

Tin Cannery project

David Reilly <hpreilly81@gmail.com>

Thu 9/24/2020 12:47 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Hello Rob. Just want to say I support the project. We need the tax revenue and jobs.

I noticed a discussion on Nextdoor Pacific Grove with the usual split between growth and anti- growth so I thought I would put in my 2 cents

51-1

David Reilly

Fwd: American Tin Cannery Hotel Proposal

Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Mon 9/21/2020 8:20 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; Stearn, Tad <Tad.Stearn@kimley-horn.com>

DEIR comment. See below.

Thank you,

Alyson Hunter, AICP | Senior Planner

City of Pacific Grove | Community Development Department

300 Forest Ave, 2nd Floor Pacific Grove, CA 93950

T: 831-648-3127 Main Reception: 831-648-3183

www.cityofpacificgrove.org | Planning website: www.cityofpacificgrove.org/planning/

Due to COVID-19 citizens are strongly encouraged to conduct City business via email and phone. Remote procedures are in place to process City permits including building and planning permits.

<https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/general-documents/community-development/remote-procedures050420.pdf> You can view the Monterey County Health Officer's updated COVID-19 Shelter Order and FAQs [here](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sandra Kandell** <skandell@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Date: Sun, Sep 20, 2020 at 1:00 PM

Subject: Fwd: American Tin Cannery Hotel Proposal

To: Anastazia Aziz <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>, Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

FYI

Sandra Kandell

City Clerk

City of Pacific Grove

Begin forwarded message:

From: Elizabeth D <edoan26@outlook.com>**Date:** September 20, 2020 at 10:30:28 AM PDT**To:** "citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org" <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>**Subject:** American Tin Cannery Hotel Proposal

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the proposal for the hotel where the tin cannery is currently located. We do not need more hotels especially with the current reopening challenges from COVID for existing properties in the area. Not to mention the negative effects the noise of construction for two years will have on the harbor seals that use that area for a breeding and birthing site. Could you provide more information on how to oppose this proposal.

Kindest regards;

Elizabeth Doan

52-1

VISUALS FOR ATC PROJECT: RENDERINGS SIZE, TREE TAGGING

Inge Lorentzen Daumer <ilwd50@gmail.com>

Fri 9/18/2020 5:32 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: jkuehl@cityofpacificgrove.org <jkuehl@cityofpacificgrove.org>

 1 attachments (412 KB)

WAKE-UP P.G.! LOOK WHAT'S COMING!.jpg;

Dear Rob Mullane,

Full sized renderings are not nearly large enough to convey the impacts! We need almost Billboard size renderings, especially on the Eardley/Central entrance to our city with the back "view" of the 3rd story Executive Building with the removal of the iconic protected Cypress trees...I noticed today that no trees are tagged (marked with ribbon) to show the public! This just isn't good enough...we should have Story Poles.

53-1

Sincerely,

Inge Lorentzen Daumer
Sloat Ave. Resident and homeowner

Virus-free. www.avg.com



ATC PROJECT "POSTERS"...

Inge Lorentzen Daumer <ilwd50@gmail.com>

Thu 9/24/2020 5:03 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Rob Mullane,

The placement of your renditions, at 2 locations (at the ATC), I would liken to trying to put out a forest fire with a water bottle...
Ineffective! Please get real about Public Noticing with visuals! Way too little, way too Late!

54-1

Sincerely,

Inge Lorentzen Daumer

Virus-free. www.avg.com

Fw: American Tin Cannery Hotel

Judith Cabral <jaccabral@yahoo.com>

Fri 9/25/2020 4:04 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Judith Cabral <jaccabral@yahoo.com>

To: rmullane@hrandassociates.org <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc:

Sent: Friday, September 25, 2020, 03:47:37 PM PDT

Subject: American Tin Cannery Hotel

Well, it seems the last "home town" has decided to go big or go home as the old saying goes. A 260 room and conference center definitely falls in that category. I get it, it's all about the money.

But tell me, is the corner of Oceanview Blvd. and Eardley the perfect spot in Pacific Grove for this behemoth 377,461 square foot project? Do you or any of the City Council members for that matter ever travel Oceanview and Eardley or Central Ave in the summer? It is all ready gridlock. Now you want to drop in another 300 plus cars, 600 people into that very same area.

It's not like "car week" when we must endure a couple of weeks of congestion and chaos. It is something we will have to endure for month after month because as we all know, tourist season pretty much never ends.

Do you even care what this very large footprint is going to do to an already fragile coast and its inhabitants? Will the Harbor Seals on Hopkins Beach go the way of the Monarch Butterflies? Just disappear? The Harbor Seals habitat on Hopkins Beach is frequently disrupted by careless, thoughtless people intruding upon their solace. Its sanctuary is defended now only by dedicated volunteers because our small town, understaffed Police Department is unable to patrol that area with any regularity.

Yes, understaffed. This tourist season was a glowing example of that. Closed beaches and parks were over run, with loads of trash left behind and all rules ignored. Rarely saw any police making even a token attempt to enforce the rules.

Pacific Grove is selling it's soul for the big bucks. Don't call PG the "last hometown" ever again. PG will become just another coastal tourist trap like every other southern California town.

Judith Cabral

55-1

ATC Latest Hotel Ideas

Jacqueline Fobes <jtfobes@yahoo.com>

Tue 9/22/2020 12:04 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; Bill Peake <bpeake@cityofpacificgrove.org>

09-22-2020.

Dear Sir,

We are responding to the DEIR for the hotel project being considered at the American Tin Cannery site. How many times do we have to do this? Developers keep coming up every few years with the plans for the same old unattractive monstrous huge hotel. People who love the town keep responding with concerns about the increased traffic, the congestion, the noise, the unsafe numbers of people coming and going in and out, the welfare of the marine animals rookeries... Need we go on? What part of this do these greedy developers not get?

56-1

More importantly, what part of this doesn't the city understand? How many more times do we go down this road? We know Pacific Grove needs money. People comprehend that. None of us are desperate enough to burden future generations with all of the problems associated with this current large development. People just do not want a huge hotel, but perhaps would agree to a smaller boutique hotel, a small attractive mixed business and condo development, with attractive walkways and plantings, not large, something that actually fits in with the local Victorian style of nearby homes. We do not need two swimming pools and a spa in a cool ocean environment that rarely gets above 70F. Also getting the hotel traffic (guests, employees) in and out of the town impacts every single person on this Peninsula. Roads are small, narrow, and already full of cars. There is no where for additional vehicles to go now.

56-2

One of the things the horrific wildfires this year made us all aware of is how our safety is endangered when the town has too many tourists. There are basically only two ways in and out of Pacific Grove, ways that could be clogged with vehicles, preventing people from getting out in an emergency. We do not need to encourage more tourists. Another issue is the trash and environmental damage that tourists leave behind. Big Sur is a prime example. Tourists should not be the "bread and butter" that supports this town. Get some new ideas.

56-3

Please re-think this proposal.
Thank you for your consideration.

Jacqueline Fobes, Ph.D.
James Fobes, Ph.D.

Hotel

Holcomb, John S FAC (CIV) [REDACTED]

Wed 9/23/2020 2:06 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Disgusting! What's the point of pubic comments, you're not going to listen and just carry on with what you want to do. Why not double the size so we can use more water and log jam Lighthouse even more.

57-1

American Tin Cannery Hotel Project

Keegan Barry-Holson <keegan.barryholson@gmail.com>

Mon 9/21/2020 9:58 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Mr. Mullane,

I do not know you, but I hope my message brings light to the incredibly fragile nature of the harbor seal habitat in Pacific Grove, CA. I understand that there is a plan to build another hotel in the area, the American Tin Cannery Hotel. This is truly devastating news. Although I understand that most people just want to make money, there are greater and more important things in life. The seals already have so many human-related struggles. They deal with decreasing fish populations, rising water temperature, increased noise and human activity (including in their "protected" area at Hopkins Marine Station). If you think this project will not harm them, you are surely wrong. This is impossible. These animals deserve to be protected. It is incredibly disheartening to me that so many people could care less about doing what's right for the environment and the animals that were there long before we were.

Please, consider stopping this project.

I love the area, but I will not stay in this hotel if this moves forward. And, I will make it my goal to deter anyone who considers it.

Yours truly,

Keegan Barry-Holson, MD

58-1

Fwd: ATC Hotel - Public Comment - Request for Story Poles and more- for Sept 28, 2020

Kimberly Brown <thegoodkimberly@comcast.net>

Fri 9/18/2020 5:38 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@brandassociates.org>

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kimberly Brown <thegoodkimberly@comcast.net>

Subject: ATC Hotel - Public Comment - Request for Story Poles and more- for Sept 28, 2020

Date: September 18, 2020 at 5:32:58 PM PDT

To: citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org, citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org, dave@laredolaw.net, heidi@laredolaw.net, aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org, ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org, rmullane@brandassociates.org

Cc: alexandra.mccoy@coastal.ca.gov, Kevin.Kahn@coastal.ca.gov, Lisa Ciani <lisa.ciani@gmail.com>

To All Concerned,

I am a homeowner and registered voter in the City of Pacific Grove. I wanted a commercial enterprise to take over the existing American Tin Cannery property. However, I am extremely concerned and disappointed with the magnitude of the proposed hotel: two wings, swimming pools, underground parking for 260 cars and the removal of 79 trees. NO this is not what I voted for.

59-1

My husband and I are currently in the middle of remodeling our home to include the addition of a second story. We now have a beautiful view of the ocean, trees, and neighboring houses. However, we have no idea if this view recently available to us will be obliterated by the proposed ATC hotel. There are no story poles.

The reasoning not to have story poles due to being too hazardous to the public tells me straight away that the project is too dangerous for the environment and the community to proceed with the proposed plan. For me to understand the full context of the plan, I am expected to read 1500 pages at the Police Station. This project is not transparent to the public.

59-2

If I am not mistaken, the Monterey Bay Aquarium, a nonprofit organization had story poles for their expansion. I recall seeing them and wondering what the project would be. It didn't appear to interfere with the existing architecture and wasn't an "eye sore".

Furthermore, I can't imagine where the 79 trees slated for removal are located. They are not marked in anyway to let the public who use the recreation trail know that the trees providing shade, rest, relaxation, and home to countless species will be destroyed. I am requesting that each and every tree to be removed be tagged visually with signage stating "to be destroyed". This will give all current tourists and residents on the Monterey Peninsula knowledge of what is coming to Pacific Grove. What they are enjoying in that moment will never be the same.

59-3

I appreciate your due diligence in being more transparent with this horrendous project. I also ask that the developers and all involved to rethink and redesign the ATC Hotel to fit with the environment and our community.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Brown
316 10th Street
Pacific Grove, CA

Fwd: Correction from Sept 17, 2020 Public Comment Letter -Pacific Grove American Tin Cannery Hotel

Kimberly Brown <thegoodkimberly@comcast.net>

Sun 9/20/2020 8:03 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kimberly Brown <thegoodkimberly@comcast.net>**Subject:** Fwd:Correction from Sept 17, 2020 Public Comment Letter -Pacific Grove American Tin Cannery Hotel**Date:** September 20, 2020 at 7:59:58 AM PDT**To:** citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org, citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org, dave@laredolaw.net, heidi@laredolaw.net, aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org, ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org**Cc:** alexandra.mccoy@coastal.ca.gov, Kevin.Kahn@coastal.ca.gov, Lisa Ciani <lisa.ciani@gmail.com>

To All Concerned,

On September 17, 2020, I submitted a letter for public comment. In the letter I wrote,

...."For me to understand the full context of the plan,
I am expected to read 1500 pages at the Police
Station."...

I stand corrected. On Sept. 20, 2020, I received an e-
mail which included the link to the DEIR. The
website is as follows:

<https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-development/planning/ceqa-california-environmental-quality-act>

I truly appreciate the accessibility to the DEIR.

With gratitude,

Kimberly Brown
Pacific Grove Resident
316 10th Street

60-1

Harbor Seals of Pacific Grove - American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project

Kris Lannin Liang <grlbordr@yahoo.com>

Wed 9/23/2020 12:43 PM

To: aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Cc: donne.brownsey@coastal.ca.gov <donne.brownsey@coastal.ca.gov>; caryl.hart@coastal.ca.gov <caryl.hart@coastal.ca.gov>; effie.turnbull-sanders@coastal.ca.gov <effie.turnbull-sanders@coastal.ca.gov>; sara.aminzadeh@coastal.ca.gov <sara.aminzadeh@coastal.ca.gov>; katie.rice@coastal.ca.gov <katie.rice@coastal.ca.gov>; carole.groom@coastal.ca.gov <carole.groom@coastal.ca.gov>; Maricela.morales@coastal.ca.gov <Maricela.morales@coastal.ca.gov>; watanabe@stanford.edu <watanabe@stanford.edu>; elahi@stanford.edu <elahi@stanford.edu>; larry.crowder@stanford.edu <larry.crowder@stanford.edu>; bblock@standord.edu <bblock@standord.edu>; aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>; nthometz@usfca.edu <nthometz@usfca.edu>; max.delaney@noaa.gov <max.delaney@noaa.gov>; R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>; ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>; citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; dave@laredolaw.org <dave@laredolaw.org>; heidi@laredolaw.org <heidi@laredolaw.org>

 1 attachments (358 KB)

Tin Cannery EIR Response .docx;

Dear Ms. Aziz,

Please find **attached** my comments regarding the proposed American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project. I believe the development of the [proposed hotel and commercial project](#) at the American Tin Cannery will lead to the decline or destruction of the established harbor seal colonies in the immediate vicinity at Hopkins West Beach and Fisher Beach.

Before the City of Pacific Grove moves forward with this project, I respectfully request the following:

1. Require additional detail, including any studies that have been conducted, regarding multi-year excavation of up to 18 feet of granite bedrock, with a focus on the effect it would have on local wildlife
2. Ascertain whether California Department of Fish & Wildlife and/or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will entertain issuing two-year long Take Permits to address the constant disturbance and potential loss of two established rookeries within a California Marine Protected Area, inside a National Marine Sanctuary
3. Require completion of a study to determine the near- and long-term impacts of development in this area, in partnership with Hopkins Marine Lab and University of California Santa Cruz' Institute of Marine Sciences and Long Marine Lab

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Kris Lannin Liang

61-1

September 23, 2020

Ms. Anatasia Aziz
Chief City Planner
City of Pacific Grove
Pacific Grove, CA

Re: American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project
Draft EIR | July 2020

Dear Ms. Aziz,

I believe the **development of the [proposed hotel and commercial project](#) at the American Tin Cannery will lead to the decline or destruction of the established harbor seal colonies in the immediate vicinity at Hopkins West Beach and Fisher Beach – both of which are vital haul-out and birthing sites for up to 400 federally protected harbor seals.** West Beach is also a nesting site for black oystercatchers, a keystone species and indicator of the overall health of the rocky intertidal community under the jurisdiction of the California Coastal National Monument. Both haul-out sites are rated “high” on Pacific Grove’s [“Land Habitat Sensitivity Map”](#) (page 53).

61-2

The Coastal Act defines Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas as “any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments” (Public Resources Code §30107.5).



61-3

An adult Black Oystercatcher with its two chicks in the harbor seal rookery at Hopkins Marine Station. The Black Oystercatcher is a charismatic bird that feeds and nests on the shores of Pacific Grove. Pairs establish territories that they defend vigorously. Pacific Grove citizen volunteers monitor their nesting success after being trained in a program coordinated by the Pacific Grove Museum of Natural History. Photo by Kim Worrell

Image included in Pacific Grove’s Local Coastal Plan (March 2020)

Pacific Grove’s economy is tied to the beauty of its natural resources. Listed as number two on Pacific Grove City Council’s [“Goals and Tactics, Vision and Mission Statements”](#) is “Environmental Stewardship” – key to this mission is preserving monarch butterfly, bird and marine mammal habitat. According to the Pacific Grove Museum of Natural History, [the best place to view harbor seals](#) is THE area that will be most impacted by the development of this

61-4



project. [The Harbor Seals of Pacific Grove](#)'s 12,000+ followers are further evidence of the connection the community, and visitors from around the world, have to the city's iconic animals.

61-4
Cont

Before the City of Pacific Grove paves the way to a legacy of sacrificing its public scenic view area and natural resources in favor of oversized development and, in order to avoid a repeat of controversy, expense and legal investigation surrounding the last attempt to develop this site, please consider the following:

61-5

1. Require additional detail, including any studies that have been conducted, regarding multi-year excavation of up to 18 feet of granite bedrock, totaling approximately 46,700 cubic yards of material, with a focus on the effect it would have on local wildlife
2. Ascertain whether California Department of Fish & Wildlife and/or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will entertain issuing two-year long Take Permits to address the constant disturbance and potential loss of two established rookeries within a California Marine Protected Area, inside a National Marine Sanctuary
3. Require completion of a study to determine the near- and long-term impacts of development in this area, in partnership with Hopkins Marine Lab and University of California Santa Cruz' Institute of Marine Sciences and Long Marine Lab

61-6

61-7

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Kris Lannin Liang

cc: Ms. Sara Aminzadeh, Commissioner, California Coastal Commission
Dr. Barbara Block, Hopkins Marine Lab
Ms. Donne Brownsey, Vice Chair, California Coastal Commission
Dr. Larry Crowder, Hopkins Marine Lab
Mr. Max Delaney, Resource Protection Specialist, Greater Farallones Marine Sanctuary
Dr. Robin Elahi, Hopkins Marine Lab
Ms. Carole Groom, Commissioner, California Coastal Commission
Ms. Caryl Hart, Commissioner, California Coastal Commission
Ms. Maricela Morales, Alternate for Carole Groom, California Coastal Commission
Mr. Bill Peake, Mayor of Pacific Grove
Ms. Katie Rice, Commissioner, California Coastal Commission
Ms. Susanne Rust, Los Angeles Times
Dr. Jillian Sills, Pinniped Lab, University of California Santa Cruz
Dr. Nicole Thometz, Thometz Lab, University of San Francisco
Ms. Effie Turnbull-Sanders, Commissioner, California Coastal Commission
Dr. James Watanabe, Hopkins Marine Station
Mr. Justin Viezbicke, California Stranding Coordinator, NOAA

Fwd: Public Comment re: ATC hotel project (Form submission from: Contact the Historic Resources Committee)

Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Thu 9/24/2020 1:30 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; Stearn, Tad <Tad.Stearn@kimley-horn.com>

FYI

Thank you,

Alyson Hunter, AICP | Senior Planner

City of Pacific Grove | Community Development Department

300 Forest Ave, 2nd Floor Pacific Grove, CA 93950

T: 831-648-3127 Main Reception: 831-648-3183

www.cityofpacificgrove.org | Planning website: www.cityofpacificgrove.org/planning/

Due to COVID-19 citizens are strongly encouraged to conduct City business via email and phone. Remote procedures are in place to process City permits including building and planning permits.

<https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/general-documents/community-development/remote-procedures050420.pdf> You can view the Monterey County Health Officer's updated COVID-19 Shelter Order and FAQs [here](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **City of Pacific Grove Website** <website@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Date: Thu, Sep 24, 2020 at 1:06 PM

Subject: Public Comment re: ATC hotel project (Form submission from: Contact the Historic Resources Committee)

To: <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Name: Lisa Ciani

Email: lisa.ciani@gmail.com

Message:

Dear HRC Members,

Here is the text of my General Public Comment about the ATC hotel project at the American Can Company site at yesterday's meeting:

As you know, the draft EIR for the ATC hotel project is out for public review, although much of the public is unaware of it due to the City's position that story poles are dangerous, and their failure to provide alternatives to story poles or any conspicuous graphics for the general public in a timely way. We're told they might get some onsite displays up by today, with the public review period for the 1,700-page DEIR ending this coming Monday, the 28th.

The American Can Company buildings are not currently on the HRI, despite having been listed there in 2004. In a letter dated June 9th, 2005, Community Development Director Jon Biggs informed Bill Grimm, CEO of the Cannery Row Company, that the property had previously been "inadvertently added" to the HRI. Without due process and without notice to the public, the Community Development Department subsequently amended the HRI to remove 125 Ocean View Blvd. Nevertheless, Page & Turnbull wrote that the property was on the HRI when they prepared the Historic Context Statement in 2011.

In any case, since 125 Ocean View is apparently not currently on the HRI, the project is not coming to you for review. Instead, it is going to ARB on October 20th, and they will make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for the Coastal Development Permit.

The Page & Turnbull technical report on the property for the draft EIR is strongly supportive of its historic significance and integrity and makes it clear that the hotel project as currently designed does not meet Secretary of Interior's Standards and would result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts. I encourage HRC to request that ARB hold a joint meeting to review the ATC hotel project, in light of HRC's significantly greater expertise in reviewing historic reports and evaluating consistency with Secretary of Interior's Standards. And in light of the importance of this site.

62-1

9/24/2020

Mail - R Mullane - Outlook

Thank you for considering my comment, and I hope you can collaborate with ARB in some way to prevent the loss of integrity and physical loss of PG's connection to Monterey Bay's historic fishing and canning industry. I believe the City is very short-sighted in undervaluing the economic benefit of the historic American Can Company buildings in any commercial project.

**62-1
Cont**

Sincerely,
Lisa Ciani

Attached File:

Submitted on Thursday, September 24, 2020 - 1:05 pm

Re: ATC DEIR

Lisa Ciani <lisa.ciani@gmail.com>

Fri 9/25/2020 3:21 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; Ben Harvey <citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org>; dave@laredolaw.net <dave@laredolaw.net>; heidi@laredolaw.net <heidi@laredolaw.net>; Anastazia Aziz <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Rob,

I found two posters with renderings from the DEIR, one on Ocean View Blvd near Eardley and one on Eardley at Sloat—the same misleading renderings as in the plans, and not very large. I could see no poster on Central Ave when I drove slowly by there twice, but my husband finally located the inconspicuous poster. It shows only one of the four views that are displayed on the other posters, the twilight view from Central. In other words, it doesn't display the whole project. This is not a good faith effort to provide an alternative to story poles. It's further evidence of the City's and/or applicant's reluctance to inform the public about this project.

Furthermore, I see NO ribbons on trees as required in LCP IP section 23.90.160.B.1.c, despite your writing to my husband on September 3rd the following:

"Thank you for noting the tree-marking component for trees proposed for removal. I will be contacting the applicant team to have them make arrangements for such tree-marking."

Where are the required tree ribbons?

As a reminder, IP section 23.90.160, which is now part of PG's municipal code, states:

"B. Applications for Development in Scenic Areas. The following documentation and requirements shall be provided for all CDP applications within scenic areas, including those mapped in LUP Figure 4; all development on, seaward, or visible from Ocean View Boulevard, Sunset Drive, and the pedestrian recreational trails seaward of these roads; and any other development that may adversely impact public views:

"1. Site-specific Visual Analysis. At a minimum, the visual analysis shall include the following:....

"c. When trees defined as major vegetation are proposed for removal, ribbons showing the location of the removal MUST be installed." (emphasis added)

Monterey cypress, all 52 of them, and most of the other trees slated for removal (79 trees in total), fit the definition of major vegetation in the LCP and/or "protected" trees in the City's municipal code.

Perhaps you are at a distance and unaware of the lack of follow-through on the part of the "applicant team". I do not believe the City is doing its job effectively if it is not confirming the applicant's follow-through. And I do not believe the citizens of Pacific Grove are getting the information that's legally required at the DEIR phase in order to understand this project and its impacts.

Lisa

> On Sep 24, 2020, at 12:23 PM, R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org> wrote:

>

> Lisa,

>

> I was forwarded your September 22nd email to the Mayor and City Council and wanted to provide an update on the on-site displays that are being installed for the American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project.

>

> The displays along the Ocean View Boulevard and Eardley Avenue frontages should be up later today, if they are not already. A third display will be installed in the parking lot next to DiMaggio's Cleaners on Central Avenue this afternoon. Please have a look at the displays and see if they are helpful additions to the figures included in the Draft EIR.

>

> Hearings on the project are anticipated to start next month. You have been placed on the list of interested parties to ensure

receipt of any upcoming hearing notices. You may also monitor the City's American Tin Cannery Hotel webpage for updates on the project. The direct link to that page is:

> <https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-development/planning/american-tin-cannery-atc-hotel-and-commercial-project>

>

> Thank you again for your comments and participation.

>

> Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner

>

> HR & Associates

> Phone: (805) 350-3282

> email: rmullane@hrandassociates.org

>

>

> From: Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

> Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 2:47 PM

> To: Heidi Quinn <heidi@laredolaw.net>; R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

> Cc: Anastazia Aziz <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>

> Subject: Re: FW: ATC DEIR

>

> Thanks - I'm forwarding to Rob and filing.

>

> Thank you,

>

> Alyson Hunter, AICP | Senior Planner

> City of Pacific Grove | Community Development Department

> 300 Forest Ave, 2nd Floor Pacific Grove, CA 93950

> T: 831-648-3127 Main Reception: 831-648-3183

> www.cityofpacificgrove.org | Planning website: www.cityofpacificgrove.org/planning/

>

> Due to COVID-19 citizens are strongly encouraged to conduct City business via email and phone. Remote procedures are in place to process City permits including building and planning permits.

> <https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/general-documents/community-development/remote-procedures050420.pdf> You can view the Monterey County Health Officer's updated COVID-19 Shelter Order and FAQs here.

>

>

>

> On Tue, Sep 22, 2020 at 2:39 PM Heidi Quinn <heidi@laredolaw.net> wrote:

>

>

> From: Lisa Ciani <lisa.ciani@gmail.com>

> Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 12:39 PM

> To: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org; David Laredo <dave@laredolaw.net>; Heidi Quinn <heidi@laredolaw.net>

> Subject: ATC DEIR

>

> Dear Mayor Peake and Council Members,

>

> I spoke at the September 16th Council meeting about what appears to be a deliberate effort to keep the public in the dark about the ATC hotel project, the draft EIR for that project, and the size and scale and view impacts of that project. You must be aware that a hotel project at ATC is a matter of significant public interest and that it requires greater than usual effort to get the word out during COVID-19 restrictions. But instead, the City has been reluctant to expend any effort on transparent practices. They did not even provide the online notice on the City's homepage that is normally afforded to DEIRs of this level of public concern.

>

> Yesterday, for the first time, the City posted on their homepage the only notice they've posted there about the DEIR for the ATC hotel project—the Revised Notice of Availability—with a week remaining for public comment! They actually posted it twice, for good measure, as you can see in the screenshot below. The notices are dated September 21st, so there's no mistaking how delayed the posting is—the DEIR was released on July 30th, with no Notice of Availability posted on the homepage until yesterday's revised version. As long as I can remember, the City has always posted DEIRs for important projects in the NEWS

section on the homepage—when they were released, not when the public review period was almost over. During COVID-19 restrictions, the May 28th Perkins Park Landscape Plan Community meeting was posted in the News section of the homepage—is the ATC hotel project not that important? CEQA review is a process that’s supposed to encourage the public’s input to help assure that all the potential adverse impacts are analyzed and mitigated. The last newspaper article about the ATC project was in February. How transparent has the City been with regard to the ATC DEIR?

>
> And we’re still waiting for alternatives to story poles, which have been deemed too dangerous—perhaps too dangerous for residents to see....?

>
> Sincerely,
> Lisa Ciani

>
> <Screen Shot 2020-09-21 at 8.33.03 PM.png>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ross Family** <familyross@comcast.net>

Date: Wed, Sep 23, 2020 at 3:24 PM

Subject: ATC

To: <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>

The proposed hotel going in to the current ATC site is obscene! It is completely out of scale to the surrounding area, it will be a massive water gulp, it destroys dozens of mature trees, and it puts sensitive marine mammals (most notably seals pupping along the cove at Hopkins) at risk. From an aesthetic point of view, it looks like a massive luxury hotel, available in any upscale community in the US, not a charming piece of history that fits well with the surrounding environment. Please preserve our animals, our community, our water (really? A massive hotel, with pools, a huge laundry requirement and restaurants, when community residents have to jump through flaming hoops to add a toilet), our roadways (from further congestion) and the charm and uniqueness of our city. Can this be scaled way back? Or better yet, aborted in favor of something that will actually serve the community in which it exists? It is an abomination in its current iteration.

Lesah Ross

64-1

Sent from my iPhone

Letter 65**American Tin Cannery project**

Lois Shedlowski <edshed@comcast.net>

Wed 9/23/2020 9:38 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

We are writing to add our voices to those that approve the conversion of the ATC.

We have had the privilege of living a few blocks "up the hill" from the site for the past 36 years. During this time, we have watched other properties in the area flourish, i.e. the Aquarium, the Plaza and the Clement to name a few.

We would like to see the City of Pacific Grove benefit from another revitalization project such as the pending ATC undertaking. We would expect the following "positives" for the city to happen as a result:

1. Increased property, sales and other related taxes.
2. Increased tourism appeal. In that the ATC has been mostly vacant for years, in its current condition the building definitely does not contribute to the ambience of the area in any way. In fact, we would say it is a major deterrent in the quest to attract visitors.
3. Increased employment opportunities for our citizenry.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Sincerely, Ed and Lois Shedlowski

65-1

Marilyn J. Schultz

649 Jewell Ave

Pacific Grove, CA 93950

(831) 915-5500

marilyn.schultz@thebarnyard.com

September 25 , 2020

Via email to:

rmullane@hrandassociates.org

aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org

City of Pacific Grove

Community Development Department – 2nd Floor

Attn: Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner

300 Forest Avenue

Pacific Grove 93950

Re: American Tin Cannery Hotel & Commercial Project – Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Mullane,

I have reviewed the Draft EIR prepared by Kimley-Horn for the project and want to express my support for this project. The City of Pacific Grove should be ecstatic to be approached by developers who want to build such a stunning addition to our city, and the future TOT revenues are the shot in the arm the city budget has long awaited. This is a win-win.

From everything I can see in the report, they have been thorough, thoughtful, and sensitive to every conceivable concern. There will always be those who disagree for the sake of disagreement, but I think this is the best project we could hope for along our oceanfront.

I for one am willing to put up with a little construction disruption to be able to enjoy the end result. I was particularly impressed with the sound barriers so that both the birds and the marine mammals won't be unduly disturbed and the presence of a "noise disturbance coordinator." They have thought this through down to the smallest detail.

I support the proposed landscaping plan, tree removals and plantings, as well as the stepped building elevations, how it fits into the character of the neighborhood, and its massing. The ATC building itself is long past its prime and the proposed street view not only honors its previous architectural interest, it improves on it.

This former auto upholstery factory has a chance for a new life, one that helps our economy and the people in our community who could benefit from the jobs it provides in many sectors. I hope our townspeople will actively support preserving the echoes of the past within a new and improved design. Let's get it done while we have the chance, because projects of this caliber do not come along for our town very often, and maybe not ever again. I hope there are no further delays. It deserves a smooth process so that we can all enjoy it in our lifetimes.

Sincerely,



Marilyn Schultz

DEIR

Melissa Stepien <stepienmelissa@gmail.com>

Tue 9/22/2020 3:50 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Mr. Consulting Planner,

I am thoroughly shocked by the American Tin Cannery Hotel proposal. The detrimental environmental impact the construction of this tourist industry destination will have on the marine life at Hopkins rookery cannot be overstated. As a care technician with The Marine Mammal Center, I beg you to consider that wildlife residents are already struggling with the effects of climate change, including ocean acidification due to carbon emissions, plastic pollution, and overfishing.

The plan calls for 18 to 24 months of continual excavation, grading, and construction noises that will disrupt the harbor seals and discourage them from returning. This is unacceptable.

The Hopkins rookery is an integral part of a **Marine Protected Area**, initiated in the 1930's by Dr. Julia Platt, mayor of Pacific Grove and marine biologist. The ruin of this beach, where the nocturnal harbor seals rest, is in direct opposition to everything she believed in and fought for. It goes against everything I believe in and have fought for, including the rescue, rehabilitation and release of vulnerable marine mammals.

Thank you,
Melissa Stepien

67-1

www.pacificgrove.org

Letter 68



Begin forwarded message:

From: Mark Stevens <markstevensfinepianos@gmail.com>

Subject: American Tin Cannery Development Project

Date: September 11, 2020 at 4:44:37 PM PDT

To: Bill Peake <bpeake@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Cc: Ben Harvey <bharvey@cityofpacificgrove.org>, Amy Tomlinson <atomlinson@cityofpacificgrove.org>, nsmith@cityofpacificgrove.org, rhuit@cityofpacificgrove.org, Joe Amelio <jamelio@cityofpacificgrove.org>, Jenny McAdams <jmcadams@cityofpacificgrove.org>, Cynthia Garfield <cgarfield@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Mayor Peake, City Manager Harvey, and City Council Members.

I'm a business owner and resident of Pacific Grove and support the American Tin Cannery project. There is a certain nostalgia over the cannery and for a former way of life which no longer exists. I'm reminded of when the new development project was proposed for 520 Lighthouse and the nostalgia expressed before the City Council. Indeed, I recall someone lamenting the tearing down of the building because John Steinbeck spent time there. I was in the assembly that evening and I wondered did Steinbeck get the oil changed in his car, buy a Coke from the pop machine, use the men's room? Who cares and so much for nostalgia. I was glad when that eyesore was demolished about a month ago and construction began on the new development. Perhaps some of you recall that my piano store was housed in that building for over three years and the rent was very affordable. However, in the interest of progress and image of our downtown, I gladly packed up and moved to the space on Fountain Avenue in spite of the inconvenience and greater expense to me.

68-1

In closing, I applaud the vision for transforming a dilapidated, underused, misappropriated, and valuable parcel of property into a beautiful and modern structure that will reflect positively on our community for years to come. Out with the old, in with the new, onward and upward! *Mark Stevens*

**68-1
Cont**

Mark Stevens Fine Pianos

169 Fountain Avenue

Pacific Grove, CA 93950

831-324-7777

Nancy Runyon
1195 Hoffman Avenue
Monterey, CA 93940

September 27, 2020

Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner
Community and Economic Development Department
City of Pacific Grove
400 Forest Avenue Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Email: rmullane@hrandassociates.org

RE: Comments on American Tin Cannery (ATC) Hotel and Commercial Project – Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), SCH# 2019110152

Historic Preservation:

As an active Historic Preservationist for over 40 years it is obvious that the American Tin Cannery buildings (Cannery, Warehouse and Office) are historically and architecturally significant and retain their historic integrity. The Page & Turnbull report, “**Historic Resource Technical Report American Tin Cannery**”, in the DEIR, found the buildings eligible for the California Register of Historic Places. The Pacific Grove Local Coastal plan requires that historic structures shall be protected to the fullest extent possible.

Fortunately, for the applicant, these buildings can be fully protected and easily adapted to hotel conference & meeting rooms, ballroom, restaurants and lobby spaces. Unfortunately for the applicant and citizens, they have not fully protected and incorporated the existing historic buildings into their plans. In fact, they appear to ignore the historic character, which if kept would make them the most attractive to visit.

Historic Preservation is something to be proud of. Historic buildings give one a sense of place. It has been well documented that history travelers stay longer and spend more money. This site can easily be a genuine adaptive re-use in the successful tradition of Ghirardelli Square, the Cannery, and the Argonaut and Presidio Hotels in San Francisco. If you want a piece of the Cannery Row business, keep its architecture authentic.

The ATC complex is Pacific Grove’s only buildings that connects them with the Cannery Row National Historic District which begins on the next block. The success of the Monterey Bay Aquarium’s rehabilitation of an historic cannery and other Cannery Row buildings of character should be something a hotel should want to keep. The proposed “Mid-Century Modern” design enveloping the historic buildings is wrong for so many reasons. All 3 historic buildings should be preserved, restored and rehabilitated retaining their historic character and integrity, without courtyards cut into them intending to destroy it.

Archaeology:

Excavations for underground parking---really?!!! If this site is not already designated as an Area of High Archaeological Sensitivity it will be as soon as you start to dig. The beautiful cove across the street surely attracted Native Americans and the site was a Chinese fishing village that was burnt down in 1906. Stanford University has found artifacts at Hopkins Marine Station at their recent digs just across the street.

The California Coastal Commission (CCC) denied large basements on the Carmel Coast in July. Too many 2,000+ year old remains were being discovered by landscapers. Any project on this site should not be doing any more excavation than for foundation footings---even then with MLD and archaeological monitoring. The CCC and Pacific Grove’s LCP do not allow desecration of Native American sites.

69-1

69-2

Sea Level Rise might also suggest that any excavation is not a great idea. I received an emergency alert about 25 foot waves on Thursday. Building down is a bad idea on the coast where we are beginning to talk about raising up buildings, levees or retreating. And isn't this site on granite bedrock, like my home up the hill?

69-3

Traffic and Environmental Justice:

The proposed project would be a horrible neighbor for so many reasons. The added traffic of this proposed hotel would be a tremendous burden to already congested roads. While the current pandemic has sometimes improved our traffic, along Ocean View it has become worse. It doesn't matter what traffic studies show to those of us who live here. We know what just the Aquarium traffic does. You can't put in enough traffic signals to solve the problems that will be created by 225 hotel rooms and conferences (if we have them again).

Without a signal installed at Central and Eardley, how will the hotel's traffic even get out onto Central? They can't all snake through the Andronico's parking lot like locals do now to avoid the back-up.

An automobile entrance on Ocean View will back up traffic all along the coast where tourists are looking at the view and not paying the best attention to the road. With Sea Level Rise who knows how long cars will even be allowed on Ocean View. One way only may be coming soon.

Removing the Sloat Street block through traffic will cause neighbors who live on one way streets, Sloat and Dewey, to have to go to Ocean View and try to join or cross the traffic--- just to leave their homes. And having commercial trucks use Dewey also is a horrible additional impact to the residential neighbors. A crosswalk to the beach will only make it more difficult to turn right off Dewey but might help left turning. Few tourists bother to use crosswalks or corners anyway.

69-4

Maybe Pacific Grove will keep its "Last Home Town" feel because this project is on the edge of their town. But New Monterey's Lighthouse Avenue, 1 block away from this project, will have all the burden of the project's additional traffic and greenhouse gases. Lighthouse Avenue through the tunnel in Monterey already has over-congested, undersized traffic lanes, where gridlock and accidents are common. David Avenue in Monterey, the other main artery leading to this project from Highway 1, is only two lanes wide and all residential. Pacific Grove residents, visitors, workers and service trucks must travel through Monterey to go anywhere, so they too will feel these negative impacts. The hotel or conference guests will add to the gridlock and accidents that hurts Lighthouse Avenue/Monterey businesses. This project may benefit the City of Pacific Grove financially, but will cause economic injustice as well as environmental injustice to the residents and businesses of its neighbors in New Monterey.

Alternatives:

The DEIR Alternative A, Limited Alteration of the ATC Factory buildings would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative, after No Project. This is the only alternative that would mitigate an otherwise significant unavoidable impact. Any "Alterations" though should not destroy the ATC's integrity as historic and cultural resources. Any acceptable plans for the site should preserve, restore and re-use the existing buildings.

69-5

Instead of "No Project", I suggest a "not this project" or redesign with fewer impacts to historic and cultural resources, better plans to reduce negative impacts to local traffic and taking out fewer beautiful Cypress trees needed to clean the air. A smaller project would result in less traffic, less greenhouse gasses, less tree removal, less trash removal, less excavation---and be less of a bad neighbor. The impacts on Monterey are not just.

Please add me to your list of interested parties for notice of all actions on the American Tin Cannery.

Nancy Runyon

Email: nancy@nancyrunyon.com

Fwd: American Tin Cannery project

Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Fri 9/25/2020 8:37 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; Stearn, Tad <Tad.Stearn@kimley-horn.com>

FYI

Thank you,

Alyson Hunter, AICP | Senior Planner

City of Pacific Grove | Community Development Department

300 Forest Ave, 2nd Floor Pacific Grove, CA 93950

T: 831-648-3127 Main Reception: 831-648-3183

www.cityofpacificgrove.org | Planning website: www.cityofpacificgrove.org/planning/

Due to COVID-19 citizens are strongly encouraged to conduct City business via email and phone. Remote procedures are in place to process City permits including building and planning permits.

<https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/general-documents/community-development/remote-procedures050420.pdf> You can view the Monterey County Health Officer's updated COVID-19 Shelter Order and FAQs [here](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sandra Earl** <sandra@earlfamily.com>

Date: Thu, Sep 24, 2020 at 5:16 PM

Subject: American Tin Cannery project

To: <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

I would like to say that I am appalled at the size of the proposed hotel project for this site. In reviewing the plans for this outrageous hotel complex I want to note that there is no mention of the resulting traffic impact of such a development. Currently the section of Lighthouse Avenue directly above the project is always overcrowded and backed up for blocks before traffic can proceed down Lighthouse past David Avenue. And that stretch of Lighthouse in New Monterey has the unfortunate moniker of the busiest road in Monterey. And Oceanview Blvd. in front of the Tim Cannery is heavily trafficked as well. This project and its hundreds of parking places will have a disastrous impact on PG traffic, let alone its impact on PG's general quality of life.

This project has no business being located in Pacific Grove. It will do more harm to PG than the Holman Building and adjacent developments downtown have already done. Why does Pacific Grove want to turn a delightful small town into a crowded, congested, upscale and decidedly out-of-character unrecognizable place. We love this town and hate what changes are being proposed here.

Sincerely,

Sandra Earl

Sent from my iPad

70-1

Fwd: Harbor Seals of Pacific Grove - American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project

Anastazia Aziz <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Fri 9/25/2020 2:40 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Letter 71

Thank you.

Anastazia Aziz, AICP | Director

City of Pacific Grove | Community Development Department

300 Forest Ave, 2nd Floor Pacific Grove, CA 93950

T: 831-648-3192 Main Reception: 831-648-3190

www.cityofpacificgrove.org

Due to COVID-19 [remote procedures](#) are in place to process City permits including building and planning permits. You can also view the Monterey County Health Officer's updated COVID-19 Shelter Order and FAQs [here](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Stan Jensen** <stanj@run100s.com>

Date: Fri, Sep 25, 2020 at 2:31 PM

Subject: Harbor Seals of Pacific Grove - American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project

To: <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Ms. Aziz,

I believe the development of the [proposed hotel and commercial project](#) at the American Tin Cannery will lead to the decline or destruction of the established harbor seal colonies in the immediate vicinity at Hopkins West Beach and Fisher Beach.

Before the City of Pacific Grove moves forward with this project, I respectfully request the following:

1. Require additional detail, including any studies that have been conducted, regarding multi-year excavation of up to 18 feet of granite bedrock, with a focus on the effect it would have on local wildlife;
2. Ascertain whether California Department of Fish & Wildlife and/or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will entertain issuing two-year long Take Permits to address the constant disturbance and potential loss of two established rookeries within a California Marine Protected Area, inside a National Marine Sanctuary; and
3. Require completion of a study to determine the near- and long-term impacts of development in this area, in partnership with Hopkins Marine Lab and University of California Santa Cruz' Institute of Marine Sciences and Long Marine Lab.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Stan Jensen

--

Stan Jensen, 327 Greenway Dr., Pacifica, CA 94044-2920
<http://www.Run100s.com/> <mailto:StanJ@Run100s.com>

Virus-free. www.avg.com**71-1****71-2****71-3**

Fwd: September 23, 2020 Agenda Item 4. Public Comment - American Tin Cannery (Form submission from: Contact the Historic Resources Committee)

Alyson Hunter <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Wed 9/23/2020 8:03 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

FYI

Thank you,

Alyson Hunter, AICP | Senior Planner

City of Pacific Grove | Community Development Department

300 Forest Ave, 2nd Floor Pacific Grove, CA 93950

T: 831-648-3127 Main Reception: 831-648-3183

www.cityofpacificgrove.org | Planning website: www.cityofpacificgrove.org/planning/

Due to COVID-19 citizens are strongly encouraged to conduct City business via email and phone. Remote procedures are in place to process City permits including building and planning permits.

<https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/general-documents/community-development/remote-procedures050420.pdf> You can view the Monterey County Health Officer's updated COVID-19 Shelter Order and FAQs [here](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **City of Pacific Grove Website** <website@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Date: Tue, Sep 22, 2020 at 9:03 PM

Subject: September 23, 2020 Agenda Item 4. Public Comment - American Tin Cannery (Form submission from: Contact the Historic Resources Committee)

To: <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Name: Anthony Ciani

Email: aciani@cianiarchitecture.com

Message:

Dear Chair Sawyer and Members of the Historic Resources Committee:

The American Can Company, aka AmericanTin Cannery (ATC) is the subject of an Environmental Impact Report including, "Historic Resource Technical Report American Tin Cannery" that concludes the site and buildings are eligible for listing in the City's Historic Resources Inventory and the California Register of Historic Places. Local Historian Kent Seavey also wrote a letter supporting the property's eligibility to the HRI and California Register.

The following is a selected summary of the findings that are provided in the Page & Turnbull, Inc. treatise, "Historic Resource Technical Report American Tin Cannery" (HRTR-ATC) in the Draft EIR for listing eligibility in the California Register of Historic Places and City of Pacific Grove Historical Resources Inventory of the subject property and buildings:

- 1) "In terms of archaeological resources, the results of the assessment indicate the project location has high sensitivity for both historic and prehistoric resources." (DEIR Vol.1 p 8-36)
- 2) In terms of the historic significance of the ATC buildings: the Office Building, Factory Building and Warehouse Building; appear to be individually eligible for listing in:
 - (a) California Register under Criteria 1 (events): "[T]he American Tin Cannery appears to be individually eligible for listing" (DEIR Vol.1 page 8-25 & 26)
 - (b) Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory (Municipal Code §23.76.025) under local eligibility criteria A, C, E, H, and I. (DEIR Vol.1 page 8-26 & 27)
- 3) In terms of their Integrity; "The American Tin Cannery [ATC] retains six out of seven aspects of integrity - location, design, materials, workmanship, and feeling [and association] — and thus retains integrity overall."

72-1

Pacific Grove's Historic Preservation Ordinance provides: 23.76.030 Historic resources inventory historic determination – Additions and deletions.

Properties may be added to or deleted from the historic resources inventory either by initiation of the historic resources committee or by submittal of a historic determination application by the property owner.

I am writing to recommend that you act to add the ATC property to the City's HRI by the "initiation of the historic resources committee" per City code.

The Planning division has indicated that instead of an "Initial Screening" of the property to be reviewed by the you (HRC), they are processing this as a Phase I hearing by ARB.

The HRC is qualified and trained to evaluate the historical significance and integrity of the site and buildings, not the Architectural Review Board, therefore I request you to INITIATE the addition of the ATC property to the HRI.

As Mayor Kempe commented several years ago: "properties are with historic or not". HRC is trained and experienced at determining the "historic or not" and ARB is experienced at evaluating the proposed design for development.

Please take the initiative and insist that City Staff put this on YOUR HRC AGENDA FOR YOUR decision to list or not the American Can Company.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tony Ciani

Attached File:

Submitted on Tuesday, September 22, 2020 - 9:03 pm

72-1
Cont

ATC - ON SITE EXHIBITS AND TREE MARKINGS

Anthony Ciani <aciani@cianiarchitecture.com>

Fri 9/25/2020 2:45 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: City Clerk <cityclerk@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Rob,

The poster boards have been installed at Eardley and Sloat, on Ocean View Blvd., and at the parking lot of the cleaner. I believe it would be appropriate to install a set at the Visitor Information parking lot, too. And, at an adult eye level rather than low as is the one at the cleaners.

They are a standard drawing size, but hardly a large format which would provide a better understanding.

I am concerned that the applicant and City fail to grasp the importance of timeliness regarding this information and mandatory marking of the major trees proposed for removal. On the other hand, believing that the applicant may be motivated by self-interest; it could be they wish to avoid calling attending to the huge loss that would occur.

Nevertheless, as I wrote to you Three weeks ago (Sept. 2) it is the law. MC 23.90.160.b. 1. Site-specific Visual Analysis. At a minimum, the visual analysis shall include the following:

c. When trees defined as major vegetation are proposed for removal, **ribbons showing the location of the removal must be installed.**

The goal of the ribbons is to inform in a timely manner so they can contribute their knowledge and opinions about the removal of the trees. Also, as I commented about this specific case two weeks ago, this project is the active subject of an EIR pursuant to CEQA and relevant to its intent to assess the potential adverse impacts of the entire project at the earliest phase, including public input:

1) PRC Section 21000. Legislature finds and declares as follows: (e) "Every citizen has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment."

2) PRC Section 21001. Additional Legislative Intent: (b) "Take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with clean air and water, enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic, and historic environmental qualities"

3) PRC Section 21003

it is the policy of the state that:

a) "Local agencies integrate the requirements of this division with planning and environmental review procedures otherwise required by law or by local practice so that all those procedures, to the maximum feasible extent, run concurrently, rather than consecutively."

With regard to the ATC project and the City's administrative procedures per PRC 21003(a) to incorporate its planning procedures and environmental procedures to run concurrently, I am formally advising you and the city (by way of a copy of this email to the City Clerk) to take all administrative actions to comply with CEQA and the local municipal code.

Sincerely,

73-1**73-2**

PG resident in support of the ATC hotel project

Taylor Schultz <taylorjschultz@gmail.com>

Fri 9/25/2020 11:15 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Hello! I am writing to you today as a normally quiet Pagrovia to support the hotel project that's being considered for the Tin Cannery property. I was born and raised here. I've lived in Pacific Grove for 30 of my 34 years and my mother still lives in the house I grew up in at Lovers Point. I now live just three blocks up from my childhood home. Since the pandemic has kept us all closer to home, like so many I have started walking Pacific Grove more and more to get some fresh air and exercise. I have fallen more in love with this city as a result. On these walks, I often take the same route I've been running since I was twelve -- the Rec Trail. I start at Lovers Point and end each mile-long lap at the Tin Cannery, so I get to see the current state of the Tin Cannery property often. It is a dilapidated eyesore. Just thinking about going inside it to see the interior's current condition and lack of vibrancy now makes me sad. As the gatehouse of Pacific Grove along the most important (oceanfront) stretch of our city's border, it suggests that the area (and Pacific Grove) is deserted and way past its prime. I would be so glad and so proud to see this beautiful, thoughtfully designed hotel arrive there to bring splendor (and visitors to admire it) to that site and to our town.

I love Pacific Grove and the small town charm it maintains through our collective championing of history and architectural beauty. The Tin Cannery is not emblematic of this town's beauty or vitality. Please consider this note as my support of the revitalization of that property with the current hotel project application you're reviewing.

Thank you for all your hard work for our city.

Sincerely,
Taylor Schultz

74-1

Pacific Grove American Tin Cannery Property

Zoe Shoats <zz@montereybay.net>

Wed 9/23/2020 5:19 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Dear Mr. Mullane, et al:

I am writing in opposition to the current development plans for the existing American Tin Cannery site. Story poles have not been erected to show the public how large the proposed development would be.

In addition, traffic mitigation has not been resolved in an already congested area. Not to mention that there are only two routes in/out of New Monterey and Pacific Grove. This project would endanger the public in adding more congestion to one of the two routes.

I strongly oppose this project, but would support a much smaller development in its place.

Thank you,
Zoë Shoats
Pacific Grove resident

75-1

American Tin Cannery Draft Environmental Impact Report Comments

From: Amanda Preece

September 28, 2020

1. Trees (Fig. 3-9, Impact BIO-3):

a. The concept that mitigation is achieved when the replacement trees mature is not guaranteed. Many replanted trees fail to mature in urban settings due to lack of maintenance and care, including negative effects from water stress and mechanical damage. The removal of mature trees, causing a 30-50-year stretch of time where the site is not as biologically useful to canopy dwelling-insectivorous birds is substantial. And the assumption that simply re-planting another tree counteracts the loss is not logical. I have seen this repeatedly around town: replanted trees are not cared for and the money and effort put into it goes to waste and the beneficial habitat that was there is gone.

76-1

b. The design of the new building seemingly never allowed for the concept of leaving trees and working around them. Thus 79 trees will be removed. At the very least, the removed trees should be replaced with native trees, not exotics. This is specified in the city municipal code (12.20.070). Non-native tree species, even the drought-resistant ones, are not as beneficial to native birds and insects as native species. Many of our native birds and insects hang on by a thread, being globally in decline or projected to decline because of climate change. The residents of Pacific Grove do not want to contribute to species decline, no matter how small of an infraction. This may “just” be 79 trees, but these development projects occur repeatedly, all over the state, and these minor but numerous losses add up.

76-2

Instead of planting multiple non-native tree species as listed in Fig. 3-9 (Melaleuca sp., Olive Tree and Loquat (why?)) all over what had been a beneficial Monterey cypress patch, why not plant other native trees that have evolved to grow here and provide habitat for the many urban wildlife species (mammals all the way to insects) who have had to adapt to living in our cities plus the many migratory and semi-urban species that try to live on the periphery of our urban landscape. Example of suitable trees are Monterey pine, Monterey cypress, coast live oak, toyon, coffeeberry, *Ceanothus* sp., and coast silktassle. These plants are easily obtained from local native plant nurseries. And of course the various landscaped areas of the building complex should also include predominantly native plants.

76-3

2. Windows

- a. The building design does not take into account the effects of large glass windows to migrating bird species. Undoubtedly, even the average residential building in Pacific Grove causes multiple bird deaths due to window strikes annually. Cumulatively, nearly 1 billion birds die from hitting windows every year across the United States. And this shocking number is itself an underestimate, since most dead or stunned birds are quickly scavenged. The Monterey Bay Aquarium recently opened their new education building just down the road from the American Tin Cannery site. They did their due diligence and installed bird-safe windows designed by a company called Ornilux on their very glass-covered building. The American Bird Conservancy has other options listed on their website to help reduce window collisions. This is low-hanging fruit, and it makes a difference. The simple choice to buy the slightly more expensive glass for the windows can be used as a public relations tool to show how “eco-friendly” the city or developer is. Please consider it.

Thank you for allowing me to comment. I hope this process truly does allow for residents to feel heard and influences the decisions made by city staff and administrators as it relates to development in our town.

Re: -American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project Draft EIR - City of Pacific Grove

Anne Wheelis <annewheelis@comcast.net>

Mon 9/28/2020 4:42 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

651 Sinex Ave. Apt L 113
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
September 28, 2020

City of Pacific Grove
Community Development Department
300 Forest Avenue, Second Floor
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Attention: Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner

Re: American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project
Comments on Draft EIR/July 2020

Following are my comments on the referenced EIR:

Impact AQ-2: What is the scientific documentation of the effect of “non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers” on the quality of water run-off? Given that the project site is so close to the final destination of the storm water runoff system, any runoff from the site will not be diluted much by runoff that enters the drain further up Early Avenue or Dewey St. Has the dilution of and resultant impact of the chemical soil stabilizers been analyzed by the length of the run of the storm drain?

77-1

Impact BIO-2: The windows of the finished project should be required to be designed with bird deterrent technology, as suggested in the sustainability plan.

77-2

Impact CR-2: MM CR-2.1 should describe the frequency of “archaeological and paleontological sensitivity training.” Given the number of subcontractors and crews that will be performing work, a single training will not be sufficient to ensure that all persons have received the necessary information. Instruction should be provided in languages necessary to insure that all employees working on the project understand the requirements for archaeological and paleontological monitoring and the authority that the monitors have to halt work.

77-3

Impact HAZ-6: I strongly disagree with the statement that “the project would not significantly impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.” There are two ways out of Pacific Grove and new Monterey: the Lighthouse Avenue route through the tunnel to Monterey and access to Highway 1 or Highway 68 E, and Highway 68/Holman Highway to Highway 1. ALL other roads in Pacific Grove and new Monterey feed into those two access routes. Adding construction crews and heavy slow moving equipment to those evacuation routes during construction, and the potential of 600 guests and hotel staff plus retail staff and customers after construction will impair the evacuation of residents in Pacific Grove and new Monterey. These lessons are still being learned in the fires of 2020.

77-4

Impact TCR-1: MM TCR 1.1 does not clearly describe the role and responsibility of the Project Archeologist in responding to the discovery of tribal cultural resources during project construction. The description omits reference to the presence of the Project Archeologist for all ground disturbance, as is described in MM CR 2.3. The radius from which ceasing ground disturbance upon discovery of a tribal cultural resource is inconsistent between MM CR 2.3 and MM TCR 1.1.

77-5

Thank you for your attention to these comments

Sincerely,
Anne Wheelis

On 09/04/2020 5:24 PM R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org> wrote:

To: Interested Parties in the American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project EIR

Good afternoon. You are receiving this email because you have expressed interest in the American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project in the City of Pacific Grove or have commented on the Notice of Preparation for the associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The City of Pacific Grove, as lead CEQA agency for this EIR, has extended the deadline for public review comments on the Draft EIR. **The deadline has been extended two weeks to 5:00 pm on September 28, 2020.**

Attached is the revised Notice of Availability with a link to the Draft EIR files on the City's website as well as information on how to comment on the Draft EIR. The link to the appropriate page of the City's website is also below :

<https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-development/planning/ceqa-california-environmental-quality-act>

Please note that printed copies of the Draft EIR are available for public review as indicated in the revised Notice of Availability. Printed copies are also available for purchase at the FedEx store at 799 Lighthouse Avenue, Monterey, CA (phone: 831-373-2298). Please refer to the revised Notice of Availability for more information.

Thank you for your interest in the project.

Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner

HR & Associates

Phone: (805) 227-4359

email: rmullane@hrandassociates.org

September 28, 2020

Rob Mullane, Consulting Planner
City of Pacific Grove
300 Forest Avenue
Pacific Grove CA 93950
rmullane@hrandassociates.org

**Re: Comments for Draft Environmental Impact Report
American Tin Cannery (ATC) Hotel and Commercial Project**

Dear Mr. Mullane,

Once again the public is introduced to a proposed hotel and retail complex on, over, and beyond the American Tin Cannery. I sincerely hope it is presented using the shock and awe technique. The ATC Draft EIR mirrors other mitigation reports which consist of overwhelming amounts of documents appearing to make insignificant mole hills out of significant, mountainous environmental impacts. Mitigations for many of them are inadequate, including parking, noise (and permanent increase of noise and traffic in the neighborhood), vibration, degradation of existing roads, loss of view shed and trees, harm to sea and avian life, and toxic hazards. Detailed reports about toxic air contamination and pollution were included, but not enough about underground hazards. Only a limited geotechnical report (p. 371, Vol 11) was provided. However, it contained enough facts and comments to reinforce my abject fear and loathing of the permanent negative effects the entire project will have on everything and everyone surrounding it. There are underground hazards which should never be ignored or taken lightly.

78-1

WHERE THERE IS GRANITE THERE IS RADON. Whether **digging, trenching, or blasting unweathered and/or weathered granite bedrock**, toxic gases spread out and can seep into existing or created cracks and fissures. They can get trapped in enclosed spaces, including basements, garages, homes, man holes, and sewer pipes. It is paramount all residents, property owners, and business owners within at least 400 feet of the area be notified of major ground disturbances and the importance of installing carbon monoxide detectors. The builders should be required to prove this information is provided within the 400 ft zone.

78-2

Choosing not to blast 15 feet of bedrock to build a 250 space underground parking structure next to Ocean View Blvd is a wise choice. Blasting and removing bedrock so close to coastal cliffs includes instant loss of loose soils, high potential of damage to nearby building foundations, and inevitable weakening of surrounding granite. There is no guarantee serious toxins would not seep through altered soils and bedrock along the cliffs and shoreline. Although it pales in comparison to contaminating harbor seal beaches or rock amid which black oyster catchers nest, another reason to move this garage elsewhere is water runs downhill easily and often in Pacific Grove. The possibility of unexpected flooding due to pipes bursting, or misguided storm water runoff exists.

78-3

Overall, the proposed project is too large but I expect you already have another set of plans ready. However, in response to the *Alternatives to the Project in the DEIR Executive Summary*, I urge support for an additional alternative:

1.4.5 Alternative D:

From A: Yes to more historic preservation of the front façade

From B: YES to eliminating level 6, but not any parking spaces

From C: YES to not building an underground parking lot next to Ocean View Blvd.

YES to providing parking levels off Central Avenue. More than two.

ALSO: Building as much sound proofing as possible along Dewey Avenue and widening Dewey Avenue since it is intended to be used for service deliveries.

Thank you for the additional time periods in which to comment on the ATC DEIR.

78-4

Sincerely,

Barbara Thomas
1024 Egan Avenue
Pacific Grove CA 93950
Fishtaless@sbcglobal.net



To: City of Pacific Grove
RE: American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project
From: Christie Cromeenes
Date: 9/28/2020

To Whom it May Concern;

I'm writing today in support of the project proposed for the American Tin Cannery. Here at the Central Coast Builders Association, we work hard every day to promote fair industry practices and support projects that make sense for our community.

Preserving and renovating the historic structure along with beautifying and improving the surrounding areas, this project will bring a new sense of sophistication to the area while preserving its historic character.

This is why CCBA encourages the City of Pacific Grove to utilize the developer's willingness to take on such an important project for our community. With new job creation, enormous tax revenue benefits to the City, and a unique opportunity to redevelop an underutilized area, this is a critical project for the future of the peninsula and Monterey County as a whole.

I implore you to approve the EIR and move this project forward to completion.

I thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Kind Regards,

C. Cromeenes

Christie Cromeenes
Executive Director – CCBA
christie@ccbabuilds.com

79-1

Letter 80**American Tin Cannery**

Colleen Ingram <colleen.ingram@gmail.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 4:30 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Greetings,

I was not going to comment on this project. However, at the last minute, I drove to the site today to view the project scope displays. There are several things about this project that are concerning. Because I waited until the final hour to weigh in, I am going to make this short and as clear as possible.

1 - **COVID19 has devastated the hospitality industry.** According to the Motley Fool: The leisure and hospitality industries faced the most outsized impact in their ability to continue working. Approximately 69% of the people who work in this field, "have faced either a reduction in hours, a workplace closure, or a layoff." Does it make sense to build a new hotel knowing that our existing hotels are struggling to remain?

80-1

2 - **We have affordable housing issues in Pacific Grove.** Water rights are scarce and affordable housing is even more scarce. Should this water be used for an extra large hotel?

80-2

3 - **Trees are precious - We are Pacific Grove.** The number of mature trees that offer natural wind buffer and act as part of our unique microclimate being lost to this project is a mistake. This changes the aesthetic and environmental dynamic of that space.

80-3

4 - **The scope of this project is far too large and does not fit in with the historic Cannery buildings.** The Aquarium structure kept the cannery presence of Cannery Row. The ATC also has that history that should be valued and preserved in some way. It is understood that the building is fragile and cannot hold such a construction. However, the height, architecture, and footprint of the building should remain within its current boundaries if it is to blend in with the existing homes, and businesses that surround it. We have to remember that this structure affects our community home owners that live close by.

80-4

In addition, the displays of this project are so difficult to interpret, that they are basically useless. The standard story poles with connecting netting may be a hazard, but there could be something else used that would visually translate much more successfully than the displays that are currently posted.

80-5

It is not too late to re-evaluate what should be allowed at the ATC site.

Thank You,
Colleen Ingram
Pacific Grove resident

No hotel

Susan <rsllsimin@sbcglobal.net>

Mon 9/28/2020 3:34 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

I am writing to express my opinion of NOT wanting this large hotel built in the old Canary. More time for public opinion is needed and the orange netting with poles need to go up.

81-1

Thank You,
Carole Laine

Sent from my iPhone

Opposing ATC hotel project in PG

camilla Mitchell <koefoed@hotmail.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 2:57 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org <citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org>

To Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner,

I would like to express my concern and opposition to the proposed project. This project seems massively oversized for the area and what logistics are able to bear. What about water, traffic? This seems to have grave implications for and potentially lead to large environmental destruction — for both land and sea creatures, both during construction and forevermore.

82-1

I am deeply concerned about the lack of transparency and public information. I would encourage story poles to be placed so citizens have a chance to see what the scale of this project really is and then have an open dialogue with the many who will be impacted by this.

82-2

Sincerely

Camilla Mitchell

Project Bella 2

Clay Moltz <jcmoltz@gmail.com>

Sun 9/27/2020 11:27 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: Citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <Citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org <citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Mr. Mullane,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the new version of Project Bella. Its scale and ethos are totally out of character with site, the original intent of the plan, and the city itself. First, the project is exploiting the prior approval of a much smaller project. This new project should have to go before the voters of Pacific Grove. Second, the prior project emphasized its green character and its consistency with the cannery's history. This plan is the opposite of eco-friendly (which should be the hallmark of a town with the word "Grove" in its name), shockingly mowing down one of the most scenic "brands" of the entrance to our town—a beautiful stand of cypress trees. These trees must be maintained. Third, any project in this location should look like a cannery and reflect and include the history of the site in a respectful manner. This design fails to do so.

As a 27-year resident, homeowner, taxpayer, and voter, I strongly oppose this project and call for a thorough redesign and reconsideration by the citizens of Pacific Grove in a referendum.

Thank you for taking these points seriously in your considerations and acting upon them.

Sincerely,

Prof. Clay Moltz
431 Spruce Ave.
PG

83-1

Comments on EIR for ATC hotel

Letter 84

carmolar@aol.com <carmolar@aol.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 4:08 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

The proposed project will have very negative impacts on traffic in that area as the roads are not built for that scale of occupancy there, I don't know how the water needs are going to be met since we have an illegal water situation going on with sourcing of the current water supply, and most importantly the pupping grounds of the harbor seals across the street would be severely impacted by the excavation and construction. A much smaller project would not have these detrimental impacts.

84-1

Respectfully,
Carrie Mowatt-Larssen
515 7th Street
Pacific Grove, CA

Call for Public Comments, re: American Tin Cannery Site

Christina Rodriguez <mail@christinarodriguez.com>

Sun 9/27/2020 3:08 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Hello,

As a design school graduate and Pacific Grove resident, I can appreciate all the effort that went into the American Tin Cannery Site proposal and note the clear ambition in its modern design. However, the initiative just doesn't reflect the natural and cultural ecosystem in which it would be placed and thus shouldn't be supported in its present iteration.

As other architects and scientists have mentioned, these hotel buildings are massively out of scale for the site and surrounding area, and their construction would make the irrevocable disturbance of the harbor seals nearby a surety. I agree with the multitude of critical comments previously submitted by other residents, and remain unconvinced by the meager assurances regarding ecological footprint, waste runoff, water usage, and more.

It's important to remember that no one comes to Pacific Grove to view the hotels, they come for the coastal beauty, the wildlife, and the natural calm. This project would endanger the very natural resources this town claims to prize.

Thank you for your time.

--

Christina Rodriguez

www.christinarodriguez.com**85-1**

proposed American Tin Cannery replacement

Cari Rotoli <cmrotoli@comcast.net>

Mon 9/28/2020 12:02 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Dear Mr. Mullane,

My husband and I recently moved to Pacific Grove from the Bay Area. We returned here after 26 years away (Bay Area was where the work was) and we bought our home in the First Addition because we love this area - we love its quiet charm, its natural beauty and its unique community.

86-1

I write today to express my strong opposition to the hotel complex being proposed adjacent to the old American Tin Cannery.

The design shown on the boards shows a Motel 6 type design. Barren of natural beauty. It doesn't show the trees that are to replace the ones to be destroyed. Two trees to replace the one. Where are the 158 trees in the design? I am still trying to learn more about what is being proposed, but so far I am very disappointed in this project. We were not given ample time to research, ask questions and provide comments. The stated design is an insult to our community and the environment.

86-2

Please do what you can to revise the plans to reflect a clearer design that is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood and natural environment. Just look at Asilomar - it can be done! This version, at least from what we can tell from the limited and rushed information provided to the community thus far, is CRAP!

86-3

You and your team can do better than this. Please. Do better than this.

Sincerely,

Cari Rotoli

430 Laurel Ave

Pacific Grove, CA 93950

cmrotoli@comcast.net

Commitments on the DEIR on ATC

Douglas Downs <dougdowns74@icloud.com>

Sun 9/27/2020 12:24 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Rob Mullane, Members of the City Council of Pacific Grove,

After studying the DEIR I would like to make the following comments:

>>This project is grotesquely too large for the area in which you intend to put it. The Bella project was too large and totally misrepresented by the City to the voters a few years ago, but this project is so much larger and so much more destructive of that part of Pacific Grove than the much smaller Bella project would have been.

87-1

>>Much of the historic tin cannery buildings will be permanently altered beyond recognition.

87-2

>>79 mature trees will be removed, including 52 Monterey cypresses! This is truly appalling in a city that is losing many of its native tree habitat at an alarming rate already!

87-3

>>In a time of perpetual water shortages the idea of putting two swimming pools virtually right next to the ocean makes no sense and demonstrates the complete lack of respect for Pacific Grove and this unique historical location.

87-4

>>We all know that the traffic situation in that area will be a nightmare on weekends and that has been woefully inadequately addressed in this DEIR.

87-5

>>As required by the Local Coastal Program this project should have provided some affordable visitor accommodations and so far it does not.

87-6

This project should not be advanced until these and many other objects to it have been properly addressed.

We who have lived here most of our lives are truly appalled and outraged that the city of Pacific Grove would allow such a project to happen!

87-7

Thank you,
Douglas and Anne Downs
405 Alder Street
Pacific Grove, Ca.93950
831 375-3650

ATC HOTEL PROJECT

Deenachiro <deenachiro@gmail.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 4:29 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; Ben Harvey <citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org>

To Whom It May Concern:

It is disturbing that in these troubled times so many projects are being railroaded through the city council without citizen consultation. Given that Pacific Grove is touted as America's last hometown, these projects such as the cannabis dispensary and the huge ATC hotel project (which has been voted down by citizens several times before) keep popping up into focus after what seems to be lip service communication to the city residents. The size of this hotel, water projections and environmental impact are among many factors that must be discussed in detail before replacing a historical building on the coastline.

88-1

Please put this to a citizen vote.

Thank you.

Deena Hakim, DC

Pacific Grove Business Owner.

Sent from my iPhone

Letter 89**ATC Hotel project**

DENNIS J STANFORD <stanford.d@sbcglobal.net>

Mon 9/28/2020 2:22 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org <citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org>

Dear Folks, City Council, City Manager, et al.

It has been brought to our attention that tomorrow September 28th is the deadline for public comment on the proposed American Tin Cannery hotel project. We are sending this email to voice our opposition to the project.

It's too big for the small community of Pacific Grove. It does not fit the culture of this community.

It would stress the transportation system. Lighthouse already gets overcrowded during busy times. The roads are not built to handle the traffic it would create.

We understand we could lose historical buildings and cypress trees in the process of building a hotel of that size.

With the eventual failure of the Bella project this seems an even riskier venture.

We feel a much more modest proposal would be a better fit for this community.

Dennis and Michaelle Stanford
361 Lighthouse Ave

89-1

Tin Cannery Development - SLOW IT DOWN

Deborah Stewart <diverdeb69@gmail.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 4:22 PM

To: Ellen Sorkin <diverdeb51@sbcglobal.net>; R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Dear Mr. Mullane

I have been a long time resident of the peninsula (since 1965) and am a physician and homeowner in Pacific Grove near the butterfly trees. I stay here for the small town charm, the incredible beauty and diversity, as well as the unique community of artists, professionals, students, scientists, and many others.

90-1

I am writing to express my extremely strong opposition to the hotel complex being proposed in the area of the American Tin Cannery. We need a proper public comment period as required by law.

As I study the design, I see a design bereft of the natural beauty which brings so many visitors to our peninsula. Where are the trees being taken out? (over 150). What impact will this have on our resident harbor seal population and the extremely valuable Stanford based Hopkins Marine station, as well as adding to the horrendous congestion already in that area of Cannery Row. We have not been given a clear design, and adequate time to evaluate the degree of harmony with the natural beauty of the area.

90-2

As an illustration, this type of development can be done, perhaps not as large a scale, but the Asilomar complex is a worldwide beacon of beauty set completely within the natural settings and not disrupting it.

90-3

This plan must be slowed down. I am sure you can do better than this

Sincerely,

Deborah Stewart

American Tin Cannery (ATC) Hotel Project: Stop Trying to Sneak in Hotel Projects

David van Sunder <david@vansunder.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 11:12 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>

I'm getting very tired of the City trying to sneak in projects that the people of the City don't want. I'm especially tired of these massive hotel projects that don't fit the City of Pacific Grove or its people.

The project as proposed is way over-sized and not compatible with the character of PG, even though it would become the Lighthouse Avenue entrance to the City. It would destroy much of the significant historic buildings where the cans were manufactured for the canning industry on Cannery Row. The project also intends to haul off the reinforced concrete from those well-built structures to the landfill instead of re-using all the historic buildings.

91-1

The project would clear the site of its entire tree population—79 mature trees, including 52 Monterey cypresses—to be replaced by mostly commercial landscaping type trees and NO Monterey cypress, although they take credit on their landscaping plan for 3 existing cypresses on a neighboring property, page 84/490, volume 1).

91-2

The project would excavate dense granite for underground parking right across the street from harbor seal habitat and bird rookeries for 9 to 10 weeks at the start of construction with unrealistic noise mitigations. Even the DEIR's Geological Report states that more geological investigation is needed to "develop design-level geo-technical recommendations and criteria for planning, design, and construction" and "to better understand the economics" of construction. (Appendix G, pages 373-381/1189, volume 2). This is hardly reassuring! Think seismic impacts!

91-3

The City should not allow a city street (Sloat Avenue) to be used for the project, even with a lease agreement. On top of that, think of the traffic problems the project would create both during construction and once the hotel is in operation.

91-4

No thought was given to the people who live in the city, just to the developers and tax revenue for the City. The City is here for us not the other way around.

91-5

Sincerely Pacific Grove Resident, Business Owner & Parent,

David van Sunder

ATC Hotel and Commercial Proposal

Elin Dolowich <edolowich@gmail.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 1:49 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Cc: citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org <citycouncil@cityofpacificgrove.org>; citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org <citymanager@cityofpacificgrove.org>

 1 attachments (22 KB)

ATC Proposal heigh.jpg;

Hello:

Please accept this letter expressing my strong disapproval of the project as proposed for the American Tin Cannery site. This project proposal is an absolute monstrosity and in no way fits with the character of Pacific Grove. This site sits across from a very sensitive environmental sanctuary. The construction alone will have detrimental consequences to that protected space. Why is this necessary? Why can't PG find a developer that is willing to incorporate the rich history of our cannery building in its current state and height? It's time we stop allowing out of towners to reshape our landscape. The picture below showing the height of the proposed building as the "entrance" to our little beach town is just flat out laughable. WHY IS THIS A GOOD IDEA? Please do not continue to allow wealthy out-of-town developers destroy our oceanfront with large buildings that ruin our natural ocean views.

92-1

Best,
Elin Dolowich

--

NOTICE: CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL

The information contained in this electronic transmission and any accompanying attachment is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient set forth above in the greeting please destroy this email and any additional attachments. Your cooperation and consideration in this regard will be greatly appreciated

American Tin Cannery Hotel

Evynn LeValley Photography <evynn@evynnlevalley.com>

Thu 9/24/2020 10:28 AM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Hello,

I have been made aware of a new hotel proposal in an area that will not only demolish 70+ trees, but will greatly affect our local harbor seals. The greed of humans, willing to destroy habitats and ecosystems is heartbreaking.

I truly hope the city has a conscience, and that this project is halted immediately.

Thank you for taking the time to weigh the many benefits of keeping this land protected.

Kindly,
Evynn

--

www.evynnlevalley.com**93-1**

Tin Cannery complex comment

Gretchen Jordan <gretchen.jordan@comcast.net>

Mon 9/28/2020 2:47 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Hello.

I hope the environmental impact statement has correctly assessed the impact on the nearby Harbor seals of this very large Tin Cannery project from its initial construction through to use. The seals depend on this protected area to raise their pups and rest safely. They are already struggling given rising sea temperatures and changes in the food chain due to climate change. The constant noise of construction so close to the Sanctuary is likely to drive them away.

94-1

A second concern is building all these buildings so close to the water's edge. Here in Beach Tract we are told to expect Ocean View Blvd. to be a single lane by 2050 due to sea level rise. How can it be much different two miles away?

94-2

A third concern is the huge increase in traffic and the drastic change in the look of our small town. Sometimes tax revenue should not be the only criteria for development.

94-3

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Gretchen Jordan

Gretchen B Jordan
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
(Office) 831-920-2790
(Mobile) 505-720-7098

Harbor Seals of Pacific Grove and the American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project

Helen M. WORKMAN <hworkman@berkeley.edu>

Sun 9/27/2020 8:43 PM

To: aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>; ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>; R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Dear Ms. Aziz, Ms. Hunter, and Mr. Mullane,

I am writing in regards to the proposed hotel and commercial project at the American Tin Cannery. I am very concerned about the negative effects it would have on the harbor seal colonies in the vicinity of Hopkins West Beach and Fisher Beach, and potentially the demise of the colonies.

I have been a volunteer in the Harbor Seal Hospital at the Marine Mammal Center in Sausalito for six years. Many of our patients are admitted from the Monterey and Pacific Grove area, and many of our rehabilitated animals are released near there. Many find their way to the Hopkins Beach area where they recover, join the rookery, and breed. Harbor Seals are very sensitive animals and are highly susceptible to stress which can seriously affect their health, including human disturbance and noise. Even at the Center, the harbor seal hospital is situated away from the main facilities and away from public view to lessen any disturbances and noise, and those of us who work with them are trained to perform any handling of them quietly and with the least amount of handling or disturbance.

Please note I am writing on my own behalf based upon my experience and observations. Before proceeding with the project, I urge the City of Pacific Grove and the developers to consult with the experts at TMMC in Sausalito, the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, and NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) for their input to address the impact this development will have on two established rookeries, both within a California Marine Protected Area and a National Marine Sanctuary. In addition, I hope you will seek input from the Hopkins Marine Lab and UC Santa Cruz' Institute of Marine Sciences and Long Marine Lab.

The seal colonies and other wildlife in the Pacific Grove and Monterey area are a gift to the residents and to the public. I feel we have the responsibility to protect them.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Workman

95-1

Please allow sufficient time as required by law for the local community to respond to this project !

96-1

hljgft <hljgft@sbcglobal.net>

Mon 9/28/2020 3:45 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

Letter 97**Fwd: PUBLIC COMMENTS ON DEIR for ATC HOTEL AND COMMERCIAL PROJECT.**

Inge Lorentzen Daumer <ilwd50@gmail.com>

Mon 9/28/2020 4:56 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; rmullane@cityofpacificgrove.org <rmullane@cityofpacificgrove.org>; alexandra.mccoy@coastal.ca.gov <alexandra.mccoy@coastal.ca.gov>; Kevin.Kahn@coastal.ca.gov <Kevin.Kahn@coastal.ca.gov>; Mayor Bill Peake <bpeake@cityofpacificgrove.org>; Anastazia Aziz <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>; ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>

From: **Inge Lorentzen Daumer** <ilwd50@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Sep 28, 2020 at 4:48 PM

Subject: Fwd: PUBLIC COMMENTS ON DEIR for ATC HOTEL AND COMMERCIAL PROJECT.

Dear Mr. Mullane and City Officials and Staff,

As a Pacific Grove resident who has lived most of my life in my Grandparents home (bought the year I was born, over 70 years ago) located on Sloat Ave., 3 houses West of the proposed ATC Hotel and Commercial Project, I feel I am intimately familiar with the area slated for redevelopment. I find the DEIR woefully inadequate and mis-leading.

The Project has started off on the wrong foot by not correcting, immediately, on all the documents and reports, the name of Dewey "Street" to the Correct Dewey Avenue. The Technical Reports most often have the name wrong, creating a mish-mash of nomenclature.

The description of Project Location is mis-leading in its description of "The property is one block northeast of and one-half block from the jurisdictional boundary with the City of Monterey." This entire project is West of any jurisdictional boundary of the City of Monterey.

The way that this DEIR, of over 1,679 pages was first issued for Public Review and comment was only on-line. No hard-copies were even available on a limited basis, well into the Review period, until the Public pushed-back. Only in this last week of slightly extended public review have Any depictions, very inadequate in size, been installed at the project site. Story Pole installation requirements were "deemed to be unsafe" by City Officials, thereby limiting any Public Outreach/Awareness of the immense size and visuals of this major project. I find the developers are doing their very best to keep the Public in the dark. Why are they afraid of real public scrutiny?

Major deficiencies occur in proposed mitigations for Noise, Traffic flow and volume, treatment of Historical Status of each building to be demolished, either partially or wholly, Views, Biological Resources. The simple conclusion...this project needs a redesign to be compatible with Pacific Grove! In its current design, it only fits somewhere in New Monterey's Cannery Row, which we are Not. We need a scaled-down less massive design, fully utilizing the Historic Buildings, retention of healthy protected Cypress trees, publicly accessible amenities, and far less impact on the established Residential Neighborhood (which has lived in basic harmony with the ATC, in all its incarnations, for over 70 years). The DEIR clearly states that "...the project would result in an intensification of uses at the project site...the project would result in a change of use at the project site". This site also had a change in zoning to allow Hotel use, which had never been allowed previously. As such, it will be subject to Condition 2 of the SWRCB moratorium, as Dave Stoldt somewhat alluded to in his MPWMD Review letter: "The moratorium on expanded water service Connections may affect the American Tin Cannery Hotel Project."

Under Aesthetics, "significant and unavoidable" loss of views by building placement is simply unacceptable and Not "generally consistent" with the surrounding areas. Loss of all current trees on site (especially protected Monterey Cypress) is also unacceptable, as any replacement trees will take years to once again contribute to air quality and tree canopy size. I have grown up and old with these trees! Whereas the renderings of the project depict large trees (generally as large as what they want to remove), that is not Reality and very mis-leading, with no way to fully mitigate that loss.

Under Noise, I find their assessments and mitigation measures to be disingenuous. There is simply no way that building a protective fence around the site with some baffling elements incorporated is going to protect the Seals pupping on the HMS beach, the Oystercatchers nesting in the rocky-tidal areas, the ongoing scientific studies at HMS, and the Established, older Residential Neighborhood, of which I am a part. Sound carries greatly here by the shore, and winds change direction all the time. Our largest noise impact currently comes from Traffic, which has greatly lessened due to Covid-19 restrictions. During Special Events we can hear noise coming from Lover's Point and from Cannery Row, and always from the Recreation Trail.

The excavation of solid Granite bedrock, starting from 4.4' down to 16' would be unbearable, "mitigations" notwithstanding, and studies were done with a "Limited Geotechnical Phase II Exploration". It looks like the deepest underground excavation for Parking Garages would be right adjacent to my Residential Neighborhood and the Seal pupping Beach at HMS. Are Contractors, "Biological Monitors" and a "Noise Coordinator" telephone number, really going to follow rules and conditions and act in a timely manner? My long experience says: NO. It is stated several times in different studies in the DEIR that it must be coordinated, monitored and evaluated "with the City" and is only as good as the "hotel operator". My apologies for having little faith in the Process!

The over 2 years of estimated Construction time, with a high-walled construction site, heavy trucks damaging our roads daily with haul-off of tons of excavated and demolished debris, constant noise of Heavy Equipment would be unbearable and take away all rights of "quiet enjoyment" of our homes while lowering property values.

When it comes to the partial closure and demolishing of the through-way Sloat Ave. to create a Service Entrance:

I find in the **Cal Sts & Hy Code 8300 et seq. laws regarding "Vacation" , meaning "the complete or partial abandonment or termination of the public right to use a street, highway, or public service easement".**

"Municipal authorities may not vacate any portion of public street for sole benefit of private individuals. A municipality cannot barter away streets and alleys...for the interest of private individuals..."

Since the U.S. Supreme Court has deemed Corporations are Individuals, it follows that Pacific Grove cannot barter away Sloat Ave. for the use of the ATC Hotel and Commercial Project.

**97-8
Cont**

The way that the DEIR presents the Service entrance and Traffic Flow would open up the entirety of Sloat Ave. to Commercial Truck Traffic, through our Residential Neighborhood. Several Design Elements shall be included prior to approval of final improvement plans. They are listed on page 17-47 of the Transportation and Circulation study for the DEIR.

97-9

The 'complete' Traffic Studies IDAX are fraught with mistakes. As an example, they did not depict an accurate configuration of Sloat Ave. in their diagram and counts of the intersection of 1st and Central Ave. Sloat is a One-Way Avenue only allowing Ingress, not Egress. going eastward. IDAX portrays land configurations emptying into the intersection, which is definitely not accurate!

97-10

In conclusion of my brief analysis, I would say:

Re-design project so Historic Resources are not demolished and retain their integrity.

Re-design for an open-buffer space between the Residential blocks on Dewey Ave. and any Hotel Units.

Redesign to include and retain healthy, protected Cypress trees.

Lower the height of the Executive Wing building to retain the iconic Public Views.

Less rooms = less Parking excavations needed. Move all vehicle entrances to Eardley Ave. by the Commercial Surroundings.

97-11

Try to fit into the Community Surroundings instead of creating a Visual Blight! Where are the Public Amenities and benefits? This is my life, my home!

Sincerely,

Inge Lorentzen Daumer
Sloat Ave. Pacific Grove, CA



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Pacific Grove Hotel at Tin Cannery

Patrice Bell <pbell@toast.net>

Sun 9/27/2020 1:37 PM

To: R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>

We oppose the new hotel on the grounds that it is not needed. Most of the tourists come from the Bay area and do not stay overnight. Additionally, the current hotels and bed/breakfast in Pacific Grove rarely, if ever, exceed demand.

| 98-1

The intersection of Laurel and Ocean View is horrific as it is, the walking/bike path is so crowded now with tourists that it is difficult to pleasantly walk in / along the path. Social media has brought more and more people to our tiny peninsula and we simply do not have the infrastructure to support all of these additional influx of tourists. And you want to encourage more to come down - we think not!

| 98-2

A 2 year construction period is totally unrealistic to say nothing of what it would do to our roads, noise, and quality of life for us residents that live hear.

| 98-3

What is needed is a mixed use housing project that the city could provide for people employed by the city. That is justifiable - another hotel by an out of area developer is not.

| 98-4

We request removing the hotel request.

Sincerely,
John and Patrice Bell
43 year Pacific Grove residents

B E C O M FINE ART & DESIGN

AMERICAN TIN CANNERY PROJECT COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR (JULY 2020)

September 27, 2020

Rob Mullane, AICP, Consulting Planner
Community and Economic Development Department City of Pacific Grove
400 Forest Avenue Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Via email: rmullane@hrandassociates.org

RE: American Tin Cannery (ATC) Hotel and Commercial Project –

Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Comments

Dear Mr. Mullane:

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope and content of the environmental impact report to be prepared for the American Tin Cannery Hotel and Commercial Project.

As someone with a professional background and personal devotion to the preservation of historic resources, I will confine my comments to this area of the DEIR.

The redevelopment of the American Tin Cannery site is a tremendous opportunity to recognize and celebrate the vital history of Monterey Bay's fishing industry to our area with a project that fully reuses the historic buildings within a new hotel/retail complex. The proposed project fails to respond to this opportunity on many levels. None of the alternatives presented are an adequate reflection of the history or current conditions of the site and its setting.

I ask that the owners and their representatives go back to the drawing board and come up with a new design that will meet the Pacific Grove's Architectural Review Guidelines, Pacific Grove's General Plan goals, Local Coastal Plan goals, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Restoration and Adaptive Reuse. We, the citizens of Pacific Grove and the Monterey Bay Area, deserve and demand something much better than the current proposal.

I submit the following comments to emphasize the importance of recognizing and protecting the cultural and architectural resources of the American Tin Cannery (ATC) property and surrounding area for their contribution to the City of Pacific Grove. The ATC, formerly the American Can Company, (ACC), circa 1927, provided the City of Pacific Grove with tremendous economic value that, with care, can continue into the future.

Comment #1: The extensive Page and Turnbull historic assessment clearly states that the Factory Building, the Warehouse Building, and the Office Building are all significant historical assets that retain their historic integrity and are therefore eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Places as well as the local Historic Resources Inventory. Considering the national importance of the Monterey fishing/canning industry to World War II efforts and the literary importance of John Steinbeck's Cannery Row, the ATC site may well be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places as well.

I feel strongly — and I am backed up by the Page and Turnbull Historic Analysis — that the current proposal is inconsistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for the treatment of Historic Structures. If this proposal moves forward, it runs the risk of being held up and ultimately reversed on appeal by citizens' efforts to hold Pacific Grove accountable for following its own regulations for historic preservation and adherence to the Secretary of Interior Standards.

That said, the remaining buildings of the ATC must be retained, restored, and reused as part of any proposed hotel/retail project for this site. The current proposal would decimate these resources, unnecessarily demolishing the Warehouse Building and destroying the center of the Factory Building. The modest remaining historic remnants would be overwhelmed by the scale and style of the proposal. We need a new alternative design that respects what remains of our cultural history at this site for citizens and visitors into the future.

Comment #2: The American Can Company is a cluster of buildings that were designed and built to fulfill different roles on the same site. The proposed project destroys this important aspect of the historic character of this industrial complex in its setting and replaces it with a large-scale, unified structure that is out of keeping with the history and scale of the existing historic complex.

Comment #3: As stated in the DEIR, the current proposal is for a group of modern structures. But why build a new version of "modern" that has no relationship to our unique region? The existing structures are the epitome of modernism: These purpose-built, exposed concrete and glass buildings, aglow with natural light and ventilation, expressed through iconic saw-toothed roof, industrial steel-sash windows, and corrugated metal siding are as modern now as when they were first built, ninety-three years ago.

The new project should (1) Retain and restore each of the historic buildings for reuse; (2) Reduce the scale of any new construction so that it does not overwhelm the historic building complex; (3) Reflect the scale, style, materials, and details of the original buildings in all new construction. This is not to say there cannot be new interpretations of the details of the ACC, but what went before should definitely be acknowledged in the new design.

Comment #4: A new design that incorporates the historic building complex and respects the existing scale of the site and its neighborhood will better meet the stated "Project Objectives," specifically Goals #6 & #8.

Goal #6 Create an architectural design program for the site that is responsive to program needs, is contextually appropriate, and that will present a distinctive and attractive gateway transition into the City.

Goal #8 Implement a hotel and commercial project consistent with the vision and policies of the City of Pacific Grove Local Coastal Program.

The change to a true historic adaptive reuse design of a reduced scale will be a better fit for Pacific Grove, as well as more in keeping with the goals of our historic City. It will also enhance the time visitors spend in PG and therefore contribute significantly to Pacific Grove's revenue without losing PG's unique qualities.

Comment #5: The concept of photographic and written documentation of what is to be lost as a mitigation for the unnecessary loss is an insult to those who care about our history and to all future generations. The DEIR states that the loss of Historic Resources is "Significant and Unavoidable."

99-2

99-3

This “fact” is only true if the current design is followed. I believe implementing the proposed design would be a grave and unnecessary error on the part of Pacific Grove government, staff, and the developers. The ATC site is a great opportunity for a unique project that would celebrate the heritage of Pacific Grove and the fishing industry that was an integral part of our development — a legacy that will otherwise be lost forever.

The only time this type of “documentation” is an appropriate mitigation for historic demolition is when the loss has already occurred. So please drop the idea that this is somehow an appropriate or useful option to preservation. It is not.

The proposed “Public Interpretive Display” would be a boon to the hotel and the City and should still be carried out. But not as a mitigation for historic loss. Rather, this public display should further tie the renovated hotel structures to the history of the site for the public and hotel patrons to realize the significance of the Monterey fishing industry to local, State, and National history.

Comment #6: It is difficult for the average citizen, or even those accustomed to reviewing architectural plans and renderings, to truly appreciate the huge difference in scale that the new project would impose. Figure 5-5 does a good job of attempting to show what will come, but without the story poles and netting that is typically required for all development — even small residential additions in Pacific Grove — we are all at a disadvantage. This same issue has been fought over and over in Pacific Grove for the last twenty years. Only through some type of full-scale, on-site display of both scale and height can the public truly understand the proposal's effects.

Back in 2002, the same issue of large commercial buildings being exempt from the requirement to erect netting was fought over at all stages of the proposed development for the Holman Hotel. The initial proposal was to demolish the entire block that contains the Holman Building as well as all parking lots and associated buildings and replace it with a zero-lot line, seven-story building. In the end, despite various efforts to stop netting from going up, the citizen outcry eventually led to the erection of a series of aluminum poles topped with helium balloons and netting to represent the height and mass of the proposal. This modified netting was left up only briefly, but the effect was immediate and consequential. The special election to change the zoning in order to allow for the seven-story hotel went down in flames. As a result, the historic Holman Building was saved and restored and the hotel concept was greatly reduced in scale and re-designed to more carefully fit into its historic neighborhood. I ask that prior to any proposed development being approved for this site, some form of on-site, full-scale story poles and netting be installed.

Comment #7: The mass and scale of the proposed project appears to substantially interfere with existing scenic and panoramic views from public pedestrian and vehicular vantage points. In my walking tour of the area of the project, as well as how it is presented in the DEIR, I believe without more significant opportunity for the general public to see the scale of the proposed project through some version of netting as proposed above in Comment #6, citizens will be shocked and dismayed at the radical change to views and the surrounding neighborhood of small homes and retail structures.

A new proposal must be brought forward that will be more considerate of the existing neighborhood scale.

Comment #8: The proposal intends to remove a substantial number of mature trees that contribute to the overall scenic and historic quality of the site and adjacent streetscapes. With a more careful design that incorporates these mature, valued trees as a priority, both the project and the City will benefit. If the scale of the development is reduced to better fit into the existing neighborhood, the existing mature Monterey Cypress and Live Oaks can be incorporated into the new design.

Comment #9: The proposal talks about LEED certification and Green practices being followed for this project. How is demolishing structurally sound buildings and hauling the massive amount of waste off to our overstressed landfill in any way compatible with a “green” project? The Environmental Impact Report should consider how to reuse these historic buildings as part of the proposal. The EIR should not “green-

99-3
Cont

99-4

99-5

99-6

wash” the project with no true intention of following best practices for our current and future environmental crises.

Comment #10: Last but certainly not the least of my Comments, please recognize that The City of Pacific Grove Architectural Review Guidelines should have been followed from the very start in the design of this project. They were not.

While The Guidelines were primarily developed for residential projects, the Architectural Review Board has consistently utilized them for all commercial projects in the past. As a long-term, professional member of both the Architectural Review Board and the Historic Resources Committee, I can state with authority that this proposed project is in direct conflict with a number of clear, unambiguous Guidelines that must be followed before this project is granted approval by the ARB and the City. Thus far, all of these Guidelines have been overlooked by the project applicants.

Section 1: Neighborhood Compatibility

Guideline #1: “The mass and height of a new building should blend well with neighboring structures and not overwhelm them with disproportionate size or a design that is out of character.” (See Comment #2 above)

Guideline #9: Attempt to preserve some portion of neighbor’s views by carefully positioning or limiting the width, depth, or height of proposed building elements. (Again, see Comment #2 above)

Guideline #15: Open space and landscaped areas should blend visually with adjacent properties. (See Comment #8 above)

Guideline #16: An effort should be made to preserve significant public view corridors. (See Comment #7 above)

Guideline #19: Avoid excessive cut and fill. (The proposal includes massive cut/blasting into granite bedrock for parking. Other options must be explored!)

Section 2: Preservation of Significant Trees

Guideline #21: The design and siting of a dwelling should take into consideration all existing trees in order to avoid unneeded cutting and trimming. (See my Comment # 8 above)

Section 3: Mass and Scale of a Structure

Guideline # 24: A new structure should appear similar in scale to those seen as traditional in the neighborhood. (See Comment #2 above)

Guideline #27: A building should be in scale with its site. Take care to provide enough open space around a structure to complement its design, allow for sunlight and air, and preserve the character of the neighborhood. (See my Comment #7 above)

Guideline #28: An addition should complement and balance the overall form, mass, and composition of the existing building. By using less than the allowed maximum lot coverage and incorporating a variable footprint within the required setbacks, a more interesting structure can result with more room for landscaping. (The proposed design intends to cover the entire site without concern for the existing mature trees or smaller scale neighborhood homes and structures. This is inappropriate. See Comment #8 above)

Guideline #30: Avoid designs that incorporate large, unbroken roof surface that run parallel to the street. (If the building and roof forms for the new hotel were broken into smaller sections, it could help to lessen the scale difference with the existing neighborhood and the existing original ATC buildings.)

Guideline #35: Design a façade to appear similar in scale and character to those in its context. (The current design lacks any sense of contextual scale and human scale. See Comment #7 above)

Appendix 1: Working with Buildings on the Historic Resources Inventory.

1. Neighborhood Context: ... Any additions to historic buildings must take into account the effect of the proposed addition on the existing neighborhood.
4. Compatibility of New Work with Old: Additions and remodels should be compatible with the original historic building forms, scale, and materials and not compromise the architectural integrity of the original.

CONCLUSION: This project is Pacific Grove's one and only chance to hold onto our cultural history. To lose this treasure would be a backward-thinking approach to development. Pursuing current development ideas incorporating historic preservation and adaptive reuse would yield a more unique, valuable project and allow our community to hold on to our cultural patrimony. We already have chain hotels aplenty in the region. Why not pursue an alternative design that will be a better fit to our historic region and more of a draw for travelers interested in the history of our area?

Should the proposed design move forward, my chief concern is the extensive damage that would be done to the important Historic Resource of the last major Monterey Bay fisheries structure that remains in Pacific Grove's care. This destruction is unnecessary and will leave future generations questioning "What were they thinking?" Why destroy this historic resource when preservation and adaptive reuse will leave our heritage intact while still providing for a hotel/retail project that is a true reflection of the heritage of Cannery Row and the generations of sardine fishing and canning industries that built the Monterey Peninsula.

The site is large enough to accommodate a hotel and ample retail space while retaining the historic Cannery Factory and Warehouse structures. The developers can have it all; imagination is all that is lacking. With a more thoughtful design in keeping with the goals of retaining the historic structures while weaving in mature trees, parking, and hotel amenities, everyone wins.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey N. Becom

Jeffrey Becom
Pacific Grove homeowner
currently residing in Carmel Valley

American Tin Cannery Hotel Project - Public Comment

Joseph Bileci <j.e.bileci@gmail.com>

Sun 9/27/2020 8:22 AM

To: Anastazia Aziz <aaziz@cityofpacificgrove.org>; ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org <ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org>; R Mullane <rmullane@hrandassociates.org>; Kevin.Kahn@coastal.ca.gov <Kevin.Kahn@coastal.ca.gov>

To all:

Please consider the following in regard to the above-referenced proposed project::

1. Story poles should be required to provide proper notice to residents regarding the dimensions of the project. I drive the commute from Pacific Grove to Monterey every weekday and I was unaware of the dimensions until a neighbor recently alerted me to them. In a critical viewshed area such as this, size does matter;

100-1

2. The water use issue is critical. The long-time water shortage on the peninsula has yet to be solved. The increase in water use from the current use to the proposed use has to be calculated realistically, and an acceptable source for the increased volume has to be specifically identified, with primary consideration given to the water needs of residents;

100-2

3. The traffic along the Pacific Grove-Monterey Lighthouse Avenue corridor prior to the Covid-19 pandemic was already a significant problem. For example, during late afternoon on Friday, this corridor was often gridlocked, and it has actually taken me an hour to drive from Pacific Grove to Monterey. Recent state legislation severely limiting local planning regarding accessory dwelling units is resulting in more residents and more traffic. It is unlikely that the existing roads can realistically and safely support the increase in traffic from guests and employees resulting from the project;

100-3

4. In conjunction with the installation of story poles, the trees to be removed need to be marked to provide proper notice to residents of the extent of mature tree removal required for the project. Further, the replacement requirement of 5-gallon trees for fully mature trees is inadequate. These trees are not being removed because they present a hazard, but merely because they are in an inconvenient location. If they are removed, they should be replaced with sufficiently large tree specimens to at least approach replacement of the volume of canopy loss;

100-4

5. Minimizing construction disturbance to nearby residents, as well as wildlife, is critical;

100-5

6. Any long term lease agreement with the City of Pacific Grove should be negotiated by a qualified professional representing the City's long-term interests.

100-6

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Bileci Jr.
Pacific Grove Resident