

# Midcoast Community Council

*An elected Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors  
representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar*  
P.O. Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038-0248 - [www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org](http://www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org)

**Dave Olson**   **Chris Johnson**   **Lisa Ketcham**   **Dan Haggerty**   **Erin Deinzer**   **Joel Janoe**   **Laura Stein**  
Chair   Vice-Chair   Secretary   Treasurer

Date: February 25, 2015  
To: Dennis Aguirre, Project Planner  
Cc: Renée Ananda, CCC Coastal Program Analyst  
From: Midcoast Community Council/ Dave Olson, Chair  
Subject: **PLN2014-00133 – 115 West Point Ave – CDP for 3,973 sq/ft addition to existing 1,888 sq/ft legal non-conforming residence in Waterfront Zoning District**

The Midcoast Community Council commented on an early referral of this planning application on 7/23/14. The issues we brought up were not addressed in the 2/11/15 staff report and remain our concerns, as follows:

- As a condition of this project, we would like to ensure that coastal armoring is never allowed for this house or for the four contiguous lots under common ownership that serve as the yard on the shoreline (#047-032-280, 270, 260, 250).
- We would like to ensure that future development will not occur on those four shoreline parcels due to their 6 to 9 ft elevation on the shoreline next to Pillar Point Marsh. The 2/11/15 staff report identifies these parcels as providing lateral coastal access related to the current project. What is their legal status in light of the Witt and Abernathy<sup>1</sup> decisions? Are they indeed separate parcels from the two to be combined for the house (#047-132-160, 170)?
- Public coastal views should not be blocked from West Point Ave across the yard toward Pillar Point and the marsh in the area seaward of the most-seaward tree. It is not clear whether the proposed solid wood fence will extend into that area and block the view.

Regarding the recently released tsunami analysis for the project, we defer to and support the comments submitted by Coastal Commission staff on 2/23/15.<sup>2</sup> Oddly, the GeoSoils analysis makes no mention of the 1946 tsunami in Princeton, for which this house serves as the iconic image (attached).

The Neg/Dec identifies the site address incorrectly as 155 West Point. Historical Resources 5.a states, "The residence is not considered historic." Per aerial photos cited in the report, the residence dates from prior to 1931 and can be considered one of the earliest buildings in Princeton.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Court of Appeal, First Appellate District (*Witt Home Ranch Inc. v. County of Sonoma* and *Abernathy Valley, Inc. v. County of Solano*). The mere reference to a subdivision map filed in compliance with the 1908 subdivision map law "does not conclusively establish its legal separation from adjacent lands in common ownership."

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.midcoastcommunitycouncil.org/storage/issues/plns/2015-02-23-CCC-PLN2014-00133WestPoint115.pdf>

Estimated life of the remodel is 50 to 75 years, but the house is already at least 85 years old. This project appears to be a new much larger house masquerading as a remodel due to the non-conforming use. How can sea level rise managed retreat be accomplished with these time frames?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.



<http://www.midcoastcommunitycouncil.org/storage/images/1946-04-01-tsunami-155WestPoint.jpg>