

Randall Adams

From: Robert Taro <rwtao@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:22 AM
To: Randall Adams
Subject: Project at 325 Coates - Item 5 6-21-2019

Mr. Adams -

My family has owned the property located at 324 Coates Dr., directly across the street, from 325 Coates for over 40 years.

We object to the project at 325 Coates. I am unable to attend the meeting Friday morning and I request that my comments be reflected in the record during the hearing.

We object for the following reasons:

- 1) Lack of notice - as noted above, we cannot attend. My mother didn't even learn about this until Wednesday 6-19-19 when notified by a neighbor. I was surprised to learn that there was no notice provided to the legal owner of 324 Coates - which is located directly across the street from the project. Due in part to the lack of adequate notice, I am unable to attend.
- 2) The proposed project would create a substantial reduction in the sight line from our house to the ocean, and as a result, would impair the use and enjoyment of the house we have owned for over 40 years.
- 3) There is no way to mitigate the loss of sight line to the ocean from 324 Coates as it is directly across the street from the project. We disagree with the findings about sight in the staff report and are curious to find out if anyone has considered the view from 324 - especially from the deck.
- 4) My parents specifically bought 324 Coates due to the expansive ocean views offered from that location. To allow a two story house across the street would substantially impair the use and enjoyment of 324 Coates - something that would likely reduce the value of the property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert J. Taro
Sent from my iPad

→ Seadiff
→ 2 stories
→ Rooftops
→ Andy Montoya
→ John Hovet
- Peggy Montoya

Met w/ a number
of Subject Matter Experts / peers
29 of project
passed + enforced.
- Vision Reg system
- Casework will be enforced

Craig Wilson - underwrite
15,000 acres of land
Equestrian - including in the
planning to the area.

Jeff Goffey - will collaborate
w/ Carol first

1900
35,000 acres
Matt DeYoung - Mountain
Cara McClure - Senior
Support the plan

Randall Adams

From: Kathryn T <kathryn_annie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 12:48 PM
To: Randall Adams
Subject: Project at 325 Coates - item 5 6/21/2019

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: Project at 325 Coates - item 5 6/21/2019

Mr. Adams-

The property at 324 Coates, directly across the street from the proposed item #5 has been in my family for decades, which is over 40 years to be specific.

324 Coates has been my primary residence twice when I have been gainfully employed in the county of Santa Cruz. I have been making plans to return to that home. One of the best features of working from home has been the luxury of working in the upstairs windows or the deck, and enjoying the sight of the water. On a clear day, we can even see the Moss Landing PG&E towers. It has been a sense of comfort to me since I have been a child knowing that we have that vista to enjoy.

We object most heartily to this proposal for the lot across the street for the following reasons:

1 – We were not notified of this hearing. We only heard about because a concerned neighbor called and spoke to my mother. I can attest to the fact that over the years I have seen countless notices of hearings for similar projects in the neighborhood. I fail to understand how we can be appraised of other “hearings” but this one that is crucial to our home value and atmosphere has failed to reach us. We are beyond surprised that we have not been given proper notice by the county and that if not for the concerns of a neighbor been made aware of this situation.

Would you have accepted no comment from us as implied consent?

2. I cannot attend the meeting tomorrow. Due to lack of appropriate notice by the county – as detailed above – I regretfully cannot attend due to my work schedule. Had proper notice been received, I would have had a front row seat at this meeting as this has a huge impact upon our home.

Would you have accepted my absence as implied consent?

3. In some communities, there are grandfathered-in requirements for changing the footprint of a home. While I cannot speak to the specific laws in Santa Cruz County – I did read the report that we had to find online ourselves, and here’s what I understand:

The garage is being proposed to increase by almost 70% in size

The single family dwelling is proposed to increase by almost 34% in size

But no where in your report was I able to determine the increase in HEIGHT of the proposed dwelling – which I would speculate would have to be at least a 100% increase over the current structure.

This is the key part of this proposal that I vehemently object – our home at 324 Coates was purchased specifically for the VIEWS – expansive and open – not for us to crane our necks around and see a sliver of the ocean.

Has any consideration been taken into account that residents in our home will have to suffer the loss of sightline?

325 Coates currently has full water views from their lot, deck, and living room that is on the water side of the home. Must they be granted an even larger share of the view?

4. This is a very narrow street. While I understand the planning/proposal of this project is one step – and generally has no bearing on the physical demolition/construction that occurs after – you must consider the HOW of what comes next. This could be 6 months to a year+ of construction that brings noise, traffic, debris and chaos to the very peaceful and calm neighborhood that we enjoy. As the directly across the street neighbor – this will cause undo hardship as we try to negotiate exiting our garage and driveway. 325 has no legal street parking – so where do all the construction vehicles go?

Has anyone taken into consideration that there are issues beyond just approving a permit to increase the size of a home and garage?

5. My parents purchased this beach house because it had an ocean (bay) view. My father passed away in 2009. Just prior to his passing, he gave me a deathbed directive. His last words to me were “whatever you do – hang onto that beach house – it was a great investment and a joy to our family”.

If this project is approved, the end result of a two-story home built in place of a one story home will absolutely astronomically destroy the enjoyment and purpose of our 40+ year investment and treasured view. No doubt, it will also reduce the value of the property as well as the coastline view will have been obliterated.

I urge everyone involved to consider the impact to our family – part of this community for over 40 years – and our neighborhood – will have to have to endure if this project is approved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathryn Taro

Lee Otter: Neighbor Braemson
Drive neighborhood.

member of Bonny Doon neighborhood.
- supports project. Coastal Commission
staff.

→ reviewed the plan, visited the property
numerous times

→ timber harvest + riparian
2nd growth redwoods.

Great plan. separate
adignments.

Nina Cogan - Peninsula Open Space
Trust
supports the plan.
77,000 acres.

- State Coastal Greenway.
Contributed 1.9 mil to
the 30 mil fee.

Habitat fragmentation due to
development #1
threat.

Samartha Sharp - Design engineer - drainage -
grading - drainage -

Jocelyn Drake

From: Randall Adams
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 3:39 PM
To: Robert Taro; Kathryn T
Cc: Jocelyn Drake
Subject: RE: Project at 325 Coates - Item 5 6-21-2019
Attachments: 171286 Mailed Notice List.pdf

Robert & Kathryn Taro,

Thank you for your comments. I have forwarded them to the Zoning Administrator for consideration and they have been included in the administrative record for this project.

Please note that adequate advance notification of the proposed development and public hearing have been provided in the manner noted below.

A large neighborhood notification sign has been located at the front of the subject property since March of this year (3/12/19), and an additional hearing notice placard has been posted at the property in advance of the hearing.

Per the attached list, mailed notices (in the form of blue postcards) were sent to the owner of record at:

Taro Properties LLC
431 Garrison Avenue
Modesto, Ca 95358

And to the resident/occupant of the property at:

Resident
324 Coates Drive
Aptos, Ca 95003

Please also note that while scenic views from public beaches and parks are considered in the review of development proposals, private ocean views from surrounding properties across or over private property are not protected as a component of the review process.

Further details regarding the compliance of the project with site standards and other requirements can be found in the staff report which is available online at: www.sccoplanning.com (Direct link to staff report: <https://sccounty01.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/planning/plnmeetings/PLNSupMaterial/Zoning/agendas/2019/20190621/005.pdf>)

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Taro <rwtaro@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 6:22 AM
To: Randall Adams <Randall.Adams@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: Project at 325 Coates - Item 5 6-21-2019

Mr. Adams -

My family has owned the property located at 324 Coates Dr., directly across the street, from 325 Coates for over 40 years.

We object to the project at 325 Coates. I am unable to attend the meeting Friday morning and I request that my comments be reflected in the record during the hearing.

We object for the following reasons:

- 1) Lack of notice - as noted above, we cannot attend. My mother didn't even learn about this until Wednesday 6-19-19 when notified by a neighbor. I was surprised to learn that there was no notice provided to the legal owner of 324 Coates - which is located directly across the street from the project. Due in part to the lack of adequate notice, I am unable to attend.
- 2) The proposed project would create a substantial reduction in the sight line from our house to the ocean, and as a result, would impair the use and enjoyment of the house we have owned for over 40 years.
- 3) There is no way to mitigate the loss of sight line to the ocean from 324 Coates as it is directly across the street from the project. We disagree with the findings about sight in the staff report and are curious to find out if anyone has considered the view from 324 - especially from the deck.
- 4) My parents specifically bought 324 Coates due to the expansive ocean views offered from that location. To allow a two story house across the street would substantially impair the use and enjoyment of 324 Coates - something that would likely reduce the value of the property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert J. Taro
Sent from my iPad

THE RURAL BONNY DOON ASSOCIATION
KEEPING BONNY DOON RURAL AND NATURAL • SINCE 1957
P.O. Box 551 FELTON, CA 95018

Randall Adams
Project Planner
Santa Cruz County Planning Dept.

June 14, 2019

Dear Mr. Adams,

Regarding Item 6 on the June 21, 2019 Zoning Administrator Agenda:

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County is planning to open the San Vicente Redwoods property to the public, which we applaud. Bryan Largay of the Land Trust has been very generous in keeping the public informed of its plans and support what they are doing.

There is one request that we want to make of the Planning Department as it considers approving the permit(s) for this project to go forward. Mr. Largay has told us that the Land Trust intends to monitor the public's use of the planned trails, and take appropriate actions to deal with any problems that arise, such as the building of illegal trails, and negative impacts to the environment and the flora and fauna. During our review of the draft Public Access Plan, we did not find mention of a public reporting mechanism for the monitoring that will take place. Bonny Doon residents and others are interested in following these efforts and would benefit from understanding how things proceed with adaptive management for the many mitigations included in the plan. And, we understand that proceeding from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and then onto Phase 3 will be contingent on meeting targets that will be monitored over time.

Therefore, we strongly request that the Conditions of Approval for the application include timely public reporting of the monitoring, and any actions taken as a result.

Many thanks,



Andrew E. Davidson
RBDA Chairman

Mitigation +
Monitoring +
Reporting
Plan
Adaptive manage
public

What is the
plan for
advising
the public
about the
plan to
open the
property
to the
public?

Randall Adams

From: louisemoran6 <louisemoran6@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 3:45 PM
To: Randall Adams
Subject: Item# 6.181146 Land trust Santa Cruz.

Hi Randall,

I am writing about the public hearing Friday June 21st regarding the Land Trust Santa Cruz parking area located on Empire Grade in Santa Cruz County. I am the owner of Crest Ranch Christmas tree farm which is also where my residence is at 12200 Empire Grade.

I have a few concerns that I would like addressed. One the being the pavement on the exit of the parking lot. I would appreciate the pavement being extended from the street to the edge of the 1st horse parking stall. The reason for this is to prevent any excess dust from contaminating and affecting tree growth on our Christmas trees as well as excess dust entering our residence.

My 2nd concern is the need for No Parking signs at the Entrance and Exit of the parking area, especially so that there is no overnight parking in that location. There is also an additional need for No Parking signs directly across from the entrance next to my property as this area is not paved and there are multiple problems with having cars able to park in this area. (1- dust/debris affecting the growth of trees, 2 - Increased potential for theft of Christmas trees during the selling season, 3 - to help decrease potential for our fence being cut to enter and stash possible paraphenelia, for the low security prisoners at fire camp up the road, which is why we suspect it has been cut in the past.)

Thank you for considering my concerns in this matter.

Regards,

Louise Moran
12200 Empire Grade
Santa Cruz, Ca
831-334-4031 cell

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S9+, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone



June 19, 2019

Jocelyn Drake
Zoning Administrator
Planning Department
701 Ocean Street, Suite 400
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Comment on San Vicente Redwoods Public Access Plan, Project 181146

Dear Ms. Drake,

I write to you on behalf of Save the Redwoods League in support of the Public Access Plan at San Vicente Redwoods (SVR). Save the Redwoods League (the League) has been working to protect and restore redwood forests and connect people to their peace and beauty since 1918. Over the last hundred years, the League has pioneered science-based forest restoration work, educated thousands of schoolchildren about the redwood forest, and established dozens of parks and reserves across California.

In 2014, the League acquired a conservation easement over SVR from its owners, Peninsula Open Space Trust and Sempervirens Fund, to ensure the permanent protection of the myriad conservation values of the property: statewide and regional conservation significance, forests, biodiversity, watershed protection, viewshed protection, landscape and habitat connections, public recreation, education, and scientific study. In cooperation with Peninsula Open Space Trust, Sempervirens Fund, and the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, the League has been engaged in a joint partnership to maintain, restore, and develop these conservation values as they pertain to the conservation easement and management of SVR. The League regularly collaborates with the SVR partners as well as monitors projects and the property as a whole to ensure the protection of these values.

In conjunction with all other conservation values, the easement allows for public access on SVR. After years of planning and assessment, the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County has led the effort to develop a Public Access Plan consistent with the partners' vision of SVR and the League's conservation easement. The Public Access Plan takes into account the conservation values of the property to balance the protection of those values while providing access for the public benefit. With each stage in development of the public access project, the League has been regularly engaged in the planning process and provides feedback to ensure continued consistency with the easement terms.

The collaborative effort between the SVR partners enables a safeguard against potential conflicts with the management of the property and the terms of the conservation easement. The League will continue to ensure the protection of the property and its conservation values in perpetuity in its responsibility as holder and steward of the conservation easement.

Thank you for your consideration of the Public Access Plan for SVR. Please don't hesitate to call with any questions, 415-820-5804.

Best,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Paul Ringgold', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Paul Ringgold
Chief Program Officer

Encl.

To: Zoning Administrator, County Government Center, 701 Ocean St. Room 400
Santa Cruz CA 95060

From: Charles A. Perrone

2015 Maciel Avenue (BTW: simulate Portuguese pronunciation please! mah-see-'ell)

Santa Cruz CA (California) 95062-1918

email: charlesaperrone@gmail.com

phone: (831) 475-1210 cel: (352) 256-3176



6-10-19

Re: Item #4. 181055 1920 Maciel Avenue APN: 029-121-01

I received a notice about a 6-21-19 public hearing on a proposal for a neighboring property. It looks like I will not be able to make the live event so here are my comments.

As a resident, I have absolutely no problem with the proposed building, as there is plenty of room on the lot. It is a family affair.

However, I must take the opportunity to declare in very strong terms that the county should take advantage of expected changes to the curbside to make this street safe. Between Encina Dr. and Mattison Lane the road dips, narrows, and ceases to have sidewalks. There are, however, pedestrians, parents with baby carriages, bicyclists, skaters, dog walkers and folks by their homes. And there is a **terrible** speeding problem exacerbated by the narrowing street. I have witnessed countless, almost daily, dangerous moments and even confrontations between motorists. And all the driveways on the west side of the avenue are, in effect, blind driveways. It does not help to have a Speed Limit 25 at the top of the street, speeders simply ignore as they accelerate toward the dip. Coming out of the dip going up, vision is impaired as well. Cars drive 35, 45, even 55 MPH. The normal solution for this kind of situation is speed bumps, just like the ones on Mattison Lane and 30th Avenue, which at least have sidewalks. If they can have speed bumps why not us? One street over was divided into two dead-end lanes. Why? Because, according to neighbors, there was a fatality on the street. This avenue here is a prime candidate to be the next death spot, following the Hwy 9 accident last month in Felton. I suggest, then, that the county insist on speed bumps at some distance on either side of the driveway to 1920 Maciel, and, while you are at it, a couple more closer to Mattison and Encina. We pay substantial taxes. Can't we at least have the government look out for our safety?

