

Exhibit C

This page intentionally left blank.

MINUTES
Toro Land Use Advisory Committee
Monday, January 22, 2024

1. Meeting called to order by Weaver at 4:03 pm

2. Roll Call

Members Present:

McMurtrie, Schwartz, Keenan, Weaver and Bean

Members Absent:

Gobets, Mueller and Pyburn

3. Approval of Minutes:

A. October 23, 2023 minutes

Motion: Bean (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: McMurtrie (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: 5 McMurtrie, Keenan, Schwartz, Weaver and Bean

Noes: 0

Absent: 3 Mueller, Gobets and Pyburn

Abstain: _____

4. **Public Comments:** The Committee will receive public comment on non-agenda items that are within the purview of the Committee at this time. The length of individual presentations may be limited by the Chair.

None

5. Scheduled Item(s)

6. Other Items:

A) LUAC member nominated for Chairperson: Weaver

Motion: Bean (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: McMurtrie (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: 5 Keenan, Schwartz, Bean, McMurtrie, Weaver

Noes: 0

Absent: 3

Abstain: 0

B) LUAC member nominated for Secretary: Bean

Motion: McMurtrie (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: Keenan (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: 5 Keenan, McMurtrie, Weaver, Scwartz, Bean

Noes: 0

Absent: 3

Abstain: 0

C) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects (Refer to pages below)

D) Announcements - None

7. Meeting Adjourned: 5:25 pm

Minutes taken by: Bean

Jill Trahan	X		She submitted a letter detailing her concerns She understands that the location of the homes cannot be changed due to the constraints of the lots. She feels that two identical “cookie cutter” houses next to each other is not in keeping with the Toro Land Use Plan. Her main concern is the loss of her privacy and views and she wants a line of sight analysis to insure that from the balconies of the proposed houses they do not look into her windows. She requests a “collaborative process” in which the landscape plans can be discussed to insure that her privacy and views are preserved and that no chemicals are used.

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)	Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)
Weaver: concerned with Visual Sensitivity area (VS) The Laureles Grade is a state designated scenic road and only a few pine trees screen the proposed houses from the Grade. Pine trees are not protected trees, Oak trees are protected. Pine trees can die and blow over.		He requests planting a screen of 20 one gallon oak trees along the property line with the Grade. The expectation is that half of them will not survive but the remainder will provide adequate screening. Davis agrees that screening with trees is a good idea.
Weaver: what is the set back from the Laureles Grade road? What is the height of the two houses above average Grade?		Davis: Setback is over 100 ft. Davis says height above average grade is 16 ft. Both house to be built on a slope.
Utilities should be underground. There is a 40 ft wide PG&E easement for utilities with a high voltage power pole present. The two houses should be a little different from each other architecturally.		Davis: High voltage power pole cannot be changed. Electric to the two homes will be underground. Although actual the buildable space is constrained, partially due to the septic and leash line plans according to Davis, the two houses could use visual differences, not cookie cutter

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

Some LUAC members felt that the staking and flagging of these proposed houses was not up to the county requirements.

It had blown down and was replaced just a few days ago. Davis maintained that it was up to standards.. There was a discussion about the requirements and whether they were met. McMurtrie commented that at the LUACs and Planning Commission meeting, some Commissioners seemed unconcerned with staking and flagging requirements and this surprised him.

Weaver stated that Laureles Grade Road was the first County Road in the State of California to be added to the official list of California Scenic Highways. This official Scenic Road status was designated in 1969 and the status needs to be protected. The Monterey County General Plan/Toro Area Plan Policies that are pertinent to these two projects are: T-3.1, T-3.2, T-3.3, T-3.4, and T-3.5

Exterior lighting needs to respect the Toro Area quality of darkness

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Bean (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: McMurtrie (LUAC Member's Name)

 Support Project as proposed

 X Support Project with changes

 Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: _____

Continue to what date: _____

Ayes: 5 McMurtrie, Schwartz, Keenan, Weaver, Bean

Noes: 0

Absent: 3 Pyburn, Mueller, Gobets

Abstain: 0

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee

Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Housing & Community Development
 1441 Schilling Place 2nd Floor
 Salinas CA 93901
 (831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Toro

2. **Project Name:** COOPER DAVID TREVOR
File Number: PLN230129
Project Location: 26135 LAURELES GRADE, CARMEL VALLEY, CA 93924
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 416-051-016-000
Project Planner: Hya Honorato
Area Plan: Toro Area Plan
Project Description: Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow the construction of a 2,283 square foot single family dwelling with a 624 square foot attached garage, 68 square foot front porch, a 294 square foot wood deck, and associated site improvements.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative present at meeting? YES Yes X Darren Davis NO _____

(Please include the names of the those present)

Darren Davis, designer; Rainforest Farm,LLC owners:Mo Trahan, Sean Trahan, Jill Trahan, and Lyn Trahan (neighbors)

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? Yes: Kayla Nelson and Hya Honorato (Name)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Jill Trahan	X		She submitted a letter detailing her concerns She understands that the location of the homes cannot be changed due to the constraints of the lots. She feels that two identical "cookie cutter" houses next to each other is not in keeping with the Toro Land Use Plan. Her main concern is the loss of her privacy and views and she wants a line of sight analysis to insure that from the balconies of the proposed houses they do not look into her windows. She requests a "collaborative process" in which the landscape plans can be discussed to insure that her privacy and views are preserved and that no chemicals are used.

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)	Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)
Weaver: concerned with Visual Sensitivity area (VS) The Laureles Grade is a state designated scenic road and only a few pine trees screen the proposed houses from the Grade. Pine trees are not protected trees, Oak trees are protected. Pine trees can die and blow over.		He requests planting a screen of 20 one gallon oak trees along the property line with the Grade. The expectation is that half of them will not survive but the remainder will provide adequate screening. Davis agrees that screening with trees is a good idea.
Weaver: what is the set back from the Laureles Grade road? What is the height of the two houses above average Grade?		Davis: Setback is over 100 ft. Davis says height above average grade is 16 ft. Both house to be built on a slope.
Utilities should be undergrounded. There is a 40 ft wide PG&E easement for utilities with a high voltage power pole present. The two houses should be a little different from each other architecturally.		Davis: High voltage power pole cannot be changed. Electric to the two homes will be underground. Although actual the buildable space is constrained, partially due to the septics and leash line plans according to Davis, the two houses could use visual differences, not cookie cutter

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

Some LUAC members felt that the staking and flagging of these proposed houses was not up to the county requirements. It had blown down and was replaced just a few days ago. Davis maintained that it was up to standards.. There was a discussion about the requirements and whether they were met. McMurtrie commented that at the LUACs and Planning Commission meeting, some Commissioners seemed unconcerned with staking and flagging requirements and this surprised him.

Weaver stated that Laureles Grade Road was the first County Road in the State of California to be added to the official list of California Scenic Highways. This official Scenic Road status was designated in 1969 and the status needs to be protected. The Monterey County General Plan/Toro Area Plan Policies that are pertinent to these two projects are: T-3.1, T-3.2, T-3.3, T-3.4, and T-3.5

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Bean (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: McMurtrie (LUAC Member's Name)

 Support Project as proposed

 X Support Project with changes

 Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: _____

Continue to what date: _____

Ayes: 5 McMurtrie, Schwartz, Keenan, Weaver, Bean

Noes: 0

Absent: 3 Pyburn, Mueller, Gobets

Abstain: 0

This page intentionally left blank