joel and Dena Gambord from the February 8, 2018 Zoning Administrator decision approving an application (RMA-Planning File No. PLN170535/Hevrdejs) for a Combined Development Permit to allow construction of a 10,417 square foot single-family dwelling with a 799 square foot attached garage and a 548 square foot detached garage, construction of an 810 square foot accessory dwelling unit, a Variance for an 8,463 square foot net reduction of impervious surface coverage, and development within 750 feet of known archaeological resources and on slope exceeding 30 percent;
- b. Find the project is the reconstruction of an existing facility which qualifies as a Class 2 categorical exemption per Section 15302 of the CEQA Guidelines, and that there are no exceptions pursuant to CEQA section 15300.2; and
- c. Approve a Combined Development Permit consisting of:
 1. Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow construction of a 10,417 square foot single-family dwelling with a 799 square foot attached garage and a 548 square foot detached garage;
 2. Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow construction of an 810 square foot accessory dwelling unit;
 3. Variance to allow an 8,463 square foot net reduction of impervious surface coverage (from 27,829 to 19,366 square feet);
 4. Coastal Administrative Permit to allow development within 750 feet of known archaeological resources; and
 5. Coastal Administrative Permit to allow development on slope exceeding 30 percent.

A draft resolution, including findings and evidence, is attached for consideration (**Attachment B**).

Staff recommends approval subject to twenty (20) conditions.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Owner: Frank and Michelle Hevrdejs

APN: 008-371-013-000

Zoning: Low Density Residential, 1.5 acres per unit, Design Control Overlay (Coastal Zone)
[LDR/1.5-D (CZ)]

Parcel Size: 2.12 acres (92,410 square feet)

Flagged and Staked: Yes

SUMMARY:

The Applicant, Frank and Michelle Hevrdejs, proposes to construct a single-family dwelling, attached and detached accessory structures, and an accessory dwelling unit on a previously-developed property in Pebble Beach, in approximately the same footprint as the existing development. The property is approximately 2.12 acres or 92,410 square feet, and is zoned Low Density Residential, 1.5 acres per unit, with a Design Control District overlay, in the Coastal Zone. The existing single-family dwelling on the parcel, although previously approved for demolition under RMA-Planning File No. PLN160178 (Zoning Administrator Resolution No. 16-019), has not yet been demolished.

County staff scheduled and duly-noticed the project for public hearing before the Zoning Administrator on February 8, 2018. On February 8, 2018, after review of the application and submitted documents, and public hearing at which all persons had the opportunity to be heard, the Zoning Administrator found the project to be categorically exempt from CEQA and approved a Combined Development Permit to allow the proposed development (Monterey County Zoning Administrator Resolution No. 18-006; **Attachment D**).

The Appellant, Joel and Dena Gambord, then timely filed an appeal from the February 8, 2018, decision of the Zoning Administrator. The appeal contends that the findings or decision or conditions are not supported by the evidence, and the decision was contrary to law. Many of the contentions of the appellant involve a concern about privacy and private views between the two properties, which are not protected by the County. The specific contentions raised by the Appellant are addressed below in the Discussion section of this report.

The Applicant and Appellant both requested a continuance of the appeal hearing date to allow time for the parties to reach a mutually acceptable screening plan to satisfy the Appellants' concerns. Therefore, on April 17, 2018, the Board approved a continuance to May 15, 2018.

The hearing on the project at the Board is de novo. Staff is recommending denial of the appeal. Staff has prepared a draft resolution denying the appeal, and categorically exempting and approving the project. If the Board desires to take a different action, the Board could adopt a motion of intent and continue the hearing to a date certain for the staff to prepare a resolution with modified findings.

DISCUSSION:

The Appellant (Joel and Dena Gambord), pursuant to MCC Section 20.86.030.C, filed a timely appeal which raised fifteen specific contentions:

- A) The Appellant was not afforded due process at the Del Monte Forest Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) meeting on July 6, 2017;
- B) The granting of a Variance was not valid because the legal, non-conforming status of the

- Applicant's property has expired;
- C) The County did not make the findings to support the granting of a Variance;
 - D) The Variance was not consistent with Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan (LUP) Policy 77;
 - E) Neighborhood character includes residential privacy;
 - F) The County did not consider a project alternative to preserve the Appellant's privacy;
 - G) The County did not have substantial evidence supporting the finding that there is no feasible alternative to development on slopes exceeding 30 percent;
 - H) The County did not have substantial evidence supporting the finding that the proposed development on slopes exceeding 30 percent better achieves the goals, policies, and objectives of the County's Local Coastal Program;
 - I) Approval of the Hevrdejs project violates the intent of LUP Policy 35 regarding use of trees to screen development;
 - J) The CEQA Guidelines prohibit the single residence categorical exemption due to numerous violations of the County's Local Coastal Program;
 - K) The Appellant disagrees with the finding of consistency;
 - L) That neighborhood character includes privacy, and the project invades the privacy of the Appellant;
 - M) That unusual circumstances exist which preclude the use of a categorical exemption under CEQA;
 - N) The site coverage and variance findings were outlawed by a Coastal Commission decision on a different application (RMA-Planning File No. PLN120663/Bardis); and
 - O) That there is no substantial evidence to support the finding to allow development on slopes exceeding 30 percent.

County staff has provided additional detail in the responses to each of the contentions below, as well as in the draft resolution. Staff's analysis has concluded that these contentions are without merit because they are not supported by evidence and/or are not relevant under Monterey County Code and/or raise concerns not protected under County Zoning. The text of the Appellant's specific contentions follow below, with proposed responses for consideration by the Board:

Appellant's Contention A:

"At the Del Monte Forest Land Use Advisory Committee Meeting Due Process of Law Was Denied to Joel Gambord When He Was Prevented from Presenting His Proposal to Mitigate the Visual Impact of the Proposed Residence by Regulating Its Location."

The County referred the project to the Del Monte Forest Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) for review of the application as submitted by the Applicant. Pursuant to the Monterey County LUAC Procedure guidelines adopted by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors on April 28, 2015, the purpose of a LUAC is to provide comments and recommendations to the Appropriate Authority, reflect the perspective of the local community, provide a venue for project neighbors to provide input on a proposed project, and to identify concerns.

The LUAC reviewed the project at a duly-noticed public meeting on July 6, 2017, at which all persons (including the Appellant) had the opportunity to be heard, and voted 6 - 0 - 1 (6 ayes and 1 abstention) to support the project as proposed. As part of the public comment testimony, the Appellant had the opportunity to state a concept for relocating the proposed residence and constructing a circular driveway. After considering the testimony, including consultation with County staff, the LUAC chose not to recommend any changes to the project. In addition, the Appellant had the opportunity to submit correspondence to the County and to be heard at the Zoning Administrator public hearing. The Zoning Administrator heard and considered the Appellant's re-design concept, and decided to approve the project as proposed by the Applicant. Based on the evidence above, staff finds that the Appellant was not denied due process.

Appellant's Contention B:

"The Variances Cannot Be Granted On A "Net Reduction Of Site Coverage" Theory Because The Theory Requires "Legal, Nonconforming" Status For The Existing House And Lot, And This Status Has Expired Under County Ordinance."

Pursuant to Monterey County Code (MCC), the residential use of the property has not been abandoned. Furthermore, the legal nonconforming status applies to site coverage, not the use, and the existing structural and impervious surface site coverage remains in place (i.e., it has not been abandoned or demolished). Therefore, the legal nonconforming status regarding site coverage remains in effect for the subject parcel.

Appellant's Contention C:

"Even If The "Legal, Nonconforming" Status Still Existed, The "Net Reduction" Theory Fails To Make The Legally-Required Showing That "Strict Application" Of The 9,000 Square Feet "Maximum Site Coverage" Requirement Prevents Construction Of A House And Driveway."

The County's past practice has been to grant similar Variances to other property owners in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification to exceed the 9,000 square foot combined coverage limitation where a net reduction in the existing combined coverage will occur. Numerous examples include, but are not limited to, PC93167 (Steakley), PC94216 (Moore), PLN980384 (Rachleff), PLN980540 (Schwab), PLN000454 (Gambord), PLN020361 (Griggs), PLN070577 (Pepe), PLN090061 (Rachleff), and PLN120663 (Bardis). For these projects, the County approved Variances to exceed the structural and impervious coverage limitations, and allowed an increase to structural coverage, based on a reduction of impervious surface coverage, and an overall net reduction in total coverage.

As proposed, the project significantly reduces impervious site coverage by 8,463 square feet, thereby reducing runoff and meeting the intent of Policy 77 of the DMF LUP and MCC Section 20.147.030.A.1.(b). Furthermore, the Monterey County Water Resources Agency and RMA-Environmental Services reviewed the submitted application materials, and applied conditions as necessary to ensure drainage or runoff design measures are implemented (Erosion Control Plan, Grading Plan, inspections, geotechnical certification, Drainage Plan, and completion certification - Condition Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 17). See the

recommended conditions of approval (**Exhibit 1**) attached to the Draft Resolution (**Attachment B**). The Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan (LUP) requires implementation of low-impact development standards to control and reduce post-construction run-off, and implementation of these conditions would ensure compliance with the stormwater policies to provide on-site retention to prevent off-site discharge from storms.

In addition, the topography of the parcel significantly limits available building area without encroaching into slope exceeding 30 percent or exceeding the 9,000 square foot limitation on impervious coverage. The County has reviewed the project plans and visited the site to analyze possible development alternatives. Based on site topography and existing development, the proposed project better meets the goals and objectives of the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan.

Appellant's Contention D:

"Even If a Zoning Variance Were Legally- Permissible The Zoning Administrator Erred By Approving The Project In Violation Of Policy 77 Of The Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan Of Monterey County Local Coastal Program, Which Requires That "New Residential Development, Including Main And Accessory Structures ... Shall Be Limited To A Maximum Of 9,000 Square Feet Of Site Coverage."

See Contention C above regarding consistency with land use plan policies and regulations concerning legal nonconforming status. See also Finding Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11; and supporting evidence in the Draft Resolution (**Attachment B**). The County finds that the project, as proposed, meets the goals and objectives of the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan.

Appellant's Contention E:

"The Zoning Administrator Erred Under The Design Review Zoning Overlay (Cz), By Failing To Find Whether The "Neighborhood Character" Of Pebble Beach/Del Monte Forest Includes Residential Privacy."

Pursuant to Section 20.44 (Design Control District) of the Monterey County Code (MCC), neighborhood character refers to design elements of the site and proposed structures (including fences), such as, exterior colors and materials, size and configuration (i.e., bulk and mass), and location. These elements are relative to the parcel on which the structure is constructed, and are not intended to protect the privacy of adjacent development or parcels, provided the proposed development meets applicable development standards. Based on past interpretations and previous County land use decisions, the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan and applicable MCC sections do not protect privacy, and "residential privacy" is not a factor in determining neighborhood character.

As currently designed, the proposed single-family dwelling conforms to all required setbacks, which provide for a minimum separation distance between structures on adjacent lots. As proposed, the main terrace would be over 92 feet from the Appellant's residence, approximately the same distance as the Applicant's existing residence.

Additionally, the proposed residence is consistent with the size and scale of surrounding residences, and the bulk and mass would not contrast with the neighborhood character. The project vicinity includes residential and golf course uses. The residential lots along the northeastern side of Crespi Lane slope upward from the road, with southwesterly views toward Stillwater Cove. Residences on 5 of 6 lots are constructed near the top or northeastern end of each lot. On the subject lot, the proposed residence would be constructed within the same approximate development footprint and visual alignment as the existing residence. The proposed terrace meets the required setbacks, terraces are typical of single-family dwellings in the project vicinity, and the size and location of the proposed terrace are not unusual.

Therefore, the County finds that the project, as proposed and conditioned, conforms to the policies and development standards of the applicable Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan and ordinances related to land use development, is consistent with the size and scale of surrounding residences, and the bulk and mass would not contrast with the neighborhood character.

Appellant's Contention F:

"The Zoning Administrator Further Erred Under The Design Review Zoning Overlay (Cz), By Failing To Consider Whether The Neighborhood Character Of Privacy Could Be Preserved For Project Neighbors Gambord By An On-Site Alternative Location For The Proposed Residence."

This contention erringly asserts that privacy is part of neighborhood character (see Contention E above regarding neighborhood character and privacy). The Zoning Administrator did consider the location of the proposed structures. The proposed residence would be constructed on the same general footprint, and would be a similar distance away from the Appellant's residence. As proposed, the distance between residences would decrease from approximately 92.5 feet to 83.5 feet, and the main terrace would remain over 92 feet from the Appellant's residence - approximately the same distance as the Applicant's existing residence.

MCC does not require the County to consider alternatives to the proposed design, provided the proposed design conforms to required development standards. Also, CEQA does not require a lead agency to consider alternatives for a categorical exemption.

The project, as proposed and conditioned, conforms to the goals, policies, objectives, and development standards of the applicable Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan and ordinances related to land use development. In addition, as proposed and conditioned, the project does not involve a feature or condition that distinguishes the project from the exempt class of environmental review.

Appellant's Contention G:

"The Zoning Administrator Erred Under §20.64.230 Of The Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan By Finding - Without Any Substantial Supporting Evidence Showing Consideration Any Concrete, Feasible Alternative - That There Is No Feasible Alternative Which Would Allow Development To Occur On Slopes Of Less Than 30%."

As proposed, the development better achieves the goals, policies, and objectives of the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan. Pursuant to applicable MCC, the County may allow development on slopes exceeding 30 percent if the County finds that there is no feasible alternative which would allow development to occur on slopes less than 30 percent, or that the proposed development better achieves the goals, policies, and objectives of the applicable local coastal program. MCC only requires one (not both) finding to be made. In this case, the County did not make a finding of no feasible alternative because the County finds that the development better meets the goals, policies, and objectives of the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan by proposing to construct the residence on the same general footprint as the existing residence, thereby minimizing new site impacts. As presented at the Zoning Administrator public hearing on February 8, 2018, the Appellant's proposal for moving the residence and constructing a circular driveway around the residence would involve significantly more disturbance of slope over 30 percent, more disturbance of currently undisturbed area, and removal of trees and vegetation not currently proposed for removal. All of these suggested impacts are avoided under the Applicant's proposal.

Appellant's Contention H:

"The Zoning Administrator Further Erred Under §20.64.230 Of The Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan By Finding - Without Any Substantial Supporting Evidence Showing Consideration Any Concrete, Feasible Alternative - That The Proposed Development Better Achieves The Goals, Policies And Objectives Of The Monterey County Local Coastal Program Than Other Development Alternatives."

See Contention G above regarding development on slopes exceeding 30 percent. The development better meets the goals, policies, and objectives of the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan by proposing to construct the residence on the same general footprint as the existing residence, thereby minimizing new site impacts.

Appellant's Contention I:

"The Zoning Administrator Erred In Approving The Hervdejs Application Because It Violates Intent Policy 35 Of The Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan Of Monterey County Local Coastal Program To Use Trees To "Screen The Development From ... View [Of] Neighboring Properties.""

Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan Policy 35 addresses minimizing the removal of trees, and does not prohibit use of trees or other vegetation for screening. Therefore, this assertion regarding the applicability of Policy 35 is incorrect and not relevant.

Appellant's Contention J:

"The Zoning Administrator Erred Under CEQA, Because The CEQA Guidelines "Unusual Circumstances" Exception Prohibits The "Single Residence" Categorical Exemption. The "Unusual Circumstances" Are Numerous Violations Of The Local Coastal Program Of Monterey County."

The Zoning Administrator (ZA) found that the project, as proposed and conditioned, is consistent with the class of project which are categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15302, and that the proposed project does not involve a feature or condition that distinguishes the project from the exempt class. The proposed residence will be located on the same site as the structure replaced, and will have substantially the same purpose and capacity as the structure replaced. See also Finding No. 4 (CEQA) and supporting evidence in the draft resolution.

The ZA also found, and staff concurs, that no further environmental review is required, there is no substantial evidence of an unusual circumstance, and there is no substantial evidence that would support a fair argument that the project has a reasonable possibility of having a significant effect on the environment or that it would result in a cumulative significant impact.

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2, Exceptions, unusual circumstances apply to the physical characteristics of a site - such as location (i.e., sensitive environment), cumulative impact (of successive projects), significant effect (on the environment), proximity to scenic highways, hazardous waste sites, or historical resource.

As proposed, the project does not involve any unusual circumstances as defined under CEQA. The granting of a Variance or other entitlement to better achieve the goals, policies, and objectives of the applicable local coastal program does not constitute an unusual circumstance as defined by CEQA.

Appellant's Contention K:

"FINDING NO. 1- CONSISTENCY WITH COUNTY POLICIES, ETC.

• Specific Reasons for Disagreement:

o Specific reasons for disagreement with this general and conclusory finding will be under below-listed specific disagreements with more specific Findings listed by the Zoning Administrator to support it."

See Contentions L, M, N, and O below regarding neighborhood character, CEQA, site coverage, and development on slope.

Appellant's Contention L:

"FINDING NO. 2 - PROJECT ASSURES PROTECTION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER, ETC.

• Specific Reasons for Disagreement:

The Zoning Administrator failed to find whether, under Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan Section 20.44.010, (1) neighborhood character in Pebble Beach includes privacy, and (2) whether the visual impacts of a privacy-invading line of sight from the proposed location of the project residence into Appellants residence can be adequately mitigated by regulating the location of the structure by changing it to: (1) either of the two alternative locations proposed by Appellant, or (2) any concrete feasible location, or (3) the "no project alternative" location, or (4) any feasible alternative location meeting the 9,000 square feet maximum site coverage requirement."

See Contentions E and F above regarding neighborhood character and alternatives. See also Finding Nos. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 (Consistency/Health & Safety/Site Suitability, Design, CEQA, Site Coverage, Variance, and Development on Slope) and supporting evidence in the draft resolution.

Appellant's Contention M:

"FINDING NO. 3 - CEQA EXEMPTION

• Specific Reasons for Disagreement:

The project has the following unusual circumstances:

- **Violation of Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan Section 20.44.010 by not protecting the neighborhood character of privacy for Appellants by feasibly regulating the location of the project residence to avoid its privacy-invading line of sight as set forth above.**
- **Violation of Policy 77 of the Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan of the Monterey County Local Coastal Program by site coverage in excess of its 9,000 square feet maximum.**
- **Violation of Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan Section 20.64.230 by allowing development to occur on slopes greater than 30% without any substantial supporting evidence to show that there is no feasible alternative that would allow development to occur on slopes of less than 30%. That is, there is no attempt in the record to consider: (1) the 2 feasible alternatives proposed by Appellant, or (2) any concrete feasible alternative, or (3) the "no project alternative" or (4) any alternative meeting the 9,000 square feet maximum site coverage requirement."**

See Contentions C, D, E, F, G, H, and J above regarding Variance findings, LUP Policy 77 consistency, neighborhood character, privacy, development on slope, and CEQA. See also Finding Nos. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 (Consistency/Health & Safety/Site Suitability, Design, CEQA, Site Coverage, Variance, and Development on Slope) and supporting evidence.

Appellant's Contention N:

"FINDINGS NOS. 6, 7, 8 & 9 - SITE COVERAGE (DEL MONTE FOREST WATERSHEDS), VARIANCE (Authorized Use, Special Circumstances, Special Privileges)

• Specific Reasons for Disagreement:

All the reasoning employed in these Findings is outlawed by the Coastal Commission Decision made on or about 9/14/17 in the matter of the application of Chris and Sara Bardis (PLN120663)."

On September 14, 2017, the California Coastal Commission (CCC) considered an appeal of a project on the Bardis property (RMA-Planning File No. PLN140715). The CCC found that the appeal raised a substantial issue of conformance with the local coastal program, and continued the hearing date to a date uncertain. By making a finding of a substantial issue, the CCC assumed jurisdiction over the permit application, and continued the hearing so Coastal

Commission staff could present the facts of the appeal in a detailed report. Per discussions with Coastal Commission staff on March 12 and 13, 2018, a hearing for this appeal has not yet been scheduled before the CCC. Although it contains similar project characteristics to PLN140715, the Bardis application identified in the contention (RMA-Planning File No. PLN120663) was not appealed to or by the CCC. Based on the evidence above, the contention is factually incorrect, as these findings have not been “outlawed” by the Coastal Commission. Moreover, each project is evaluated based on its own particular facts and circumstances. The County’s findings for site coverage and variance are valid for this application for all the reasons stated in the project resolution.

Appellant’s Contention O:

“FINDING NO. 10 -DEVELOPMENT ON SLOPE

• Specific Reasons for Disagreement:

There is no substantial evidence to support the finding that there is no feasible alternative which better meets the objectives of the applicable land use plan, and would allow development to occur on slopes of less than 30%, in that: there is no attempt in the record to consider: (1) the 2 feasible alternatives proposed by Appellant, or (2) any concrete feasible alternative, or (3) the "no project alternative" or (4) any feasible alternative meeting the 9,000 square feet maximum site coverage requirement.”

The Appellant presented one alternative at the Zoning Administrator public hearing on February 8, 2018, and has not submitted any other alternatives to the County. The Appellant’s proposal for moving the residence and constructing a circular driveway around the residence would involve significantly more disturbance of slopes over 30 percent, more disturbance of currently undisturbed area, and removal of trees and vegetation not currently proposed for removal. All of these suggested and additional impacts are avoided under the Applicant’s proposal.

A more detailed project discussion is included as **Attachment A**.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15302, Class 2, categorically exempts replacement or reconstruction of existing structures and facilities where the new structure will be located on the same site as the structure replaced and will have substantially the same purpose and capacity as the structure replaced. The proposed project involves the demolition of a single-family dwelling and accessory structures on the parcel (the County previously approved the demolition under RMA-Planning File No. PLN160178; Zoning Administrator Resolution No. 16-019), and construction of a single-family dwelling and accessory structures on a residentially-zoned parcel within a developed neighborhood. As proposed, the main dwelling unit and non-habitable accessory structures would be located on the same approximate hardscape and landscape footprint as the current structure and improvements. The proposed design does not increase the bulk and mass of the existing single-family dwelling, and the proposed setbacks are similar to those of the existing residence. The Applicant also proposes to construct an accessory dwelling unit on an area of the property that is clear of vegetation and reasonably level. Therefore, the project qualifies as and is consistent with the

parameters of the Class 2 categorical exemption. No evidence of significant adverse environmental effects or other unusual circumstances that would take this project out of this exemption category was identified during staff review of the development application.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The following County agencies or departments reviewed this project:

RMA-Public Works

RMA-Environmental Services

Pebble Beach Community Services District (Fire Protection District)

Water Resources Agency

The project was referred to the Del Monte Forest Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) for review. The LUAC, at a duly-noticed public meeting on July 6, 2017, voted 6 - 0 - 1 to support the project as proposed (**Attachment F**).

FINANCING:

Funding for staff time associated with this project is included in the FY2017-18 Adopted Budget within RMA-Planning's General Fund 001, Appropriation Unit RMA001.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS STRATEGIC INITIATIVES:

This action represents effective and timely response to our RMA customers. Processing this application in accordance with all applicable policies and regulations also provides the County accountability for proper management of our land resources.

Check the related Board of Supervisors Strategic Initiatives:

☐ Economic Development

☒ Administration

☐ Health & Human Services

☐ Infrastructure

☐ Public Safety

Prepared by: Joe Sidor, Associate Planner, x5262

Reviewed by: Brandon Swanson, RMA Services Manager

Approved by: John M. Dugan, AICP, Deputy Director of Land Use and Community
Development

The following attachments are on file with the Clerk of the Board:

Attachment A - Project Discussion

Attachment B - Draft Resolution, including:

○ Exhibit 1 - Recommended Conditions of Approval

○ Exhibit 2 - Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Color/Material Finishes

Attachment C - Notice of Appeal (February 20, 2018)

Attachment D - Zoning Administrator Resolution No. 18-006 (February 8, 2018)

Attachment E - Vicinity Map

Attachment F - Del Monte Forest LUAC Minutes (July 6, 2017)

The staff report and all attachments are also available for review on the RMA-Planning public website at the following link:

<http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agency-rma-/planning>

cc: Front Counter Copy; Pebble Beach Community Services District (Fire Protection District); RMA-Public Works; RMA-Environmental Services; Environmental Health Bureau; Water Resources Agency; Joseph Sidor, Associate Planner; Brandon Swanson, RMA Services Manager; Frank and Michelle Hevrdejs, Property Owners; Anthony Lombardo & Associates, Attorney for Applicant; Joel and Dena Gambord, Appellant; Fenton & Keller, Attorney for Appellant; Bruce Tichinin, Interested Party; The Open Monterey Project (Molly Erickson); LandWatch; Project File PLN170535