NOTICE OF MEETING
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Thursday, June 20, 2019, 6:00 P.M.
Council Chamber – City Hall – 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER
1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. COMMISSION AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS (City-Related Items Only)

3. COUNCIL LIAISON ANNOUNCEMENTS

4. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT
   General Public Comment must deal with matters subject to the jurisdiction of the City and the Planning Commission that are not on the Regular Agenda. This is the appropriate place to comment as to items on the Consent Agenda, only if you do not wish to have the item pulled for individual consideration by the Planning Commission. Comments from the public will be limited to three minutes and will not receive Planning Commission action. Comments regarding items on the Regular Agenda shall be heard prior to Planning Commission’s consideration of such items at the time such items are called. Whenever possible, written correspondence should be submitted to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting, to provide adequate time for its consideration.

CONSENT AGENDA
   The Consent Agenda deals with routine and non-controversial matters, and may include action on resolutions, ordinances, or other public hearings for which testimony is not anticipated. The vote on the Consent Agenda shall apply to each item that has not been removed. Any member of the Planning Commission, staff, or the public may remove an item from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration. When items are pulled for discussion, they will be automatically placed at the end of their respective section within the Regular Agenda. One motion shall be made to adopt all non-removed items on the Consent Agenda. Items pulled from this section will be placed under 5. Regular Agenda

5. A. Approval of Minutes of the June 6, 2019, PC Regular Meeting
   Reference: Alex Othon, Staff liaison
   Recommended Action: Approve minutes.
   CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

FULL PRESENTATIONS

6. A. Presentation on Regional Housing Updates
   Presenter: Heather Adamson, Director of Planning at AMBAG, AICP
   Staff Reference: Terri Schaeffer, Senior Program Manager
   Recommended Action: Receive information.
   CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.
REGULAR AGENDA

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

For public hearings involving a quasi-judicial determination by the Planning Commission, the proponent of an item may be given 10 minutes to speak and others in support of the proponent’s position may be given three minutes each. A designated spokesperson for opposition to the item may be given 10 minutes to speak and all others in opposition may be given three minutes each. Very brief rebuttal and surrebuttal may be allowed in the sole discretion of the Planning Commission. In public hearings not involving a quasi-judicial determination by the Planning Commission, all persons may be given three minutes to speak on the matter. Public hearings on non-controversial matters or for which testimony is not anticipated may be placed on the Consent Agenda, but shall be removed if any person requests a staff presentation or wishes to be heard on the matter.

A. Address: 983, 985, 987 Piedmont Ave., Pacific Grove (APNs 007-611-023, -024, -025)

Application #: Zoning Map Amendment (ZA) 18-0663

Description: The Planning Commission is requested to provide a recommendation to the City Council on an owner-initiated Zoning Map Amendment to change the subject properties’ zoning from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Residential Single-Family (R-1). The amendment is requested to facilitate a lot line adjustment between 983 and 985 Piedmont which will be reviewed by a separate review authority. No new development is proposed at this time.

Zone District/General Plan Designation: Planned Unit Development (PUD) / Low Density Residential (RL)

Coastal Zone: No Historic Resources Inventory: No

Area of Special Biological Significance: No

CEQA Status: Exempt from CEQA per §15061(b)(3) which states that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to the City Council which will be the final review authority for the Zoning Map Amendment.

Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE OF ADA COMPLIANCE: Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (Codified At 42 United States Code Section 12101 and 28 Code of Federal Regulations Part 35), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, disability, age or sexual orientation in the provision of any services, programs, or activities. The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of assisted listening devices will be available at this meeting. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting or provide the requested agenda format.
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CALL TO ORDER

- Commissioners Present: (6) Robin Aeschliman, Bill Bluhm, Jeanne Byrne, William Fredrickson, Steven Lilley (Vice-Chair), Donald Murphy (Chair)

- Commissioner Absent: (1) Mark Chakwin (Secretary)

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by Commissioner Byrne, seconded by Vice Chair Lilley, the Commission voted 6-0-1 (Commissioner Chakwin absent) to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

2. COMMISSION AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS (City-Related Items Only)

(Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

- The Chair asked about the status of the sub-committee, composed of Vice Chair Lilley, Commissioners Byrne and Fredrickson, that was formed to prepare a letter presenting the sense of the Planning Commission about issues attendant to project-renewal fees for projects that are on the City’s Water Wait list.

- Commissioners Byrne and Fredrickson noted that recent developments in City access to water resources, plus City changes on fees for projects on the Water Wait list rendered the sub-committee’s mission moot.

- Senior Program Manager Terri Schaeffer noted: (1) that the City Council of Monterey will hold a study-session about affordable housing on June 26th and that the Pacific Grove Staff and Planning Commission were invited to observe. (2) The City is working on Title 24 Subdivision Map Act update, which will be ready for Planning Commission action this summer. (3) The City is working on a Wireless Telecommunications Code, which will be ready for Planning Commission conceptual review this summer.

3. COUNCIL LIAISON ANNOUNCEMENTS

- City Council Mayor Pro-Tem, Dr. Robert Huitt, provided an update from the latest City Council meeting, and issues that the Council is working on now and in the near future.

(Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

4. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

- None
CONSENT AGENDA

5. A. Approval of Minutes of the May 2, 2019, PC Regular Meeting
   Reference: Alex Othon, Staff liaison
   Recommended Action: Approve minutes.
   CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

   On a motion by Commissioner Byrne, without second, the Commission voted 6-0-1 (Commissioner Chakwin absent) to approve the Consent agenda including the Planning Commission meeting minutes for May 2nd 2019. Motion Passed.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Public Hearings
   - None

7. FULL PRESENTATIONS

A. Tools for Affordable Housing Development
   Reference: Terri Schaeffer, Senior Program Manager
   Recommended Action: Receive information
   CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

   - Terri Schaeffer, Senior Program Manager, provided a presentation and answered questions.
     (Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

   - The Chair opened the floor to public comment.
     None
   - The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

   - The Planning Commission discussed the issue.
     (Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

B. View the California Preservation Foundation’s Webinar on the Brown Act
   Reference: Terri Schaeffer, Senior Program Manager
   Recommended Action: Receive information
   CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

   - Terri Schaeffer, Senior Program Manager, provided an introduction to the Webinar
     (Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

   [Commissioner Aeschliman departed at 18:40]

   - The Chair directed that the Planning Commission would view the first one-half hour of the one-hour Webinar during this meeting; and then the Planning Commission would view the second one-half hour of the Webinar during the next meeting.
     (Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

   - The Webinar was presented for one half hour.

   - The Chair queried Planning Commissioners if they wanted to continue to hear the second half of the webinar at the next meeting. The Chair then told staff that the Commission would let
Staff know if the second part of the webinar would be presented next meeting.

(Please refer to the Audio Recording for details)

ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.
- Next meeting is scheduled for June 20th, 2019.

_________________________
Mark Brice Chakwin, Secretary

_________________________
Date

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION
TO: Chair Murphy and Members of the Planning Commission
FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2019
LOCATION: 983, 985, 987 Piedmont Avenue; aka Lots 61-63 of the Calabrese Canyon Townhomes
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A Zoning Map Amendment to change the properties’ zoning from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Residential Single-Family (R-1) is requested to facilitate a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) between 985 and 987 Piedmont Avenue.
APPLICANT/OWNER: George Wilson, Gary Wilson, and Ling Su Lin and Matthew Hammond, property owners
EXISTING ZONING/LAND USE: Planned Unit Development (PUD) / Residential Low Density (RL)
PROPOSED ZONING/LAND USE: Residential Single-Family (R-1) / Residential Low Density (RL)
CEQA: Exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:
As a legislative amendment described in §23.84.040 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC), the zoning map amendment shall be reviewed first by the Planning Commission, which will provide a written recommendation to the City Council as the final review authority. The Planning Commission is requested to provide a written recommendation on the findings, conditions of approval, and the Section 15061(b)(3) CEQA exemption to the City Council for the zoning amendment.

BACKGROUND:
On June 4, 1980, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 5347 (attached) creating the Calabrese Canyon Planned Unit Development (PUD) of which the subject three (3) parcels and a fourth (not included in this application) were a part. The Resolution requires that the development of the four (4) smaller parcels with residential uses first secure a Use Permit. The existing homes on 987 (Lot 63) and 983 (Lot 61) Piedmont received Use Permits in 1998 and 1991, respectively. 985 (Lot 62) Piedmont is currently vacant. The three (3) lots in question were originally included in the larger Calabrese Canyon PUD to provide the lot size needed to obtain the density requested by the PUD developer at the time. The lots were subdivided from the larger PUD property and sold separately, but retained the PUD zoning. Lots 61, 62, and 63 are currently 6,901 sf (Lot 61), 6,900 sf (Lot 62), and approximately 6,871 sf (Lot 63) in size, respectively. The fourth parcel, known as Lot F, is a vacant lot located to the east of 983 Piedmont. It is considered part of the open space required for the Calabrese Canyon development and is owned by the City of Pacific Grove (City). See the attached Assessor Parcel page map for more information. No change to this parcel is proposed at this time.
Now that the Calabrese Canyon PUD development is built-out and the individual lots in question are being developed with single-family residences, the existing PUD zoning district, as described in PGMC §23.60, is no longer the appropriate tool to implement the underlying Residential Low-Density land use designation, which allows up to 5.4 units per acre. All three owners of lots 61, 62, and 63 are supportive of changing the zoning to R-1, which has a minimum lot size of 4,000 sf and a 40’ minimum lot width. The map amendment will result in a more conforming situation in terms of the single-family low-density development that exists on two (2) of the three (3) subject properties. The subject properties are adjacent to existing R-1 zoning to the west and south and will not result in “spot-zoning”. If this amendment is approved, future single-family residential development on Lot 62 will not be required to receive a Use Permit. This amendment will facilitate a separate lot line adjustment between Lots 61 and 62 which will be reviewed at a later time by the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) as required per PGMC §23.70.050.

DISCUSSION, ANALYSIS and CEQA:

Zoning Map Amendment. The required findings for the legislative amendment are included here and in the attached permit for the Planning Commission’s review and the City Council’s eventual adoption. Per PGMC §23.84.060, the findings required for all zoning ordinance/map amendments are:

(b)(1)(A) The proposed amendment is consistent with the general plan and, if applicable, the certified local coastal program; and

(B) The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the city.

and (b)(3) Additional finding for zoning map amendments: the site is physically suitable (including ability to meet requested zoning regulations, access, provision of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses, and absence of physical constraints) for the requested zoning designations and anticipated land uses.

Additionally, for owner-initiated amendments, per PGMC §23.86.080, the Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation, including all required findings, to the Council for final action. The standard permit (attached) is the instrument by which the Planning Commission forwards its recommendation, in writing, to the Council.

The proposed amendment from PUD to R-1 is consistent with the existing Residential Low-Density land use designation, the property is not in the Coastal zone, the amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the city, and the site is physically suited for single-family residential development.

CEQA. Staff recommends that both the Planning Commission and Council find the proposed legislative amendment (zoning map amendment) covered under the “common sense exemption” which asserts that CEQA only applies where it can be seen with certainty that there is a possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment. In those cases where there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. (14 CCR §15061(b)(3)) The proposed change from PUD to R-1 zoning will not result in an increase in density or an intensification of use.
ATTACHMENTS:
A. Application
B. Draft Permit
C. CEQA Documentation
D. Draft Map Amendment Ordinance 19-___
E. Resolution No. 5347
F. Assessor Parcel page 007-611

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Alyson Hunter

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE  
Community Development Department – Planning Division  
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950  
Tel: 831.648.3190 ● Fax: 831.648.3184 ● www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd

Permit Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>985 Piedmont Ave</th>
<th>APN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>Rezone from PUD to R-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Applicant
Name: Gary Wilson  
Phone: 831-901-5424  
Email: Gw1st@msn.com

Owner
Name: George Wilson  
Phone: 831-394-0923  
Email:  
Mailing Address: 983 Piedmont Ave, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Mailing Address: 360 B Hastin St, San Carlos, CA 93955

Permit Request:
☐ CRD: Counter Determination  
☐ AP: Architectural Permit  
☐ AAP: Administrative AP  
☐ ADC: Arch Design Change  
☐ ASP: Admin Sign Permit  
☐ SP: Sign Permit  
☐ UP: Use Permit  
☐ AUP: Administrative UP  
☐ ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit  
☐ LLA: Lot Line Adjustment  
☐ IHS: Initial Historic Screening  
☐ HPP: Historic Preservation  
☐ A: Appeal  
☐ TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't  
☐ EIR: Environmental Impact  
☐ VAR: Variance  
☐ MMP: Mitigation Monitoring  
☐ Stormwater Permit  
☐ Other: Rezone

CEQA Determination:
☐ Exempt  
☐ Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration  
☐ Environmental Impact Report

Review Authority:
☐ Staff  
☐ HRC  
☐ ZA  
☐ PC  
☐ SPRC  
☐ CC  
☐ ARB  
☐ ____

Active Permits:
☐ Active Planning Permit  
☐ Active Building Permit  
☐ Active Code Violation Permit #:

Overlay Zones:
☐ Butterfly Zone  
☐ Coastal Zone  
☐ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)  
☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)

Property Information
Lot: ____________________  
ZC: ____________________  
Block: ____________________  
GP: ____________________  
Tract: ____________________  
Lot Size: ____________________

☐ Historic Resources Inventory  
☐ Archaeologically Sensitive Area

Staff Use Only:
RECEIVED  
MAY 21 2019  
SP PAID  
426.45  
5-21-19

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE  
COMMUNITY DEV DEPT
INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively "Indemnitees"), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements which may accrue against indemnitees by reason of the City’s processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney’s fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City’s right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant’s inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City’s duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City’s misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 5-9-19

Owner Signature (Required): [Signature] Date: 5-9-19

Owner [Signature] Date: 5-16-19
Owner [Signature] Date: 5-16-19
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## Planning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>zone $426.65 amend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update Fee</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>25% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>15% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$0.48 * (# of Mailings)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees:** $426.65
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CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd

Permit Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>983 PIEDMONT AVENUE</th>
<th>APN: 007-611-024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tree Work? □ Yes ☑ No

**APPLICANT & OWNER**

| Name: | GARY J. WILSON |
| Phone: | (831) 875-4591 |
| Email: | gjwilson@msn.com |
| Mailing Address: | 983 PIEDMONT AVENUE PACIFIC GROVE, CA 93950 |

| Name: | GEORGE J. WILSON |
| Phone: | (831) 394-0925 |
| Email: | — |
| Mailing Address: | 360 B SHASTA AVENUE SAND CITY, CA 93955 |

**Permit Request:**

- CRD: Counter Determination
- AP: Architectural Permit
- AUP: Administrative UP
- ADC: Arch Design Change
- ASP: Admin Sign Permit
- SP: Sign Permit
- UP: Use Permit
- UPP: Administrative UP
- ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit
- LA: Lot Line Adjustment
- LM: Lot Merger
- IHS: Initial Historic Screening
- HPP: Historic Preservation
- A: Appeal
- TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev’t
- EIR: Environmental Impact
- VAR: Variance
- MMP: Mitigation Monitoring
- Stormwater Permit
- Other: ___________

**CEQA Determination:**

- Exempt
- Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Environmental Impact Report

**Review Authority:**

- Staff
- ZA
- SPRC
- ARB

**Active Permits:**

- Active Planning Permit
- Active Building Permit
- Active Code Violation Permit #: ___________

**Overlay Zones:**

- Butterfly Zone
- Coastal Zone
- Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)
- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHSA)

**Property Information**

- Lot: ___________
- Block: ___________
- Tract: ___________
- ZC: ___________
- GP: ___________
- Lot Size: ___________
- Historic Resources Inventory
- Archaeologically Sensitive Area

**Staff Use Only:**

- Received by: __________________
- Assigned to: __________________
- PAID $1,996.35 8-6-18

**CERTIFICATION** – I, the undersigned, under penalty of perjury, depose and certify that I am the applicant for this request, that the property owner approves this application and that all statements contained herein, including all documents and plans submitted in connection with this application, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

I further acknowledge it is my responsibility to determine whether additional permits are required.

**Applicant Signature:** __________________ Date: 8/6/18

**Owner Signature (Required):** __________________ Date: __________________

Updated: 08/17/2017
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# Planning Fee Calculation

## Permit Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$3,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$3,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$3,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>25% of fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update Fee</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>$452.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$90.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>$45.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>25% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>$256.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>$126.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>15% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>$159.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$0.48 * (# of Mailings)</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fees: $1,996.35
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
T: 831.648.3190 • F: 831.648.3184 • www.ci.pg.ca.us/cdd

App. # LLA 18-1063

Permit & Request Application
for Lot Line Adjustment (LLA), Lot Merger (LM) or Subdivision (SUB)

Engineer/Surveyor or other designated representative

STEVEN C. WILSON, RCE & PLS
MONTEREY BAY ENGINEERS, INC.

Address
607 CHARLES AVE., SUITE B, SEASIDE, CA 93955

Daytime Phone #
(831) 899 - 7899

Email Address
mbayengr@mbay.net

I. Deed Restrictions (attach copy of restrictions, if available):

a. What Deed Restrictions are presently effective on the property and pertain to the proposed request?

NONE

RECEIVED
AUG - 6-2018

II. Owner's Certification:

a. I/We Gary J. Wilson being first duly sworn, depose and say: That I/We am/are the owner(s) in the above application and know the contents thereof; that the property has been surveyed and all lot corners staked as required by the City of Pacific Grove; that the same is true of my/our knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information or belief, and that those matters are believed to be true and correct.

Owner Signature

Date

Owner Signature

Date

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ________________

Subscribed and sworn to before me on ________________, 2010.

[NOTARY SEAL]

Notary Signature

NOTARY PUBLIC

Rev. 08/15/12
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CALIFORNIA JURAT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Monterey

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 5th day of June 2018

by

Name of Signers

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Signature:

Signature of Notary Public

Seal

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though this section is optional, completing this information can deter alteration of the document or fraudulent attachment of this form to an unintended document.

Description of Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: Permit Request App. For 1st line adj.

Document Date: Signed 6-5-16

Number of Pages: 1

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: NY
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE  
Community Development Department – Planning Division  
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950  
T: 831.648.3190 • F: 831.648.3184 • www.ci.pg.ca.us/cdd  
Permit & Request Application  
for Lot Line Adjustment (LLA), Lot Merger (LM) or Subdivision (SUB)  

Engineer/Surveyor or  
other designated representative  

STEVEN C. WILSON, RCE & PLS  
MONTEREY BAY ENGINEERS, INC.  

Address  
607 CHARLES AVE, SUITE B, SEASIDE, CA 93955  

Daytime Phone #  
(831) 899-7899  

Email Address  
mbayengr@mbay.net  

I.  
Deed Restrictions (attach copy of restrictions, if available):  
a.  
What Deed Restrictions are presently effective on the property and pertain to the proposed request?  

NONE  

REV: 6-6-18  
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE  
COMMUNITY DEV DEPT  

II.  
Owner's Certification:  
a.  
I/We, the undersigned, being first duly sworn, depose and say: That I/We am/are the owner(s) in the above application and know the contents thereof; that the property has been surveyed and all lot corners staked as required by the City of Pacific Grove; that the same is true of my/our knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information or belief, and that those matters are believed to be true and correct.  

George J. Wilson  
Owner Signature  
6-6-18  

Owner Signature  
Date  

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  

COUNTY OF  

) ss.  

Subscribed and sworn to before me on 2010.  

[NOTARY SEAL ↓]  

Notary Signature  
NOTARY PUBLIC  

Notary Name Typed or Printed  
6-5-18  

Rev. 08/15/12
CALIFORNIA JURAT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Monterey

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 5th day of June 2018

by George J. Wilson

Name of Signers

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Signature: __________________________

Signature of Notary Public

OSCAR CERVANTES
Notary Public - California
Monterey County
Commission # 2237167
My Comm. Expires Apr 7, 2022

Seal

Place Notary Seal Above

--- OPTIONAL ---

Though this section is optional, completing this information can deter alteration of the document or fraudulent attachment of this form to an unintended document.

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: Permit Request App. for Lot Line Ads.

Document Date: Signed 6-5-18

Number of Pages: 

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: [N/A]
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT PERMIT # 18-0663

AN OWNER-INITIATED ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE PROPERTIES’ ZONING FROM PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) TO RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY (R-1). NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED AT THIS TIME.

FACTS

1. The subject properties are located at 983, 985, 987 Piedmont Avenue, Pacific Grove, 93950 (APNs 007-611-023, -024, -025), lots 61, 62, and 63, respectively.
2. The subject site has a designation of Low Density Residential (up to 5.4 dwelling units/area) on the adopted City of Pacific Grove General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning district.
4. The subject three (3) parcels range in size from 6,871 – 6,901 sq. ft. in size.
5. 983 and 987 Piedmont are currently developed with single-family residences; 985 Piedmont is vacant.
6. The neighborhood is not located in the Area of Special Biological Significance, the Archaeological Zone or the Coastal zone, nor are the properties listed on the Historic Resources Inventory.
7. The amendment is requested to facilitate a future lot line adjustment (LLA) between 983 and 985 Piedmont which will exchange 1,574 sq. ft. between the two resulting in two (2) parcels that conform to the R-1 minimum parcel size (4,000 sf) and minimum lot width (40’). The LLA will be reviewed by the Site Plan Review Committee as required by PGMC §23.70.050.
8. The proposed legislative amendment is covered under the “common sense exemption” which asserts that CEQA only applies where it can be seen with certainty that there is a possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment. In those cases where there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. (14 CCR §15061(b)(3))

FINDINGS: Zoning Map Amendment: PGMC Sec. 23.84.060(b)(1) and (3):

(A) The proposed amendment is consistent with the general plan and, if applicable, the certified local coastal program; and

(B) The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the city.

(3) Additional finding for zoning map amendments: the site is physically suitable (including ability to meet requested zoning regulations, access, provision of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses, and absence of physical constraints) for the requested zoning designations and anticipated land uses.

The map amendment will result in a more conforming situation in terms of the single-family low-density development that exists on two (2) of the three (3) subject properties. The subject properties are adjacent to existing R-1 zoning to the west and south and will not result in “spot-zoning”. The map amendment is necessary to allow the proposed lot line adjustment to occur between 983 and 985 Piedmont Ave.

PERMIT: Zoning Map Amendment 18-0663

A Zoning Map Amendment to change the properties’ zoning from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Residential Single-Family (R-1). No development is proposed at this time.
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:**

1. Recommends that the City Council find that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. Recommends that the City Council approve an Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the City of Pacific Grove as conditioned and pursuant to CEQA categorical exemption 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question (changing the zoning from PUD to R-1) may have a significant effect on the environment.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE ____ DAY OF ________, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

AYES: 

NOES: 

ABSENT: 

ABSTENTIONS: 

APPROVED: 

_______________________________ Don Murphy, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

________________________________
Gary Wilson, owner

Date

________________________________
George Wilson, Owner

Date

________________________________
Su Ling Lin & Matthew Hammond, Owner(s)

Date
NOTICE OF EXEMPTION FROM CEQA

Property Address/Location: 983/985/987 Piedmont Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950
File No. ZA/LLA 18-0663 / APNs 007-611-023, -024, -025

Project Description: A zoning map amendment to change the existing zoning from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Residential Single-Family (R-1) and a lot line adjustment between APNs -023 and -024 to exchange 1,574 sf. No new parcels will be created and no new development is proposed at this time.

ZC: PUD  GP: Residential Low Density  Lot Size: 6,901 sf (Lot 61), 6,900 sf (Lot 62), and 6,871 sf (Lot 63)

Applicant Name: Gary Wilson  Phone #: 831-375-4591 / 831-901-5426
Mailing Address: 983 Piedmont Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Email Address: gjw1st@msn.com

Public Agency Approving Project: City of Pacific Grove, Monterey County, California
Exempt Status (Check One):
☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1):15268))
☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3): 15269(a))
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c))
☐ Categorical Exemption
  Type and Section Number: _______________________
☐ Statutory Exemptions
  Type and Section Number: _______________________
☐ Other: 15061(b)(3) for activities that cannot possibly have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Exemption Findings:
14 CCR §15601 Review for Exemption is used for activities covered by the common sense exemption that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.

The proposed zoning map amendment to change the 3 subject residential parcels from PUD to R-1 will not result in an increase in density or intensity of use, will not allow for additional subdivision and will bring the parcels into alignment with neighboring R-1 district.

Contact: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner  Contact Phone: (831) 648-3127
Signature:  Date: ____________, 2019
ORDINANCE NO. 19-___

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
AMENDING THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

FACTS

1. Pursuant to Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC) section 23.12.020, the designations, locations and boundaries of the zoning districts within the City of Pacific Grove (City) are established by and delineated upon the map entitled “Zoning Map, City of Pacific Grove, California,” dated January, 1987 (Zoning Map); amendments to the Zoning Map must be adopted by ordinance.

2. Lots 61, 62, and 63 were created in 1980 by the Calabrese Canyon Townhomes final map filed in Volume 14, Cities & Towns, Page 47.

3. Lots 61, 62, and 63 (collectively, Lots) are also known as Assessor Parcel Nos. 007-611-023, 007-611-024, and 007-611-025, respectively.

4. These Lots, in addition to Lot “F” adjacent and owned by the City, are zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) as they were once part of the larger Calabrese Canyon Townhomes PUD.

5. The Lots were subsequently sold separately to individuals.

6. Lots 61 and 63 were developed with single-family residences; the third lot, Lot 62, remains vacant.

7. As required by City Council Resolution No. 5347, adopted June 4, 1980, which granted the Use Permit for the Calabrese Canyon Townhome PUD and which requires a Use Permit for the four smaller lots (Lots 61, 62, 63 and “F”), the existing homes on Lots 61 and 63 received Use Permits in 1998 and 1991, respectively.

8. The Lots are surrounded on the south and west by the Residential Single-Family (R-1) zoning district and across the street to the north by the Residential Multiple-Family (R-3) zoning district.

9. The Lot owners have initiated amendment of the Zoning Map to change Lots 61, 62, and 63 from PUD to R-1.

10. The proposed amendment would create a more conforming situation regarding lot size as the approximately 8,900 sq. ft. Lots are currently nonconforming to the minimum lot size of the PUD zone, which is one (1) acre.
11. The owners of Lots 61 and 62 intend to seek a lot line adjustment between these two properties to accommodate the exchange of 1,574 sq. ft. pursuant to Section 66412(d) of the Subdivision Map Act and in conformance with the City’s General Plan.

12. Under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guideline 15061(b)(3), the amendment is exempt from review as it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Council hereby finds and determines each of the foregoing Facts, which are incorporated into this ordinance by reference, are true and correct.

SECTION 2. The zoning map amendment was initiated by the owners of record of the three Lots that are subject to the proposed amendment.

SECTION 3. The amendment application was reviewed in compliance with Chapter 23.72 PGMC (Permit Application Filing and Processing) and the Planning Commission provided a recommendation of approval, based on the findings contained in PGMC 23.86.080 (Notice of Recommendation by Planning Commission on Amendments), at a noticed public hearing.

SECTION 4. The City Council hereby amends the Zoning Map, City of Pacific Grove, California, dated January 1987, adopted by Ordinance 1574 N.S. as described in the Facts above, and as reflected in the revised Zoning Map, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and incorporated by reference.

SECTION 5. If any provision, section, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Ordinance, or any part thereof, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance, or any part thereof, or its application to other persons or circumstances. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed and adopted each provision, section, paragraph, subparagraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, paragraphs, subparagraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 6. In accord with Article 15 of the City Charter, this Ordinance shall take effect 30 days after adoption on the second reading.
PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE THIS ___ day of __________, 2019, by the following vote:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSENT: 

APPROVED: 

____________________________ 
BILL PEAKE, Mayor 

ATTEST: 

___________________________________ 
SANDRA KANDELL, City Clerk 

APPROVED AS TO FORM: 

____________________________ 
DAVID C. LAREDO, City Attorney
Exhibit 1

City of Pacific Grove Zoning Map

The zoning for Lots 61, 62, 63, as depicted below, is hereby changed from Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Residential Single-Family (R-1)
RESOLUTION NO. 5347

RESOLUTION GRANTING USE PERMIT FOR CALABRESE CANYON PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT.

THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

1. That a Use Permit be and is hereby issued for the Planned Unit Development at Calabrese Canyon for the development of 60 condominium units on the lower portion thereof as presented in Use Permit Application No. 1394-80, subject to the conditions imposed on such use permit by the Planning Commission on April 24, 1980.

2. Further use permits for the development of any other areas covered by the P.U.D. must be secured from the Planning Commission.

3. Development for the four smaller lots in the P.U.D. shall be by Use Permit application distinctly applicable to said lots or any of them.

4. The further condition is imposed on the 60 condominium development, that if a traffic signal light be installed within 5 years of date at Highway 68 and Presidio Boulevard, the owners of the land which shall contain the condominium or the association of condominium owners, shall pay 10% of the cost of purchase and installation, and shall contribute 10% of the annual maintenance cost of the signal, as billed by the City, for a period of 10 years after it is installed. In lieu thereof, the developer shall be authorized to post a bond from a surety company or cash in the sum of $11,200 to secure performance of this condition.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE this 4th day of June, 1980, by the following vote:

AYES: Fisher, Franco, Hughes, Long, Martine, Sloan, Williams
NOES: None
ABSENT: None

APPROVED:

[Signature]
Mayor

ATTEST:

[Signature]
City Clerk