

Evan Ditmars

From: Geoffrey Flavell <gflavell1@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 10:36 PM
To: Evan Ditmars
Subject: June 3rd Public Hearing Item #3. 211170**

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Reference: 2965 Pleasure Point Dr. APN:032-231-06

Dear Mr. Ditmars,

We own the property directly across the street from the Gallivan's at 2970 Pleasure Point Dr.

We have reviewed the plans submitted and have no issue with the proposed exception or variance. We are delighted to see the proposed design pays homage to the 1930's mission style that W. C. Thompson, original owner/developer, intended.

Cheers,
Geoff & Limay Flavell

Evan Ditmars

From: Cove Britton <cove@matsonbritton.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 6:05 PM
To: Evan Ditmars
Subject: Re: 032-231-06 ADU

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Please do.

Thank you.

On Wed, Jun 1, 2022 at 6:02 PM Evan Ditmars <Evan.Ditmars@santacruzcounty.us> wrote:

Cove,

Are these comments you want brought up at the hearing? If so, I will add this as late mail/correspondence to be included in the record.

From: Cove Britton <cove@matsonbritton.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 5:35 PM
To: Matt Machado <Matt.Machado@santacruzcounty.us>; Manu Koenig <Manu.Koenig@santacruzcounty.us>
Cc: Jamie Sehorn <Jamie.Sehorn@santacruzcounty.us>; Richard J. Irish <richard@riengineering.com>; Evan Ditmars <Evan.Ditmars@santacruzcounty.us>; Jocelyn Drake <Jocelyn.Drake@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: 032-231-06 ADU

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Hi Matt and Manu-

This one might be a good case study and discussion.

But for the moment.

It was submitted well over a year ago. I will admit not a simple project under planning code but many projects are complex in the County. So not necessarily atypical. This is a new conversion ADU with an addition to the main residence that results in no added floor area (with the ADU credit). Something I believe we all agree should be encouraged.

Regardless, it is going to be heard on Friday by the ZA. I believe it only required an exception to the Pleasure Point second floor setbacks requirements but planning staff disagree and believe it requires a CDP.

Regardless I have a few concerns over a few minor points.

First there is a Condition of Approval on page 14 D. #3 a. (partial):

"A sewer profile shall be submitted showing the existing lateral layout and any new connections up to the main within the right-of-way for this parcel."

I spoke with engineer Richard Irish and he is cc'd here.

1. To comply with this condition requires several thousands of dollars of engineering work and months of time based on current County permit processing times. Please note that this project is submitted for a building permit and is only awaiting the results of this hearing and additional review of DPW Drainage over 50 new feet of impervious area.
2. Richard and I are unfamiliar with the nexus for this requirement as this is an existing residential structure and there is no requirement to bring it up to current code.
3. Richard and I are unfamiliar with any other jurisdiction that has such a requirement.

Can you please clarify what code and nexus for this Condition of Approval? Please note that this is an ADU permit that resulted in no additional overall square footage to the existing residence. I.e. Conditions of Approval that increase cost (and time) if not altogether not allowed under current state legislation, are certainly strongly discouraged.

Second minor issue:

Condition C. page 14 Proof of Water Service prior to application for a Building Permit.

Technically water service is only required for occupation and this project is already submitted for a building submission.

In a practical sense it is good for applicants to be aware of the issue, but also that staying in one's lane is also helpful. I.e. I do not believe it is County staff's role to make such a Condition of Approval. I can go into detail but this is an issue dealt with by Monterey where it built homes while awaiting a moratorium to be lifted.

I have additional information regarding sewer lines and their impact on groundwater. I.e. the requirement for video inspection and their public value. And also additional information on the Regional Water Control Board and the County's requirements. But I believe it is best held for another day.

And I want to note that I have no issue with Evan and my impression is he is doing his best in the situation and is respectful of my concerns but also responsive to his superiors and his own understanding. I.e. we can agree to disagree. The lack of timely process is endemic to the County at this point and I cannot lay that at anyone's feet particularly but there are state legislated requirements to process permits in a timely manner and non-substantive County process hoops are a big problem, not the applicants. That thought process is a cultural problem at the County in my opinion. But also a discussion for another day.

I would like to see that acknowledged as things are unlikely to improve unless that fundamental issue is addressed. But for now....

May I get some feedback on the Conditions of Approval noted?

Regards-

--

Cove Britton

Matson Britton Architects

O. (831) 425-0544

--

Cove Britton

Matson Britton Architects

O. (831) 425-0544