

MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting: March 11, 2009 @ 9:00 am	Agenda Item No.: 1
Project Description: Continued from January 28, 2009. Status Report - Revised Carlsen Estates Subdivision Proposal (Final Revision - Dated 08/19/08; Five Plan Sheets with Revisions 10, 13, 12, 10, and 11). The proposal is a Combined Development Permit request consisting of: 1) A Standard Subdivision Vesting Tentative Map for the division of three parcels totaling approximately 95.5 acres into 33 residential lots ranging in size from 1.02 acres to 13.29 acres; and 2) Use Permit for removal of approximately 302 oaks over 6 inches in diameter for road and driveway construction and additional oaks for septic and building envelope areas; and 3) Use Permit for the expansion of a public water system. Development of the project would require approximately 8,600 cubic yards of grading (4,300 cubic yards of cut and 4,300 cubic yards fill.)	
Project Location: 60 and 80 Carlsen Road, southerly of Berta Canyon Road, east of U.S. Highway 101, Prunedale.	APN: 125-051-005-000, 125-051-008-000, and 125-051-017-000
Planning File Number: PLN000196	Name: PACO, LLC, Property Owner
Plan Area: North County Non-Coastal Area	Flagged and staked: No
Zoning Designation: : LDR/2.5 [Low Density Residential, 2.5 acres per unit]	
CEQA Action: Environmental Impact Report	
Department: RMA - Planning Department	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission receive a status report on the Revised Carlsen Estates Subdivision Proposal, take public testimony, provide direction to staff, and continue the public hearing.

SUMMARY:

On January 28, 2009, this item was continued to March 11, 2009 due to the applicant having been called away for an urgent matter during the Planning Commission session. Staff reports and attachments for the status report discussion that was to happen that day were available to the Commission, applicant and interested members of the public and are a matter of record.

Staff had requested further information from the applicant regarding the matters set forth in our previous report, however, as of the close of business, Wednesday, March 4, 2009, staff had received no response from the applicant. No plans for remediation or proposed adjustments to the project description have been submitted, and there has been no reconciliation with the County on outstanding financial matters.

At the direction of the Planning Commission, staff returns on this date to present the discussion items from the January 28, 2009 Planning Commission and has reattached that outline here for reference. The applicant has been offered the opportunity to make an oral presentation.

/s/ Taven M. Kinison Brown
Taven M. Kinison Brown, Planning Services Manager

cc: Planning Commission Members; County Counsel; Health Department; Public Works; Water Resources Agency; Parks Department, Housing and Redevelopment, North County Fire District; Alana Knaster; Mike Novo; Carl Holm; Taven M. Kinison Brown; Linda Rotharmel; Carol Allen; Applicant William Coffee; Representative John Bridges.

Attachments: Exhibit A Status Report Discussion Items

EXHIBIT A

Status Report Discussion Items

Where are we right now?

General chronology and timing
EIR – Draft circulation date, FEIR circulation date
Subdivision Committee Hearings
Planning Commission Hearings
Direction to the applicant and staff

Code Compliance Issues

What is the history?
What codes are involved?
Why did the County retire the Red Tag?
What impact do the potential violations have on the process?
What are the options for remediation?

Financial Issues

Status of PACO LLC
Why is this relevant to a discussion of Land Use and Development Standards?
How does this affect the client's ability to indemnify the County?
How does the client proceed with improvements if approved?
Tax Letter and coming current with Tax Collector prior to Final
Outstanding unpaid invoices
Other costs prior to consideration

Where to go from here?

- PC may chose to require applicant to remediate first, or have the applicant process a revised project description that includes the remedy (County Practice)
- Could the site be restored right now?
- Are there implications for other developments?
- Supplemental Environmental Document may be required
- Potential condition regarding financial obligations
- Setting for hearing.