

**County of San Mateo  
Coastside Design Review Committee**

*The Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC) is appointed by the Board of Supervisors to ensure that new development is compatible with the physical setting of the site and the visual character of the communities of Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Miramar and Princeton.*

Katie Kostiuk, Architect

Rebecca Katkin, Architect

Beverly R Garrity, Chair/MontaraRep

Christopher Johnson, ElGranadaRep

vacant, MiramarRep

vacant, MossBeachRep

John Steadman, PrincetonRep

vacant, AltArchitect

Mark Stegmaier, AltMontaraRep

Doug Machado, AltElGranadaRep

Linda Montalto-Patterson, AltMiramarRep

vacant, AltMossBeachRep

vacant, AltPrincetonRep

---

**CDRC COMMUNICATION**

CDRC to more regularly communicate with other organizations involved in coastside design including but not limited to the MCC, Planning Commission. This would be implemented via: email cc's, request for comments, representation at meetings, etc. Chris Johnson has been providing CDRC updates to the MCC at their regular meetings, since October 2020. Lisa Ketcham, Planning Commissioner has been keeping CDRC members notified of a number of coastal projects of impact to the San Mateo County unincorporated coastal area.

**DEMONSTRATION OF SCALE/STORY POLES**

CDRC cannot require Story Poles as a Policy, though could require Story Poles if adopted as an Ordinance. Story Pole Policy has been modified to a Policy to Demonstrate Project Scale using Story Poles or other options. Until further notice, CDRC will use the May 28, 2020 doc until a new Story Pole Ordinance is adopted.

Future Direction - CDRC prefers for story poles to be a "requirement". A Draft Story Pole/ Demonstration of Scale Ordinance is in process. See CDRC approved 7/9/2020 doc (ATTACH B) sent with a letter (on Oct 7 2020) to Staff requesting the doc be used in the formal Public Process for the new Ordinance.

Director Steve Monowitz has directed staff via Planner III, Ruemel Panglao to develop the new Ordinance requiring a Demonstration of Scale, a change to Design Review Regulations, included in the application for Design Review. Staff intends for a broader public access process to include developers, homeowners, design professionals, and others. **Ruemel to develop a work plan.**

**DESIGN STANDARDS, UPDATE**

C-1/Midcoast package has been passed to County staff. Planner III, Ruemel Panglao is assigned to the Project, and is in the process of drafting a C-1/Midcoast Work Plan. **At the 12Nov2020 CDRC meeting, CDRC was to discuss expanding CDRC's purview and consequently public input to non-residential structures in the Midcoast (e.g, Commercial, Industrial) either as a part of C-1/Midcoast effort or as a dedicated effort...discussion has been postponed to the Dec 10th meeting.**

Noted:

May 2020: County has added C-1/Midcoast along with Residential Design Guidelines and Height Limit Amendments to the County 2020-2021 Long Range Work Plan. **CDRC would like to discuss prioritization of changes to Design Review Ordinance(s) as follows: 1. Demonstration of Scale**

Ordinance, 2. Expand CDRC Purview, or include expanded purview into C-1/Midcoast Ordinance 3. Changes to Commercial Standards Ordinance. 4. Update Residential Guidelines Ordinance. Allow for 1hr typical on CDRC agenda for Design Review Guidelines Discussion. Architect/Katie Kostiuk & CDRC Chair/Beverly Garrity to gather related Design Standards Subcommittee work documents for CDRC review and consideration.

Discussion re: formal or informal CDRC participation in MCC's effort to review all discretionary SMC Planning Permits within the unincorporated MidCoast Area: It was suggested that this be MCC driven...If MCC thinks a particular project has challenges, MCC can reach out to CDRC for comment. Currently, CDRC members can participate as members of the public. Beverly Garrity pursued this further at the Nov 18 2020 MCC meeting to find out if the MCC members who track projects would be available to meet with interested CDRC members. MCC members Dave Olsen, Claire Toutant, and Michelle Weil of the MCC Architectural Interest Group will be available for a Zoom meeting with any interested CDRC members on a date/time tbd in January 2021 to discuss which and how MCC members track projects, what the MCC criteria is for evaluating their level of participation, and any other related topics.

### **CDRC POSTIONS**

See vacancies top of page 1.

John Steadman has been approved for Princeton.

Duties of the Vice Chair have been split amongst Sr Planner Camille, Sr Planner Ruemel, and Chair Beverly Garrity. Camille to maintain the CDRC membership roster and contact list, and send out term notification letters. Ruemel to forward to Beverly (who in turn will forward to CDRC members) notice of CDRC reviewed projects going before the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and the Zoning Hearing Office.

### **PLANNING INSPECTION REQUESTS**

County to verify a tree removal permit and CDX for 606 Balboa El Gr, corner of Balboa & Vallejo next to 506 Balboa where the entire lot has been cleared of trees and a perimeter fence erected. Architect Rebecca Katkin sent photos of the current conditions. The response from the staff code compliance section states a violation-case has been opened. The property owner is working with staff regarding compliance. Katie Kostiuk noted a vacant parcel at 498 Avenue Portola with a wood fence in process, and a parking pad installed. Staff to research possible permits.

### **CHAIR REPORTS**

Oct 2020 Chair Report has been approved.

### **NEXT CDRC MEETING Dec 10, 2020, via ZOOM**

---

### **DISCUSSION: ADU's**

At the 10 Sept 2020 CDRC Meeting County Staff and Counsel gave an overview of the California State current requirements and changes to the ADU Ordinance. At the 8 Oct 2020 Staff clarified that there is legally no public notice or appeal allowed for ADU's. Neither the public nor CDRC has the legal right to comment on ADU's. This is to incentivize ADU's per the Calif State mandatory requirements, allowing the County staff to do a compliance check using the "objective" zoning standards" \* only. Communication in response to the ADU Regulations should be directed to California State Representatives.

\* The existing "objective vs subjective zoning standards" are yet to be indicated.

---

## **HISTORICAL: RECORD RE DESIGN REVIEW UPDATES:**

The meeting with Don Horsley, Steve Monowitz, Joe LaClair, Camille Leung, Katie Kostiuik, Beverly Garrity to discuss Questions/Goals/Next Steps (see below) that emerged from the Nov 4 meeting Katie Kostiuik & Beverly Garrity had with Don Horsley & Brae Hunter to be rescheduled from its third rescheduled date in April2020 to a future date (TBD).

- **Questions:**
- *What is the process to add the one clarifying sentence on how building height is measured in the Midcoast to the three zoning ordinances where it is lacking (S-3 overlay, PAD, RM/CZ)?*
- *To better understand the resources required and timeline: What are the Planning Department processes for the Design standards updates and the C-1/Midcoast ordinance effort?*
- *What are the qualifications for which Planning management would like CDRC Architects to demonstrate?*
- *What does County planning envision for the public engagement effort toward creating a C-1/Midcoast ordinance?*
- **Goals:**
- Expedite C-1 building height measurement in Midcoast change.
- Support from County Planning to focus on C-1/Midcoast ordinance prior to the Design Standards Updates.
- Add C-1/Midcoast ordinance to County long range planning schedule.
- **Next Steps:**
- Meeting with Don Horsley, Joe LaClaire, Steve Monowitz , Camille Leung, Beverly Garrity and Katie Kostiuik to discuss these questions & goals, and to review the progress drafts for the following:
  - C-1/Midcoast Purpose
  - C-1/Midcoast Permitted Uses
  - C-1/Midcoast Development Standards
  - C-1/Midcoast Performance StandardsUpdated notes per the meeting, below:

---

## **HISTORICAL: Chair Report Record**

Request for method of measuring Building Ht was raised re: LCP Ordinance for MidPen Project PUD in Moss Beach at Jan 8th & 22nd Planning Commission Mtgs, subsequently approved at the 10June2020 Planning Commission Mtg. Planning Commission approved: PUD description to include - Building Ht to be measured from Finished Grade (vs. the lower of Finished or Original Grade), not to exceed 28 FT.

See Staff Report :

[https://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/events/Cypress%20Pt%20SR%206.10.20%20PC.docx\\_revised.pdf](https://planning.smcgov.org/sites/planning.smcgov.org/files/events/Cypress%20Pt%20SR%206.10.20%20PC.docx_revised.pdf)

ATTACH A

## **STORY POLES: Updated (7/9/2020) notes per CDRC meeting, below:**

CDRC requests this draft be an option to review with the Public for feedback during the public outreach effort for the new Demonstration of Scale Ordinance.

### **Purpose**

Story poles provide a critical three-dimensional preview of planned development. They are used to depict the elevations and silhouette of a proposed structure or an addition to an existing building, and they convey the height, bulk, scale, and massing of a project in context. Story poles are intended to aid neighbors, staff personnel, and members of the decision-making bodies in their evaluation of a project application by providing an idea of how the finished project will effect the project site, adjacent properties, and the neighborhood in general, specifically with regard to possible impacts to views and privacy.

- **Factors triggering story pole requirement:**
  - All new construction triggers story poles (i.e. one and two story etc)
  - Single story additions: Square footage of addition - currently considering 25% of percentage of (E) square footage (TBD)
  - Second story additions, regardless of square footage
- **Story Pole Plan:**
  - Graphic standards that relate to the required story pole materials with legend (see example from Town of Hillsborough)
  - Spot Elevation and height in feet above natural grade for each point where poles are located to be shown on the plan.
  - Part of the list of requirements for application to be deemed complete by Planning in order to be scheduled for CDRC review.
- **Material Specification:** Prohibit the use of PVC pipes for structure and prohibit flags for netting. Use 24" orange netting.
- **Height verification:**
  - County to possibly provide a standardized, durable tape measure to add to poles? Something that will not litter the neighborhood and will stand up to the elements.
  - Photos of installation to be provided to Planning showing heights on poles and overall installation pics.
  - Project does not get scheduled to be seen by CDRC until this is approved.
- **Exemptions:**
  - Topography or vegetation makes installation impractical or unsafe.
- **Alternative for exemptions:**
  - Rendering(s) in lieu of story poles:
    - Rendering view(s) would be from street level and include houses on all sides of the project.

- Diagrammatic site plan showing where perspective views are taken from and where they are facing. This would be approved by Planning prior to renderings being provided.
  - Streetscape elevation(s) to scale.
  - Part of the list of requirements for application to be deemed complete by Planning in order to be scheduled for CDRC review.
- **Sequencing of installation and removal:**
    - Installation timing in relation to project being agendized. Projects that have not installed story poles will be automatically continued. Discuss whether late or inadequate installations would be reviewed and continued automatically.
    - Removal - same terms as current policy, but continued projects may be required to modify story poles at the CDRC's discretion if the massing will be changing significantly.