

# **AVILA VALLEY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**San Luis Obispo County, California**

**P.O. Box 65**

**Avila Beach, California 93424**

**[www.AvilaValley.org](http://www.AvilaValley.org)**

**Special Meeting Monday, August 8, 2011**

**Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Anne M. Brown at 7:08 p.m..

Present were: Anne M. Brown, Bill Tickell, Lisa Newton, Boyd Horne, Sherri Danoff, Ted Ivarie, Ken Thompson, Lynn Helenius, Steve Johnson, Julie Hartzell. A quorum of the council was established.

Steve Johnson, See Canyon representative, started the meeting by explaining the reason for the Special Session: although the project previously was approved at the AVAC April meeting, there was no appearance or presentation at that meeting by planner Brian Pedrotti, the staff report had not yet been completed and most importantly, it was learned that neighbors had not received notice of the applicant's resurrection of the project which had been on hold for several years, and thus the neighbors had not attended the April AVAC meeting to voice their concerns. When See Canyon residents became aware that the project was scheduled for Planning Commission and aware of AVAC's endorsement at its April meeting, the See Canyon Committee of AVAC was asked by community members to represent their concerns. The Committee drafted a letter to represent community member concerns and included two possible deficiencies in the Staff Report's Conditions of Approval which it had noticed. The Committee recommended to AVAC that it consider augmenting its previous recommendation for approval by approving its draft letter to the Planning Commission.

Steve mentioned that the purpose of tonight's meeting is for AVAC to review the proposed letter and accept comments, with the intent to send/revise or not send the letter.

Steve asked Mr. Pedrotti, planner, to respond to each of the "bullet" items.

1. Guest quarter: size restriction, but allowed.
2. Fence along See Canyon Rd: a Public Works matter.
3. Driveway aprons: Public Works purview.
4. Two-lane bridge: Public Works.
5. Lot 4: Oak tree removal..can be mitigated.
6. Lot 5: Elimination of envelope "B": not really addressed. Said aerial photos show 1999 oak clearing, but there's an ag loophole.
7. Creek stewardship: could be added to Conditions of Approval.
8. Map Condition 25: will take under advisement.
9. Wells and septic tank standards: Can be clarified at the Planning Commission hearing.

Mr. Pedrotti explained that re: oaks, CALFIRE requires certain clearances around dwellings, which may account for high #s of oak removal/impact. He answered questions from the Council

Steve opened the floor for public comment:

1. Denise Allen: concerned about creek stewardship.
2. Jan Mello: wondered if lots could be held back from sale until the bridge/culvert is widened.
3. Mike Wahl : questioned the lot spacing. Mr. Pedrotti explained the clustering concept. The planning commission could specify larger open space areas. The 20-acre parcel conceivably could be split into 2 lots in the future.
4. Sheila Wahl: expressed concern about additional traffic and blind corners already present on the road. Trimming won't suffice. See Canyon Road is not a place to increase traffic.
5. Jamie Stehula: she runs, bicycles and drives See Canyon Road regularly. The fence is "in the road" and increases dangers for cyclists and runners, as will increased traffic. She wants the road straightened out and fences moved back prior to any project approval. The portion of the road near her place is undermined and will require a "Big Sur" intervention.
6. Karen Wikler: wants oaks previously removed "illegally" to be counted for mitigation. Showed aerial views taken previously to show oak removal. 1100-foot trench required for a lot 5 septic on one of the building envelopes.
7. Tyrone McSorly: he measured the width of the single lane culvert at 17'8". He is concerned about the water table being affected by new homes' use. Water is "gold" in California.
8. Jeff Herten: the canyon a "special place". The "cluster" concept not appropriate for the canyon. There are too many lots in the planned project. He is not against subdividing per se, but he begrudges the way it was done here by the applicant clearing oaks in the past and building two bridges without permits.
9. Kimberly Evenson says litter is a problem now and will potentially become worse with more homes and use of the road.

Steve then invited John Wallace, the applicant's agent, to address the previous presentations, the letter points and audience concerns. Mr. Wallace stated that he feels that all the concerns have been addressed by the project as presented. He made the following comments about the nine bullet points in AVAC's proposed letter to the Planning Commission:

1. Guest Quarters/Traffic: Said See Canyon Road has a below-average recorded accident rate per County records. Most See Canyon homes have secondary residences.
2. Fence: There are no official records showing any accidents along the project's frontage except at the Davis Canyon intersection and Pippin Lane. Applicant will be trimming vegetation, but not taking out any big trees along the fenceline.
3. Driveway Apron: Says it's about 1500-1600 feet past the one-way culvert so not a traffic/safety problem.
4. Bridge Issue: Says the project is projected to increase traffic by only 3-4%, so a small amount.
5. Lot 4 Elimination or Reduction: Said one of the smallest building envelopes in the project. Fire Department is okay with it.

6. Lot 5 Elimination Due to Oak Removal: Admitted some trees had been taken for driveway access, but hundreds of trees still left. Re: the septic system long trench concern, a “slit trencher” can be used. Ann Brown asked why there are two envelope choices on Lot 5. Mr. Wallace responded because the State and County had not resolved the septic issues so they combined two separate lots into one Lot 5.
7. Advisory Cautions for Creek Stewardship: He is open to that.
8. Map Condition 25, etc. re Tree Protection: Says he thinks the plan as is, is very specific. The applicant is paying \$60,000 in oak mitigation as is.
9. Wells / Septic Issue: Said applicant paid for a very expensive review of septic issue. The County Engineer just signed off on it. Re: water; they did a creek flow test and there is no impact on the creek.

The discussion came back to the AVAC council, and questions were asked by various members to clarify points. Sherri asked CALFIRE about the illegal bridges issue mentioned by a community member, to which Planner Brian Pedrotti responded. A motion was made by Julia Hartzell, seconded by Sherri Danoff that the proposed draft letter be sent to the Planning Commission, with the deletion in #4 of “by the applicant”. After further discussion, the question was called by Ted Ivarie and a unanimous vote to send the amended letter was made.

Sherri will put the letter on AVAC letterhead with copies to AVAC members, Brian Pedrotti, Public Works and John Wallace.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m. until the September 12<sup>th</sup> regular meeting.