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In the matter of the application of:
CARMEL RIO ROAD, LLC
RESOLUTION NO. 12-004
Resolution by the Monterey County Planning Commission:
1) Finding that the project is Statutorily Exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15270(a).
2) Denying an application for a Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) Standard Subdivision of a 7.92 acre property into 31 Market Rate lots and one Inclusionary Housing lot containing 11 Inclusionary units (2 very low, 5 low and 4 moderate); and 2) Administrative Permit and Design Approval for development in the “D” (Design Control) and “S” (Site Review) Zoning Districts.

(GPZ090004, Carmel Rio Road, LLC Subdivision, 15 and 26500 Val Verde Drive, Carmel Valley Master Plan (APNs: 015-021-015-000; 015-021-020-000, and 015-021-021-000)

The Carmel Rio Road, LLC Subdivision application (GPZ090004) came on for public hearing before the Monterey County Planning Commission on November 9, 2011 and January 25, 2012. Having considered all the written and documentary evidence, the administrative record, the staff report, oral testimony, and other evidence presented, the Planning Commission finds and decides as follows:

FINDINGS

1. FINDING: Background – The project application consists of a Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) Standard Subdivision of a 7.92 acre property into 31 Market Rate lots and one Inclusionary Housing lot containing 11 Inclusionary units (2 very low, 5 low and 4 moderate); and 2) Administrative Permit and Design Approval for development in the “D” (Design Control) and “S” (Site Review) Zoning Districts.

EVIDENCE a) The application was deemed complete as of December 9, 2010, which is 30 days from November 9, 2010 which is the date the applicant submitted the last of the materials requested on the County’s checklist.

EVIDENCE b) The 2010 General Plan was adopted on October 26, 2010 and went into effect on November 27, 2010. Pursuant to Board of Supervisors’ action on October 16, 2007 and Policy LU-9.3, subdivision applications that are deemed complete after October 16, 2007 are subject to the 2010 General Plan.

EVIDENCE c) The Interim Urgency Ordinance (Ordinance No. 5171, as modified and extended by Ordinance No. 5172 and Ordinance No. 5193, establishes a process for determining General Plan consistency for discretionary
projects pending the adoption of applicable programs and ordinances to implement the 2010 General Plan. The ordinance provides that staff shall make a recommendation regarding General Plan consistency to the decision making body. If a project is found to be inconsistent with the General Plan, the applicant is afforded a reasonable time to revise the proposed development to attain consistency. If the applicant fails to submit a revised development project within the allotted time, the application shall be denied. No permit shall be issued if the proposed development does not conform to General Plan policies.

2. **FINDING:** CEQA (Exempt) - The project is statutorily exempt from environmental review because the County is denying the application.

**EVIDENCE:**
A project that will be disapproved by the lead agency is statutorily exempt from CEQA. (Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(5) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15270(a). The project is exempt from CEQA because the County is disapproving the project.

3. **FINDING:**
**SUBDIVISION** – Section 66474 of the California Government Code (Subdivision Map Act) and Title 19 (Subdivision Ordinance) of the Monterey County Code requires that a request for subdivision be denied if any of the following findings are made:
1. That the proposed map is not consistent with the applicable general plan and specific plans.
2. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with the applicable general plan and specific plans.
3. That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.
4. That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development.
5. That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements is likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.
6. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is likely to cause serious public health problems.
7. That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.

**EVIDENCE:** a) **General Plan Consistency.** The application is inconsistent with the 2010 General Plan. The General Plan was adopted on October 26, 2010 and went into effect on November 27, 2010. Pursuant to Board of Supervisor’s action on October 16, 2007 and General Plan Policy LU-9.3, subdivision applications that are deemed complete after October 16, 2007 are subject to the ordinances, policies and standards that are enacted and in effect as a result of the 2010 General Plan. The subject application was submitted on September 3, 2009 and deemed complete as of December 9, 2010 and is subject to the 2010 General Plan.

**Proof of Access** – The project is inconsistent with General Plan Policy C-3.6 which states: “The County shall establish regulations for new development that would intensify use of a private road or access easement. Proof of access shall be required as part of any development application when the proposed use is not identified in the provisions of...”
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the applicable agreement.” To demonstrate consistency with General Plan Policy C-3.6, documentation is required, such as an agreement among all of the easement holders or a final determination by a court, that the easement allows the addition of new lots on Val Verde Drive beyond the density that was allowed when the easement was created. The applicant provided an easement document showing a non-exclusive, private easement for access and utilities. The ability to intensify the land use beyond the LDR/1 density has been contested by other parties to the easement. When the Gamboa project (now Cottages of Carmel) was processed in 2004, the County drafted a condition that required resolution via an agreement or court order – the applicant opted to obtain an easement via the Brinton’s parking lot.

b) The application, tentative map and supporting materials submitted by the project applicant to the Monterey County Planning Department for the proposed development are found in Project File GPZ090004.

4. FINDING:

APPEALABILITY - The decision on this project may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors.

EVIDENCE:

Section 19.16 and 21.80 of the Monterey County Code.

DECISION

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the above findings and evidence, the Planning Commission does hereby:

1) Find the action statutorily exempt per Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(5) and Section 15270(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

2) Deny the application for a Combined Development Permit based on the findings and evidence.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 25th day of January, 2012 upon motion of Commissioner Vandevere, seconded by Diehl, by the following vote:

AYES:  Vandevere, Roberts, Rochester, Getzelman, Mendez, Diehl, Padilla, Hert

NOES:  Brown

ABSENT:  Salazar

ABSTAIN:  None

[Signature]

Mike Novo, Secretary

COPY OF THIS DECISION MAILED TO APPLICANT ON JAN 3 0 2012

THIS APPLICATION IS APPEALABLE TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

IF ANYONE WISHES TO APPEAL THIS DECISION, AN APPEAL FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED TO THE CLERK TO THE BOARD ALONG WITH THE APPROPRIATE FILING FEE ON OR BEFORE FEB 0 9 2012.

This decision, if this is the final administrative decision, is subject to judicial review pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1094.5 and 1094.6. Any Petition for Writ of Mandate must be filed with the Court no later than the 90th day following the date on which this decision becomes final.
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