



## Monterey County

### Board Order

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

Upon motion of Supervisor Armenta, seconded by Supervisor Salinas and carried by those members present, the Board of Supervisors hereby:

Held a Public hearing and adopted Resolution No. 14-259 to:

- a. Deny the appeal by Evergreen Financial Group from the Zoning Administrator's approval of a Combined Development Permit (Venkatesh/PLN130706) consisting of: 1) a Coastal Administrative Permit to allow a new 1,938 square foot addition to a 3,808 square foot single family dwelling; 2) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of an archaeological resource; and 3) Design Approval; and
- b. Find the project Categorically Exempt per Section 15301(e) of the CEQA Guidelines; and
- c. Approve a Combined Development Permit (Venkatesh/PLN130706) consisting of: 1) a Coastal Administrative Permit to allow a new 1,938 square foot residential addition to a 3,808 square foot single family dwelling; 2) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of an archaeological resource; and 3) Design Approval.  
(Combined Development Permit - PLN130706/Venkatesh, 173 Spindrift Road, Carmel, Carmel Land Use Plan)

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 9th day of September 2014, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Supervisors Armenta, Calcagno, Salinas and Parker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Supervisor Potter

I, Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an original order of said Board of Supervisors duly made and entered in the minutes thereof of Minute Book 77 for the meeting on September 9, 2014.

Dated: September 11, 2014  
File Number: RES 14-084

Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
County of Monterey, State of California

By

Deputy

This page intentionally left blank.

**Before the Board of Supervisors in and for the  
County of Monterey, State of California**

**Resolution No.:14-259**

Resolution of the Monterey County Board of  
Supervisors to:  
a. Deny the appeal by Evergreen Financial  
Group from the Zoning Administrator's  
decision approving the application by  
Gopalkrishnan & Brenda Venkatesh for a  
Combined Development Permit; and  
b. Find the project Categorically Exempt per  
Section 15301(e) of the CEQA Guidelines;  
and  
c. Approve a Combined Development Permit  
consisting of: 1) a Coastal Administrative  
Permit to allow a 1,938 square foot residential  
addition to a 3,808 square foot single family  
dwelling; 2) a Coastal Development Permit to  
allow development within 750 feet of an  
archaeological resource; and 3) Design  
Approval.  
(PLN130706/Venkatesh).....

The appeal by Evergreen Financial Group from the Zoning Administrator's approval of the Combined Development Permit (Gopalkrishnan & Brenda Venkatesh/PLN130706) came on for public hearing before the Monterey County Board of Supervisors on September 9, 2014. Having considered all the written and documentary evidence, the administrative record, the staff report, oral testimony, and other evidence presented, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors hereby finds and decides as follows:

**FINDINGS**

1. **FINDING:** **PROJECT DESCRIPTION** – The proposed project is an application by Gopalkrishnan & Brenda Venkatesh (PLN130706) for a Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) a Coastal Administrative Permit to allow a new 1,938 square foot residential addition (893 square foot second-story master bedroom addition; 1,010 square foot main level garage addition; 35 square foot elevator addition), 197.5 square foot upper-level deck addition and interior remodel to an existing residence; 2) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of a known archaeological resource; and 3) a Design Approval. The project is located at 173 Spindrift Road, Carmel.
- EVIDENCE:** The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County RMA-Planning for the proposed development are found in Project File PLN130706.

2. **FINDING:** **CONSISTENCY / SITE SUITABILITY** - The proposed project, as conditioned, is consistent with the policies of the Local Coastal Program (LCP) and other County health, safety, and welfare ordinances related to land use and development. The site is physically suitable for the use proposed.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) No conflicts with the Carmel Area Land Use Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) were found to exist. The subject property is designated for the residential development and is zoned LDR/1-HR-D(CZ), or "Low Density Residential, 1 acre per unit, with a Historic Resources and Design Control Overlay in the Coastal Zone". The proposed project involves a residential addition and interior remodel, which is consistent with the land use designation. No communications were received during the course of review of the project indicating any inconsistencies with the text, policies, and regulations in these documents.
  - b) The project involves the approval and issuance of a Design Approval, which is required to comply with the "D" or Design Control Overlay. The materials proposed consist of cream/light-tan painted stucco walls, and large glass panel windows. Proposed colors and materials were selected to match the existing residence.
  - c) The property includes a "HR" or Historic Resources zoning overlay. In general, applications within an "HR" zoning designation require referral to the Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB), except those applications solely involving archaeological resources [Monterey County Code (MCC) 20.54.040.A]. This particular property contains the "HR" designation due to its proximity to archaeological resources, not for reasons related to a historic structure or area of historic, architectural, or engineering significance. Therefore, the project was not reviewed by the HRRB.
  - d) The project includes the request for issuance of a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of a known archaeological resource. An archaeological reconnaissance report was prepared for the subject property, which did not identify potential impacts to cultural resources. Therefore, granting of the Coastal Development Permit is warranted. A standard condition of approval requiring notification of RMA-Planning should any archeological or cultural resources be discovered during excavation activities has been applied (Condition 4).
  - e) The project has been reviewed for site suitability by the following departments and agencies: Resource Management Agency (RMA)-Planning, Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District, RMA-Public Works, RMA-Environmental Services; Environmental Health Bureau, and Water Resources Agency. There has been no indication from these departments/agencies that the site is not suitable for the proposed development. Conditions recommended by the reviewing departments and agencies have been incorporated as part of the Combined Development Permit.
  - f) The project planner conducted site inspections on October 22, 2013 and

May 18, 2014 to verify that the project on the subject parcel conforms to the plans listed above and to verify that the site is suitable for this use and concluded that it does conform.

- g) Based on the LUAC Procedures, adopted by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors per Resolution No. 08-338, this application warranted referral to the Carmel Highlands Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) because the project had the potential to raise significant land use issues (aesthetics and neighborhood character). The LUAC reviewed the project on April 7, 2014, and recommended approval with requested conditions regarding outdoor lighting, landscape lighting, and stucco wall design, by a 5-0 vote (1 member absent). Standard conditions of approval for exterior lighting and landscaping have been included in the project to address concerns with outdoor and landscape lighting. LUAC minutes are attached as Exhibit D of the June 26, 2014 Zoning Administrator Staff Report.
- h) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County RMA-Planning for the proposed development are found in Project File PLN130706.

3. **FINDING:**

**HEALTH AND SAFETY** - The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the project applied for will not under the circumstances of this particular case be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the County.

**EVIDENCE:**

- a) The project was reviewed by the RMA - Planning, Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District, Public Works, Environmental Health Bureau, and Water Resources Agency. The respective agencies have recommended conditions, where appropriate, to ensure that the project will not have an adverse effect on the health, safety, and welfare of persons either residing or working in the neighborhood.
- b) Necessary public facilities are available. The project is served potable water by California-American Water (Cal-Am) utilizing an existing service connection. The proposed addition/remodel involves the addition of a master bathroom. To ensure that no intensification of water would result from the project, the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) has applied a standard condition of approval, requiring the verification of water use units (fixture count) in the form of a completed Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Release Form, prior to issuance of any construction permit (Condition 10). Use of the MPWMD form requires the applicant to demonstrate that no additional water will be used for the project by showing the efficiency and number of existing and proposed fixtures; this will ensure that the project involves a negligible or no expansion of the existing water use.

- c) The existing residence is served by an existing onsite wastewater treatment system (septic). Due to the proposed addition/remodel, the Environmental Health Bureau has conditioned the project to require an upgrade to the existing on-site wastewater system (Condition 8). The septic system upgrade is based on the number of bedrooms, not an increase in water usage.
- d) Staff conducted site inspections on October 22, 2013 and May 18, 2014 to verify that the site is suitable for this use and concluded that it is.
- e) See Finding 1: Project Description Evidence.

4. **FINDING:** **NO VIOLATIONS** - The subject property is in compliance with all rules and regulations pertaining to zoning uses, subdivision, and any other applicable provisions of the County's zoning ordinance. No violations exist on the property.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) Staff reviewed Monterey County RMA - Planning and Building Services Department records and is not aware of any violations existing on subject property.
  - b) Staff conducted site inspections on October 22, 2013 and May 18, 2014 and researched County records to assess if any violation exists on the subject property and concluded that none exist. RMA investigated complaints of unpermitted tree removal and determined that the complaints were without merit. (See Finding 8.)
  - c) See Finding 1: Project Description Evidence.

5. **FINDING:** **CEQA (Exempt):** - The project is categorically exempt from environmental review and no unusual circumstances were identified to exist for the proposed project.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15301(e) categorically exempts the minor alteration of existing structures involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the County's determination including additions to existing structures that will not result in an increase of more than 50% of the floor area of the structure before the addition, or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less. The project proposes to add 50.8% to the existing floor area which is slightly above that listed by the exemption but this still fits within this exemption because the expansion is less than 2,500 square feet, it is an expansion of a garage and master bedroom which will not constitute an expansion of the use of the site. The addition of the master bedroom and garage are in keeping with the size of a home on this parcel related to height, area and setback requirements, and the added floor area does not adversely affect any sensitive resources or require a significant consumption of resources.
  - b) There is no evidence that unusual circumstances exist that would cause it to have a significant effect on the environment. The proposed addition consists of construction in a previously disturbed (paved) area of the property, and does not involve the removal of any sensitive species (plant

or animal), removal of protected trees, or disturbance of resources of historical or archaeological significance.

- c) No potential adverse environmental effects were identified during staff review of the development application or during site visits on October 22, 2013 and May 18, 2014.
- d) None of the exceptions under CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply to this project.
- e) See Finding 1: Project Description Evidence.

6. **FINDING:** **PUBLIC ACCESS** – The project is in conformance with the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act (specifically Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act of 1976, commencing with Section 30200 of the Public Resources Code), and Local Coastal Program, and does not interfere with any form of historic public use or trust rights.

**EVIDENCE:**

- a) The subject property is described as an area where the Local Coastal Program requires public access (Figure 3 in the Carmel Land Use Plan). An existing access trail is directly adjacent to the subject property; this project will not impact the existing access trail.
- b) No additional access is required as part of the project as no substantial adverse impact on access, either individually or cumulatively, as described in Section 20.146.130 of the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan can be demonstrated.

7. **FINDING:** **PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND** – The project has been processed in compliance with County regulations.

**EVIDENCE:**

- a) On March 18, 2014, Gopalkrishnan & Brenda Venkatesh filed an application with Monterey County RMA-Planning for a Combined Development Permit (PLN130706) to allow a 1,938 square foot residential addition to a 3,808 square foot single family dwelling.
- b) The Combined Development Permit (PLN130706) was deemed complete on May 16, 2014.
- c) The project was brought to public hearing before the Monterey County Zoning Administrator on June 26, 2014. On June 26, 2014 the Zoning Administrator found the project Categorically Exempt per Section 15301(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, and approved the Combined Development Permit application (ZA Resolution No. 14-022).
- d) An appeal from the Zoning Administrator's approval of the Combined Development Permit was timely filed by Evergreen Financial Group ("appellant"), signed by Melvin Kaplan, on July 11, 2014.
- e) The appeal was brought to public hearing before the Board of Supervisors on September 9, 2014. At least 10 days prior to the public hearing, notices of the public hearing before the Board of Supervisors were published in the *Monterey County Weekly* and were posted on and near the property and mailed to the property owners within 300 feet of the subject property as well as interested parties.
- f) Staff Report, minutes of the Zoning Administrator and Board of

Supervisors, information and documents in Planning file PLN130706.

**8. FINDING:**

**APPEAL AND APPELLANT CONTENTIONS**

The appellant requests that the Board of Supervisors grant the appeal and deny the Combined Development Permit application (PLN130706). The appeal alleges: there was a lack of fair or impartial hearing. The contentions are contained in the Notice of Appeal (**Exhibit C of the September 9, 2014 Board of Supervisors Staff Report**) and listed below with responses. The Board of Supervisors finds that there is no substantial evidence to support the appeal and makes the following findings regarding the appellant's contentions:

**Contention 1 – Lack of Fair or Impartial Hearing**

The appellant contends that the following are examples of the lack of a fair and impartial hearing:

- a) After Mr. Kaplan spoke, the Zoning Administrator called for a response from the architect, who made incorrect statements about the trees that were cut down on the project site. When Mr. Kaplan tried to further respond, he was advised that the discussion (public hearing) was closed.*

**Response:**

The appellant was afforded due process. The Zoning Administrator held a public hearing on the project on June 26, 2014. The Zoning Administrator received presentations from county staff and the project applicant, followed by testimony and presentations from the public during the hearing, and the appellant was provided the opportunity to present information to the Zoning Administrator and did so. Upon the close of the public hearing, staff responded to questions from the Zoning Administrator (related to information voiced by the appellant) after which the Zoning Administrator directed additional clarifying questions to the applicant's representative (Mr. Miller). Following these responses, the appellant (Evergreen Financial Group – Mr. Kaplan) tried to address the Zoning Administrator again; the Zoning Administrator subsequently informed the appellant that the public hearing had been closed to additional public comment. The Zoning Administrator then publicly discussed the facts and merits of all evidence received. Subsequently the Zoning Administrator approved the Combined Development Permit. The steps of staff presentation, application presentation, and public testimony,



followed by the applicant and staff responding to points raised by the public is the standard format for conducting a public hearing and was followed in this case. This process insures a fair and impartial hearing and was followed in this situation. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors' hearing on the appeal is de novo, and appellant has the opportunity to testify to the Board of Supervisors at the Board's hearing.

*b) The appellant contends that information contained in Evidence 2(d) and Evidence 3 relative to aesthetics and neighborhood character, and health and safety is lacking; claiming that excessive tree removal has changed the aesthetics and neighborhood character of the site, and affected their peace and comfort, and negatively affected their property value.*

**Response:**

The appellant is unhappy with tree trimming which was purported to have occurred within the boundaries of project site (173 Spindrift Road), claiming that trees (20-30) were removed without the appropriate permits. Prior to the hearing, two separate code enforcement complaints relative to reported tree removal were received by the Code Enforcement division of RMA-Building Services. Subsequent to these reports, Code Enforcement and Planning Department personnel separately visited the site to investigate the complaints. No unpermitted tree removal was observed or documented during any of these investigative site visits. Evidence of tree trimming was observed; however the tree trimming was not in violation of any County policies or regulations, and the trimming did not result in the decline of tree health; therefore both cases were closed "without merit." Evidence and testimony on this issue was publicly presented during the Zoning Administrator hearing and discussed, both prior to and after public testimony. County staff confirmed that no unpermitted tree removal had taken place, showing various photographs from site visits.

Based on observations made during project review and site visits to investigate the code enforcement complaints, along with the fact that no violations existed on the property, staff recommended approval of the project, with finding related to Consistency/Site Suitability (Finding 2) and Health/Safety (Finding 3). Additionally, the appellant was afforded due

process during the Zoning Administrator hearing (see Response to Contention 1(a) above).

Staff analyzed the project proposal for compliance with applicable zoning regulations (setbacks, coverage, and height) and applicable Land Use Plan policies (Carmel Highlands). No inconsistencies with plans, policies, and regulations were found to exist.

### **DECISION**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors does hereby:

- a. Deny the appeal by Evergreen Financial Group from the Zoning Administrator's decision approving the application by Gopalkrishnan & Brenda Venkatesh for a Combined Development Permit; and
- b. Find the project Categorically Exempt per Section 15301(e) of the CEQA Guidelines; and
- c. Approve the application by Gopalkrishnan & Brenda Venkatesh for a Combined Development Permit (PLN130706) consisting of: 1) a Coastal Administrative Permit to allow a 1,938 square foot residential addition to a 3,808 square foot single family dwelling; 2) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of a positive archaeological resource; and 3) Design Approval, subject to the conditions of approval and in accordance with the project plans, both attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** upon motion of Supervisor Armenta, seconded by Supervisor Salinas and carried this 9th day of September 2014, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES: Supervisors Armenta, Calcagno, Salinas and Parker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Supervisor Potter

I, Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an original order of said Board of Supervisors duly made and entered in the minutes thereof of Minute Book 77 for the meeting on September 9, 2014.

Dated: September 11, 2014  
File Number: RES 14-084

Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
County of Monterey, State of California

By



Deputy

# Monterey County RMA Planning

## Conditions of Approval/Implementation Plan/Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

PLN130706

### 1. PD001 - SPECIFIC USES ONLY

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** This Combined Development Permit (PLN130706) allows a 1,938 square foot residential addition (893 square foot second-story master bedroom addition; 197.5 square foot upper-level deck addition; 1,010 square foot main level garage addition, 35 square foot elevator) and interior remodel to an existing residence; development within a 750 foot positive archaeological buffer zone; and Design Approval for colors and materials. The property is located at 173 Spindrift Road, Carmel (Assessor's Parcel Number 241-301-014-000), Carmel Land Use Plan.

This permit was approved in accordance with County ordinances and land use regulations subject to the terms and conditions described in the project file. Neither the uses nor the construction allowed by this permit shall commence unless and until all of the conditions of this permit are met to the satisfaction of the Director of RMA - Planning. Any use or construction not in substantial conformance with the terms and conditions of this permit is a violation of County regulations and may result in modification or revocation of this permit and subsequent legal action. No use or construction other than that specified by this permit is allowed unless additional permits are approved by the appropriate authorities. To the extent that the County has delegated any condition compliance or mitigation monitoring to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, the Water Resources Agency shall provide all information requested by the County and the County shall bear ultimate responsibility to ensure that conditions and mitigation measures are properly fulfilled. (RMA - Planning)

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** The Owner/Applicant shall adhere to conditions and uses specified in the permit on an ongoing basis unless otherwise stated.

## 2. PD002 - NOTICE PERMIT APPROVAL

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation** The applicant shall record a Permit Approval Notice. This notice shall state:

**Monitoring Measure:** "A Combined Development Permit (Resolution Number 14-259) was approved by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors for Assessor's Parcel Number 241-301-014-000 on September 9, 2014. The permit was granted subject to 10 conditions of approval which run with the land. A copy of the permit is on file with Monterey County RMA - Planning."

Proof of recordation of this notice shall be furnished to the Director of RMA - Planning prior to issuance of building permits or commencement of the use. (RMA - Planning)

**Compliance or** Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits or commencement of use, the  
**Monitoring** Owner/Applicant shall provide proof of recordation of this notice to the RMA -  
**Action to be Performed:** Planning.

## 3. PD003(A) - CULTURAL RESOURCES NEGATIVE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation** If, during the course of construction, cultural, archaeological, historical or  
**Monitoring Measure:** paleontological resources are uncovered at the site (surface or subsurface resources) work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until a qualified professional archaeologist can evaluate it. Monterey County RMA - Planning and a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Register of Professional Archaeologists) shall be immediately contacted by the responsible individual present on-site. When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for recovery.  
(RMA - Planning)

**Compliance or** The Owner/Applicant shall adhere to this condition on an on-going basis.  
**Monitoring**  
**Action to be Performed:**

Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits and/or prior to the recordation of the final/parcel map, whichever occurs first, the Owner/Applicant shall include requirements of this condition as a note on all grading and building plans. The note shall state "Stop work within 50 meters (165 feet) of uncovered resource and contact Monterey County RMA - Planning and a qualified archaeologist immediately if cultural, archaeological, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered." When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for the discovery.

#### 4. PD004 - INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** The property owner agrees as a condition and in consideration of approval of this discretionary development permit that it will, pursuant to agreement and/or statutory provisions as applicable, including but not limited to Government Code Section 66474.9, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County of Monterey or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this approval, which action is brought within the time period provided for under law, including but not limited to, Government Code Section 66499.37, as applicable. The property owner will reimburse the County for any court costs and attorney's fees which the County may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The County may, at its sole discretion, participate in the defense of such action; but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his/her/its obligations under this condition. An agreement to this effect shall be recorded upon demand of County Counsel or concurrent with the issuance of building permits, use of property, filing of the final map, recordation of the certificates of compliance whichever occurs first and as applicable. The County shall promptly notify the property owner of any such claim, action or proceeding and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense thereof. If the County fails to promptly notify the property owner of any such claim, action or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense thereof, the property owner shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold the County harmless. (RMA - Planning)

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Upon demand of County Counsel or concurrent with the issuance of building permits, use of the property, recording of the final/parcel map, whichever occurs first and as applicable, the Owner/Applicant shall submit a signed and notarized Indemnification Agreement to the Director of RMA-Planning for review and signature by the County.

Proof of recordation of the Indemnification Agreement, as outlined, shall be submitted to RMA-Planning .

#### 5. PD014(A) - LIGHTING - EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** All exterior lighting shall be unobtrusive, down-lit, harmonious with the local area, and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. The lighting source shall be shielded and recessed into the fixture. The applicant shall submit three (3) copies of an exterior lighting plan which shall indicate the location, type, and wattage of all light fixtures and include catalog sheets for each fixture. The lighting shall comply with the requirements of the California Energy Code set forth in California Code of Regulations Title 24 Part 6. The exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Director of RMA - Planning, prior to the issuance of building permits. (RMA - Planning)

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall submit three copies of the lighting plans to RMA - Planning for review and approval. Approved lighting plans shall be incorporated into final building plans.

Prior to occupancy and on an on-going basis, the Owner/Applicant shall ensure that the lighting is installed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

## 6. PD032(A) - PERMIT EXPIRATION

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** The permit shall be granted for a time period of 3 years, to expire on September 9, 2017, unless use of the property or actual construction has begun within this period. (RMA-Planning)

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Prior to the expiration date stated in the condition, the Owner/Applicant shall obtain a valid grading or building permit and/or commence the authorized use to the satisfaction of the RMA-Director of Planning. Any request for extension must be received by RMA-Planning at least 30 days prior to the expiration date.

## 7. PD041 - HEIGHT VERIFICATION

**Responsible Department:** RMA-Planning

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** The applicant shall have a benchmark placed upon the property and identify the benchmark on the building plans. The benchmark shall remain visible on-site until final building inspection. The applicant shall provide evidence from a licensed civil engineer or surveyor to the Director of RMA - Building Services for review and approval, that the height of the structure(s) from the benchmark is consistent with what was approved on the building permit associated with this project. (RMA - Planning and RMA - Building Services)

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall have a benchmark placed upon the property and identify the benchmark on the building plans. The benchmark shall remain visible onsite until final building inspection.

Prior to the foundation pre-pour inspection, the Owner/Applicant shall provide evidence from a licensed civil engineer or surveyor, to the Director of RMA- Building Services for review and approval, that the height of first finished floor from the benchmark is consistent with what was approved on the building permit.

Prior to the final inspection, the Owner/Applicant/Engineer shall provide evidence from a licensed civil engineer or surveyor, to the Director of RMA- Building Services for review and approval, that the height of the structure(s) from the benchmark is consistent with what was approved on the building permit.

## 8. EHSP01 - ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM DESIGN

**Responsible Department:** Health Department

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** Environmental Health has determined that the existing septic system is not sized adequately for this project. Submit onsite wastewater treatment system plans for review and approval indicating the location, design layout and size specifications that meets standards found in Monterey County Code Chapter 15.20, Sewage Disposal Ordinance, Carmel Highlands OWMP and the Central Coast Basin Plan, Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Prior to issuance of construction permit. Submit onsite wastewater treatment system design plans for review and approval by the Environmental Health Bureau. Applicant shall obtain a permit to install the onsite wastewater treatment system from Environmental Health.

## 9. EHSP02 DEED RESTRICTION FUTURE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM REQUIREMENT

**Responsible Department:** Health Department

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** The applicant shall record a deed restriction with the Monterey County Recorder for parcel 241-301-014-000 with language indicating that an alternative onsite wastewater treatment system may be required for any future repairs of the existing onsite wastewater treatment system on the property. Contact the Environmental Health Bureau (EHB) for the deed restriction form.

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Prior to issuance of construction permit the property owner shall sign and notarize the completed deed restriction template and submit the draft for review and approval by the Environmental Health Bureau and County Counsel.  
Prior to final inspection of construction permit, the deed restriction shall be recorded with the Monterey County Recorder. Proof of recordation shall be provided to EHB and the Planning Department.

## 10. WR049 - WATER AVAILABILITY CERTIFICATION

**Responsible Department:** Water Resources Agency

**Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure:** The applicant shall provide the Monterey County Water Resources Agency proof of water availability in the form of a complete Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Water Release Form. (Water Resources Agency)

**Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed:** Prior to issuance of any construction permit, the owner/applicant shall submit a Water Release Form to the Water Resources Agency for review and approval.

A copy of the Water Release Form can be obtained at the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, the Water Resources Agency, or online at:  
[www.mcwra.co.monterey.ca.us](http://www.mcwra.co.monterey.ca.us).


This page intentionally left blank.









1000000





 **EXISTING LOWER FLOOR PLAN**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


[illegible]



 **EXISTING UPPER FLOOR PLAN**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

EXISTING UPPER FLOOR PLAN	ARCHITECT	ERIC MILLER ARCHITECTS, INC. ■
---------------------------	-----------	--


1007



**PROPOSED LOWER FLOOR PLAN**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


PROPOSED LOWER FLOOR PLAN as shown in <b>10000 Lakeshore Residence</b> 175 Sycamore Road San Dimas, CA 91768 10000 Lakeshore San Dimas, CA 91768	ARCHITECT <b>ERIC MILLER ARCHITECTS, INC.</b> 157 GRAND AVE. PACIFIC GROVE, CA 93950 (805) 461-1000 • FAX (805) 461-1001 • WEB: ericmillerarchitects.com	REVISION	No.
		COMMENTS	
<b>A-2.4</b> SHEET 12 OF 12			

Half-Size on 12x18




[illegible]






**EXISTING RIGHT ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




**EXISTING REAR ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

[illegible]



**FRONT - NORTH ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




**LEFT - EAST ELEVATION**  
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

- [illegible]

PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATION OF THE <b>Ventureash Residence</b> 175 Applehill Road, #100 Aspen, Colorado 81602 435N 744-0000	ARCHITECT <b>ERIC MILLER ARCHITECTS, INC.</b> 1517 GRAND AVENUE PUEBLO, COLORADO 81001 719.542.1100 FAX 719.542.1101	DOWNSHIP	REMODEL	No.
			A-3.2	12/27





# LEGEND

- Limit All Work Line
- Boundary: Solid Edge, Property or road
- Fenced: Dashed line, Height and pattern to match existing
- Checkered Unit Pattern -
- Cut Stone
- Checkered Gravel: 3/4" Chalkstone Gravel - 2" rounded gravel over 1" compacted base. Set stone/gravel directly into bedrock on a 2' x 2' grid.
- Concrete Paving
- Existing Walk to Kitchen
- Stone wall: 12" walls with stone veneer, 12" high corner. Stone wall to be constructed to 12' x 12'.
- Shopping Street: Paved Concrete. Paved to be constructed, PA
- Existing Area: Existing Paved

## REFERENCE NOTES

1. Trash Enclosure Area.
2. Retained Above-Ground Property Tiers
3. Existing Foundation
4. 12" x 12" x 12" stone wall material
5. Concrete Paving
6. Existing Gravel
7. Existing Trunk: Preserve and protect
8. Existing Fence

## GENERAL NOTES

1. Working surfaces shall comply with CMC 11118 Gravel and Stone Surface. All surfaces shall be slip resistant.

REVISION	No.

CONSULTANT:  
bellinger foster schmetz  
1000 10th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Tel: 415.398.1000  
Fax: 415.398.1001  
Project Number: 1000

ARCHITECT:  
**ERIC MILLER ARCHITECTS, INC.**  
1000 10th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Tel: 415.398.1000  
Fax: 415.398.1001  
Project Number: 1000

OWNER:  
**VENKATESH RESIDENCE**  
1712 10th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Tel: 415.398.1000  
Fax: 415.398.1001  
Project Number: 1000

DATE: 1/14/2013

SCALE: 1"=10'

DATE: 1/14/2013

JOB NUMBER: 1000

**L-3.0**

