

## **CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
FAX: (831) 427-4877  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



# **F19c**

### **A-3-SLO-21-0004 (WISE SECOND UNIT) MARCH 12, 2021 HEARING EXHIBITS**

#### **Table of Contents**

- Exhibit 1 – Location Maps
- Exhibit 2 – County's Final Local CDP Action Notice and Project Plans
- Exhibit 3 – Appeals of County's CDP Decision
- Exhibit 4 – Commission Staff's Letters Regarding Special Condition 6
- Exhibit 5 – Commission Executive Director's ADU Memo to Local Governments

# Project Location



# Project Location



Project Site






COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & BUILDING  
**TREVOR KEITH**, DIRECTOR

**CORRECTED NOTICE**

December 22, 2020

California Coastal Commission  
725 Front Street, Ste. 300  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060



**NOTICE OF FINAL COUNTY ACTION**

County File Number:	PMTR2020-00874
Project Description:	The applicant has requested a permit to establish a secondary dwelling unit on the project site
Project Site APN:	074-325-013
Action Taking Body:	Department of Planning and Building ("Department")
Action Taken:	Approval, Ministerial
Action Date (Corrected):	December 16, 2020
Conditions of Approval:	None
Local Appeal Periods:	Not applicable
Located Within Coastal Zone:	Yes
Appealable to Coastal Commission:	Yes
Attachments:	Attachment 1 – Findings Attachment 2 – Compliance Review Form Attachment 3 – Plans

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 30 2020**

CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA

The Department's review of a Plot Plan application for Secondary Dwelling Units is limited to a determination of consistency with the County's Local Coastal Plan (LCP) and California State Government Code Sections 65852.2 et. seq. (State Law). Pursuant to CZLUO Section 23.08.169(d) and California State Government Code Section 65852.2(l), the County is not required to hold a public hearing for a request to construct Secondary Dwelling Units. Since the action taken on this application was ministerial and at the department staff level, a staff report was not required to be prepared. In lieu of a staff report, a Compliance Review Form has been prepared and included in this notice as "Attachment 2".

The action may be appealable to the California Coastal Commission if it meets the appealable criteria in CZLUO Section 23.01.043 and Public Resources Code Section 30603(a). If this action is appealable, an appeal must be filed with the Coastal Commission in accordance with the requirements in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations Section 13111.

Additionally, CZLUO Section 23.01.043 and applicable sections of the Coastal Act provide the California Coastal Commission 10 working days following the expiration of the applicable County appeal period to appeal the County's Final Action. This means the Applicant cannot commence development and the County cannot take any further administrative actions for the proposed development, including but not limited to, the request or issuance of a building permit, until the applicable County appeal period and the Coastal Commission Appeal period, including any suspension of the appeal period by the Coastal Commission pursuant to CZLUO 23.02.039, have expired without an appeal being filed.

Since this action was ministerial and was not appealable to the County Board of Supervisors or County Planning Commission, there was no County appeal period applicable for this application; and as such, the California Coastal Commission Appeal period may commence.

If you have any questions regarding the project, please contact Cory Hanh (Planner) at [chanh@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:chanh@co.slo.ca.us) or 805-781-5710.

Sincerely,

Daniela Chavez, Supervising Administrative Clerk  
County of San Luis Obispo  
Department of Planning & Building

cc:

Applicant

Lisa Wise  
1302 Bayview Heights Dr  
Los Osos, CA 93402

Interested Parties

Los Osos Sustainability Group  
Attn: Patrick McGibney  
1177 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Los Osos, CA 93402

J.H. Edwards Company  
PO Box 6070  
Los Osos, CA 93412

### **Attachment 1 – Findings**

1. The Secondary Dwelling Unit Plot Plan application is consistent with the County's Local Coastal Plan (LCP) and California State Government Code Sections 65852.2 et. seq. (State Law).
2. The applicant will be required to provide a will-serve letter from the community water provider prior to construction permit issuance and include an onsite wastewater treatment system that complies with the standards of the County's Local Agency Management Program (LAMP).
3. Prior to approving the Secondary Dwelling Unit Plot Plan, the Department provided public notice pursuant to Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (CZLUO) Section 23.02.070(b) and Section 23.08.169.
4. The Department will review the secondary dwelling unit for consistency with applicable building and construction codes prior to issuing a construction permit for the secondary dwelling unit, including the 2:1 water offset requirement for new structures in Los Osos.

## Attachment 2 – Secondary Dwelling Unit Compliance Review Form

This form serves to provide a summary of the review conducted for the proposed secondary dwelling unit project. The description of the standards listed in this form are representative of the applicable standards found in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (Local Coastal Program). For the full text of the standards, please refer to the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance.

Standard	Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance	Proposed Project	Compliance with LCP
Accessory use	Secondary Dwelling Unit shall be accessory to a primary dwelling	Accessory use to single-family dwelling	Yes
Minimum site area	6,000 s.f.	37,520 s.f.	Yes
Setback, front	10 ft.	65 ft. and 3 in.	Yes
Setback, side	3 ft.	35 ft. 76 ft. and 8 in.	Yes
Setback, rear	5 ft.	172 ft.	Yes
Setback, interior	10 ft.	>10 ft.	Yes
Height	Max. 28 ft.	13 ft.	Yes
Size of Secondary Dwelling Unit	Size of lot over 2 acres: 1,200 s.f. Size of lot 2 acres or less: 800 s.f.	575 s.f.	Yes
Design of Secondary Dwelling Unit	Within URL and VRL, Secondary Dwelling Unit must be designed to be compatible with the primary dwelling and avoid resembling a duplex	Compatible	Yes
Off-street parking	1 space per bedroom (max. 2 spaces)	1	Yes

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

ALL PEOPLE SHALL GOVERN WITH COURTESY AND STATE THE FEELINGS OF NATIONAL REGARDS  
TOWARD THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES  
AND THE LOCAL JURISDICTION.

ANY PERSON SHALL BE WITHIN THE PUBLIC RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE  
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHALL GOVERN WITHIN THE PUBLIC RESERVATION OF THE UNITED STATES  
AND THE LOCAL JURISDICTION.

[illegible][illegible]

4. **CONTROL REQUIREMENTS**
  - A. CONTROL SYSTEMS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT, LIMIT AND REPORT ON:
    1. UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO THE SYSTEM
    2. UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO DATA
    3. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF DATA
    4. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF PROGRAMS
    5. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF OPERATING SYSTEMS
    6. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF COMMUNICATIONS
    7. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF SECURITY
    8. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF LOGS
    9. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF BACKUPS
    10. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF RECOVERY PROCEDURES
    11. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF DISASTER RECOVERY PROCEDURES
    12. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF CONTINGENCY PROCEDURES
    13. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF BUSINESS CONTINUITY PROCEDURES
    14. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF INFORMATION SECURITY PROCEDURES
    15. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    16. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    17. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF INCIDENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES
    18. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    19. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    20. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    21. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    22. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    23. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF LEGAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    24. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES
    25. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PROCEDURES
    26. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF BRAND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    27. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF MARKETING AND SALES PROCEDURES
    28. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    29. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF OPERATIONS PROCEDURES
    30. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF LOGISTICS PROCEDURES
    31. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES
    32. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF RETAIL PROCEDURES
    33. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF SERVICE PROCEDURES
    34. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    35. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF TRAINING PROCEDURES
    36. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    37. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    38. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF INNOVATION AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    39. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF ACQUISITION AND MERGERS PROCEDURES
    40. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF DIVESTITURE PROCEDURES
    41. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    42. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF FINANCIAL REPORTING PROCEDURES
    43. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF TAX PROCEDURES
    44. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES
    45. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES
    46. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    47. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEDURES
    48. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT APPLICATIONS PROCEDURES
    49. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT SECURITY PROCEDURES
    50. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    51. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    52. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT INCIDENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES
    53. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    54. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    55. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    56. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    57. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    58. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT LEGAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    59. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES
    60. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PROCEDURES
    61. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT BRAND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    62. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT MARKETING AND SALES PROCEDURES
    63. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    64. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT OPERATIONS PROCEDURES
    65. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT LOGISTICS PROCEDURES
    66. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES
    67. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT RETAIL PROCEDURES
    68. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT SERVICE PROCEDURES
    69. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    70. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT TRAINING PROCEDURES
    71. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    72. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    73. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT INNOVATION AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    74. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT ACQUISITION AND MERGERS PROCEDURES
    75. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT DIVESTITURE PROCEDURES
    76. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    77. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT FINANCIAL REPORTING PROCEDURES
    78. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT TAX PROCEDURES
    79. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES
    80. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES
    81. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    82. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEDURES
    83. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT APPLICATIONS PROCEDURES
    84. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT SECURITY PROCEDURES
    85. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    86. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    87. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT INCIDENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES
    88. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    89. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    90. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    91. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    92. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    93. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT LEGAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    94. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES
    95. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PROCEDURES
    96. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT BRAND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    97. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT MARKETING AND SALES PROCEDURES
    98. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    99. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT OPERATIONS PROCEDURES
    100. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT LOGISTICS PROCEDURES
    101. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES
    102. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT RETAIL PROCEDURES
    103. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT SERVICE PROCEDURES
    104. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    105. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT TRAINING PROCEDURES
    106. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    107. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    108. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT INNOVATION AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    109. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT ACQUISITION AND MERGERS PROCEDURES
    110. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT DIVESTITURE PROCEDURES
    111. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    112. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT FINANCIAL REPORTING PROCEDURES
    113. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT TAX PROCEDURES
    114. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES
    115. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES
    116. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    117. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEDURES
    118. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT APPLICATIONS PROCEDURES
    119. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT SECURITY PROCEDURES
    120. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    121. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    122. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT INCIDENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES
    123. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    124. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    125. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    126. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    127. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    128. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT LEGAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    129. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES
    130. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PROCEDURES
    131. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT BRAND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    132. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT MARKETING AND SALES PROCEDURES
    133. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    134. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT OPERATIONS PROCEDURES
    135. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT LOGISTICS PROCEDURES
    136. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES
    137. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT RETAIL PROCEDURES
    138. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT SERVICE PROCEDURES
    139. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    140. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT TRAINING PROCEDURES
    141. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    142. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    143. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT INNOVATION AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    144. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT ACQUISITION AND MERGERS PROCEDURES
    145. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT DIVESTITURE PROCEDURES
    146. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    147. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT FINANCIAL REPORTING PROCEDURES
    148. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT TAX PROCEDURES
    149. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES
    150. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES
    151. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    152. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEDURES
    153. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT APPLICATIONS PROCEDURES
    154. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT SECURITY PROCEDURES
    155. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    156. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    157. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT INCIDENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES
    158. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    159. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    160. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    161. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    162. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    163. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT LEGAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    164. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES
    165. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PROCEDURES
    166. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT BRAND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    167. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT MARKETING AND SALES PROCEDURES
    168. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    169. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT OPERATIONS PROCEDURES
    170. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT LOGISTICS PROCEDURES
    171. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES
    172. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT RETAIL PROCEDURES
    173. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT SERVICE PROCEDURES
    174. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    175. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT TRAINING PROCEDURES
    176. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    177. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    178. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT INNOVATION AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
    179. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT ACQUISITION AND MERGERS PROCEDURES
    180. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT DIVESTITURE PROCEDURES
    181. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    182. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT FINANCIAL REPORTING PROCEDURES
    183. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT TAX PROCEDURES
    184. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES
    185. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROCEDURES
    186. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT SUPPORT PROCEDURES
    187. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEDURES
    188. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT APPLICATIONS PROCEDURES
    189. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT SECURITY PROCEDURES
    190. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
    191. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    192. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT INCIDENT RESPONSE PROCEDURES
    193. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT BUSINESS PROCESS MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    194. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF IT IT IT IT IT SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
    195. UNAUTHORIZED MODIFICATION OF

[illegible][illegible]

1881

[illegible]

DISCONTINUED SPACE	64,427.
COMPLETION TAILOR	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>803,427.</b>

1101

THESE ARE THE SUBJECTS OF THE SEVERAL  
 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24 24-25 25-26 26-27 27-28 28-29 29-30 30-31 31-32 32-33 33-34 34-35 35-36 36-37 37-38 38-39 39-40 40-41 41-42 42-43 43-44 44-45 45-46 46-47 47-48 48-49 49-50 50-51 51-52 52-53 53-54 54-55 55-56 56-57 57-58 58-59 59-60 60-61 61-62 62-63 63-64 64-65 65-66 66-67 67-68 68-69 69-70 70-71 71-72 72-73 73-74 74-75 75-76 76-77 77-78 78-79 79-80 80-81 81-82 82-83 83-84 84-85 85-86 86-87 87-88 88-89 89-90 90-91 91-92 92-93 93-94 94-95 95-96 96-97 97-98 98-99 99-100 100-101 101-102 102-103 103-104 104-105 105-106 106-107 107-108 108-109 109-110 110-111 111-112 112-113 113-114 114-115 115-116 116-117 117-118 118-119 119-120 120-121 121-122 122-123 123-124 124-125 125-126 126-127 127-128 128-129 129-130 130-131 131-132 132-133 133-134 134-135 135-136 136-137 137-138 138-139 139-140 140-141 141-142 142-143 143-144 144-145 145-146 146-147 147-148 148-149 149-150 150-151 151-152 152-153 153-154 154-155 155-156 156-157 157-158 158-159 159-160 160-161 161-162 162-163 163-164 164-165 165-166 166-167 167-168 168-169 169-170 170-171 171-172 172-173 173-174 174-175 175-176 176-177 177-178 178-179 179-180 180-181 181-182 182-183 183-184 184-185 185-186 186-187 187-188 188-189 189-190 190-191 191-192 192-193 193-194 194-195 195-196 196-197 197-198 198-199 199-200 200-201 201-202 202-203 203-204 204-205 205-206 206-207 207-208 208-209 209-210 210-211 211-212 212-213 213-214 214-215 215-216 216-217 217-218 218-219 219-220 220-221 221-222 222-223 223-224 224-225 225-226 226-227 227-228 228-229 229-230 230-231 231-232 232-233 233-234 234-235 235-236 236-237 237-238 238-239 239-240 240-241 241-242 242-243 243-244 244-245 245-246 246-247 247-248 248-249 249-250 250-251 251-252 252-253 253-254 254-255 255-256 256-257 257-258 258-259 259-260 260-261 261-262 262-263 263-264 264-265 265-266 266-267 267-268 268-269 269-270 270-271 271-272 272-273 273-274 274-275 275-276 276-277 277-278 278-279 279-280 280-281 281-282 282-283 283-284 284-285 285-286 286-287 287-288 288-289 289-290 290-291 291-292 292-293 293-294 294-295 295-296 296-297 297-298 298-299 299-300 300-301 301-302 302-303 303-304 304-305 305-306 306-307 307-308 308-309 309-310 310-311 311-312 312-313 313-314 314-315 315-316 316-317 317-318 318-319 319-320 320-321 321-322 322-323 323-324 324-325 325-326 326-327 327-328 328-329 329-330 330-331 331-332 332-333 333-334 334-335 335-336 336-337 337-338 338-339 339-340 340-341 341-342 342-343 343-344 344-345 345-346 346-347 347-348 348-349 349-350 350-351 351-352 352-353 353-354 354-355 355-356 356-357 357-358 358-359 359-360 360-361 361-362 362-363 363-364 364-365 365-366 366-367 367-368 368-369 369-370 370-371 371-372 372-373 373-374 374-375 375-376 376-377 377-378 378-379 379-380 380-381 381-382 382-383 383-384 384-385 385-386 386-387 387-388 388-389 389-390 390-391 391-392 392-393 393-394 394-395 395-396 396-397 397-398 398-399 399-400 400-401 401-402 402-403 403-404 404-405 405-406 406-407 407-408 408-409 409-410 410-411 411-412 412-413 413-414 414-415 415-416 416-417 417-418 418-419 419-420 420-421 421-422 422-423 423-424 424-425 425-426 426-427 427-428 428-429 429-430 430-431 431-432 432-433 433-434 434-435 435-436 436-437 437-438 438-439 439-440 440-441 441-442 442-443 443-444 444-445 445-446 446-447 447-448 448-449 449-450 450-451 451-452 452-453 453-454 454-455 455-456 456-457 457-458 458-459 459-460 460-461 461-462 462-463 463-464 464-465 465-466 466-467 467-468 468-469 469-470 470-471 471-472 472-473 473-474 474-475 475-476 476-477 477-478 478-479 479-480 480-481 481-482 482-483 483-484 484-485 485-486 486-487 487-488 488-489 489-490 490-491 491-492 492-493 493-494 494-495 495-496 496-497 497-498 498-499 499-500 500-501 501-502 502-503 503-504 504-505 505-506 506-507 507-508 508-509 509-510 510-511 511-512 512-513 513-514 514-515 515-516 516-517 517-518 518-519 519-520 520-521 521-522 522-523 523-524 524-525 525-526 526-527 527-528 528-529 529-530 530-531 531-532 532-533 533-534 534-535 535-536 536-537 537-538 538-539 539-540 540-541 541-542 542-543


10

1001

1

1003





**SITE PLAN**  
 SCALE: 1" = 10'

**EROSION CONTROL BMP'S (CAFOA)**

- A. EROSION CONTROL BMP'S SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
- B. EROSION CONTROL BMP'S SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
- C. EROSION CONTROL BMP'S SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
- D. EROSION CONTROL BMP'S SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
- E. EROSION CONTROL BMP'S SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
- F. EROSION CONTROL BMP'S SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.

**EROSION CONTROL NOTES - SLO COUNTY APPENDIX A2**

1. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES FOR NEW AND EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
2. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
3. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
4. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
5. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
6. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
7. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
8. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
9. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
10. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.

**SITE PLAN NOTES**

1. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
2. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
3. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
4. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
5. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
6. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
7. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
8. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
9. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.
10. THE SITE PLAN SHALL BE DESIGNED TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING CONSTRUCTION AND TO PREVENT EROSION OF THE SOIL DURING OPERATION.

**A1.01**

**SITE PLAN**

**1302 BAYVIEW HEIGHTS DRIVE**  
 Los Osos, California, 93402

Exhibit 2  
 A-3-SLO-21-0004 (Wise Second Unit)  
 Page 6 of 7



**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

45 FREMONT STREET, SUITE 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 95060  
PHONE: (415) 904-5200  
FAX: (415) 904-5400  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



# CDP Appeal

## Appeal to the California Coastal Commission of a local CDP decision

### 1. Filing information

Appeal number: A-3-SLO-21-0004  
District: Coast District Office  
Date appeal filed: 1/11/2021

RECEIVED

JAN 11 2021

CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA

### 2. Commissioner appellant information

Appellants: Commissioners Erik Howell and Linda Escalante

### 3. Local CDP decision being appealed

Local government name: San Luis Obispo County  
Local government approval body: Department of Planning and Building  
Local government CDP application number: PMTR2020-00874  
Local government CDP decision: Approval, Ministerial  
Date of local government CDP decision: 12/16/2020

Location and description of the development that was approved or denied by the local government.

1302 Bayview Heights Drive, Los Osos

The applicant has requested a permit to establish an accessory dwelling on the project site.

**Appeal of local CDP decision**  
**Page 2**

**4. Grounds for this appeal**

See attached.

**5. Commissioner Howell certification**

I attest that to the best of my knowledge, all information and facts in this appeal are correct and complete.

Commissioner signature:

DocuSigned by:  
*Erik Howell*  
012A9DAA720046E  
01/11/2021

Date signed:

**RECEIVED**  
**JAN 11 2021**  
CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA

**Appeal of local CDP decision**

**Page 2**

**4. Grounds for this appeal**

See attached.

**5. Commissioner Escalante certification**

I attest that to the best of my knowledge, all information and facts in this appeal are correct and complete.

Commissioner signature:

DocuSigned by:  
  
CF7DAD569096480

Date signed:

01/08/2021

**RECEIVED**

**JAN 11 2021**

**CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA**



On December 16, 2020 San Luis Obispo County approved a coastal development permit (CDP) for the construction of a secondary dwelling unit in the community of Los Osos. The County's approval raises questions of consistency with County Local Coastal Program (LCP) policies related to the adequacy of water supply and wastewater services and the protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) as follows.

With respect to water and wastewater, LCP Public Services Policy 1 requires all development to be served by adequate water and wastewater services, and *requires* denial of a proposed project should such services not be available. With respect to ESHA, LCP Environmentally Sensitive Habitats Policy 1 allows only uses dependent on the resource within such habitat areas, and only when such allowable uses are sited and designed in a manner that does not significantly disrupt habitat values. All three of these issues (water, wastewater, and ESHA) are of paramount concern in Los Osos, a community that has traditionally suffered from inadequate water supply (including in terms of water coming from an overdrafted groundwater basin historically suffering from nitrate contamination) and inadequate wastewater services (including historically leaking individual septic systems affecting the Morro Bay Estuary). Moreover, all of Los Osos, including its residential areas, has been recognized as ESHA by the Commission, including due to much of it being critical habitat for the federally endangered Morro shoulderband snail.

The Commission recognized all of these constraints when it approved the County's Los Osos Wastewater Project (LOWWP) in 2010 through CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 that approved a new community wastewater treatment facility. Because of potential for that project to induce growth, including growth dependent on a water supply for which sustainable pumping/use limits and the amount of development that could be supported within those limits had not yet been identified, and including growth with the potential for ESHA impacts requiring a more proactive and comprehensive protocol for addressing such impacts (including via a United States Fish and Wildlife Service-approved Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the community then being developed), the Commission explicitly prohibited additional development reliant on the LOWWP until such time as appropriate growth limits and allowances were developed (including the HCP) and certified as part of the LCP. Thus, unless and until the LCP's Estero Area Plan (i.e., through the Los Osos Community Plan, which is part of the Estero Area Plan) is amended to identify sustainable buildout limits for Los Osos based on the actual availability of water and wastewater services, and based on measures designed to protect ESHA, the County's LOWWP is *prohibited* from serving new development on undeveloped properties. Although the lot here already contains a residential unit, the LOWWP approval is clear that new residential units that utilize water and wastewater service, including completely separate new second units as is the case here, are not appropriate and thus prohibited from connecting to the LOWWP until the Estero Area Plan (and sustainable growth limits in relation to water, wastewater, and ESHA, and an accompanying HCP to address ESHA) is amended and certified by the Commission.

The County approved the Los Osos Community Plan and HCP in December, but has not yet submitted the plans to the Commission for certification. Thus, the LCP has not yet been amended to establish sustainable buildout limits in Los Osos and development of second units on properties such as this one is premature. The County did not make any findings explaining why or how such an approval was consistent with the LOWWP's terms and conditions that prohibit wastewater service in a case like this, how or why the project would be served by adequate water and wastewater services as required by the LCP (particularly given the lack of wastewater services alone explicitly *requires* denial per the LCP), did not provide will-serve letters for water or wastewater, and only stated that 2:1 water retrofits would be required (without providing any documentation confirming

the efficacy of the retrofits). In addition, the County did not make any ESHA findings at all, did not require any biological surveys prior to approval in order to understand the potential ESHA impacts, nor did the approval provide for any mitigation measures to address potential temporary and permanent habitat impacts.

In short, the County's approval raises significant questions regarding LCP compliance with respect to adequacy of water and wastewater services, as well as ESHA protection. The County has approved a CDP for the project prior to identifying sustainable buildout limits and ESHA mitigation that must be codified through the required LCP amendment. For all of these reasons, the County's approval warrants Commission consideration regarding LCP conformance.

RECEIVED  
JAN 11 2021  
CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA



## APPEAL FORM

### Appeal of Local Government Coastal Development Permit

Filing Information (STAFF ONLY)

District Office: Central Coast

Appeal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Filed: \_\_\_\_\_

Appellant Name(s): \_\_\_\_\_

## APPELLANTS

**IMPORTANT.** Before you complete and submit this appeal form to appeal a coastal development permit (CDP) decision of a local government with a certified local coastal program (LCP) to the California Coastal Commission, please review [the appeal information sheet](#). The appeal information sheet describes who is eligible to appeal what types of local government CDP decisions, the proper grounds for appeal, and the procedures for submitting such appeals to the Commission. Appellants are responsible for submitting appeals that conform to the Commission law, including regulations. Appeals that do not conform may not be accepted. If you have any questions about any aspect of the appeal process, please contact staff in the Commission district office with jurisdiction over the area in question (see the Commission's [contact page](#) at <https://coastal.ca.gov/contact/#/>).

Note regarding emailed appeals. Please note that emailed appeals are accepted **ONLY** at the general email address for the Coastal Commission district office with jurisdiction over the local government in question. For the Central Coast district office, the email address is [CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov). An appeal emailed to some other email address, including a different district's general email address or a staff email address, will be rejected. It is the appellant's responsibility to use the correct email address, and appellants are encouraged to contact Commission staff with any questions. For more information, see the Commission's [contact page](#) at <https://coastal.ca.gov/contact/#/>).

1. Appellant information<sup>1</sup>

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

How did you participate in the local CDP application and decision-making process?

Did not participate      Submitted comment      Testified at hearing      Other

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If you did *not* participate in the local CDP application and decision-making process, please identify why you should be allowed to appeal anyway (e.g., if you did not participate because you were not properly noticed).

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please identify how you exhausted all LCP CDP appeal processes or otherwise identify why you should be allowed to appeal (e.g., if the local government did not follow proper CDP notice and hearing procedures, or it charges a fee for local appellate CDP processes).

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> If there are multiple appellants, each appellant must provide their own contact and participation information. Please attach additional sheets as necessary.

2. Local CDP decision being appealed<sup>2</sup>

Local government name: \_\_\_\_\_

Local government approval body: \_\_\_\_\_

Local government CDP application number: \_\_\_\_\_

Local government CDP decision: CDP approval CDP denial<sup>3</sup>

Date of local government CDP decision: \_\_\_\_\_

Please identify the location and description of the development that was approved or denied by the local government.

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>2</sup> Attach additional sheets as necessary to fully describe the local government CDP decision, including a description of the development that was the subject of the CDP application and decision.

<sup>3</sup> Very few local CDP denials are appealable, and those that are also require submittal of an appeal fee. Please see the [appeal information sheet](#) for more information.



On a separate page, please provide the names and contact information (i.e., mailing and email addresses) of all persons whom you know to be interested in the local CDP decision and/or the approved or denied development (e.g., the applicant, other persons who participated in the local CDP application and decision making process, etc.), and check this box to acknowledge that you have done so.

For appeals of a CDP approval, grounds for appeal are limited to allegations that the approved development does not conform to the LCP or to Coastal Act public access provisions. For appeals of a CDP denial, grounds for appeal are limited to allegations that the development conforms to the LCP and to Coastal Act public access provisions. Please clearly identify the ways in which the development meets or doesn't meet, as applicable, the LCP and Coastal Act provisions, with citations to specific provisions as much as possible. Appellants are encouraged to be concise, and to arrange their appeals by topic area and by individual policies.

[illegible]

Exhibit 3  
A-3-SLO-21-0004 (Wise Second Unit)  
Page 9 of 23

5. Appellant certification<sup>5</sup>

I attest that to the best of my knowledge, all information and facts in this appeal are correct and complete.

Print name \_\_\_\_\_

*Patrick McGibney*

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Signature \_\_\_\_\_

5. Representative authorization<sup>6</sup>

While not required, you may identify others to represent you in the appeal process. If you do, they must have the power to bind you in all matters concerning the appeal. To do so, please complete the representative authorization form below and check this box to acknowledge that you have done so.

I have authorized a representative, and I have provided authorization for them on the representative authorization form attached.

<sup>5</sup> If there are multiple appellants, each appellant must provide their own certification. Please attach additional sheets as necessary.

<sup>6</sup> If there are multiple appellants, each appellant must provide their own representative authorization form to identify others who represent them. Please attach additional sheets as necessary.

## LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The project is located at street address 1302 Bayview Heights Dr, Los Osos, CA 93402, assessor's parcel number 06079-074-325-013. The 37,520 square foot lot has an extant 1,225 square foot primary dwelling and an extant 575 square foot guest house.

The project would convert the existing guest house into a one-bedroom accessory dwelling unit by adding electrical and plumbing support for kitchen and laundry appliances. Approximately 85 square feet will be remodeled. One additional on-site parking space would be added. The project would use Golden State Water Company water service and an on-site wastewater treatment system. The applicant will be required to provide a will-serve letter for water service and the wastewater treatment system must comply with Local Agency Management Program standards.

The permit application was received by the San Luis Obispo County Planning and Building Department, the agency that grants development permits for unincorporated areas including Los Osos, on July 20, 2020. The project was approved ministerially by County staff pursuant to California Government Code section 65852.2(l) and County of San Luis Obispo Code section 23.08.169(d).

The County submitted a notice of final action for the project on December 16, 2020. The included findings state that the project is consistent with the County's Local Coastal Plan (LCP).

## GROUNDS FOR THIS APPEAL

### **I. Coastal Development Permits (CDP) for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) must conform with the San Luis Obispo County Local Coastal Program (LCP) Implementation Plan ADU provision.**

The County of San Luis Obispo (County) appears to believe that the provisions of California Government Code section 65852.2, including subsection (a)(4) which states that “an accessory dwelling unit ordinance that fails to meet the requirements of this subdivision . . . shall be null and void and that agency shall . . . apply the standards established in this subdivision . . . until the agency adopts an ordinance that complies,” supersede the ADU provisions in its LCP. This is incorrect as a matter of law. The currently certified provisions of the County’s LCP—including Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance 23.08.169, last amended in 2018—must be applied to all ADU permit applications within the County’s Coastal Zone.

#### **A. California Government Code section 65852.2 does not supersede currently certified provisions of the San Luis Obispo County LCP.**

“Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or in any way alter or lessen the effect of the California Coastal Act . . . except that the local government shall not be required to hold public hearings” for ADU permits. Cal Gov’t Code § 65852.2 (l). The inclusion of the public hearing provision in this subsection is significant because of its limiting effect. “It is a settled rule of statutory construction that where a statute, with reference to one subject contains a given provision, the omission of such provision from a similar statute concerning a related subject is significant to show that a different legislative intent existed with reference to the different statutes.” In re Jennings (2004) 34 Cal.4th 254, *citing* People v. Norwood (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 148. No other provision of the State ADU law besides those related to

Law Office of Babak Naficy

**Coastal Commission Appeal of SLO County CDP PMTR2020-00874**

Additional Sheet 1 of 5 | Attached to Appeal Form Page 4

## GROUND FOR THIS APPEAL

public hearings, including the prohibition on lot size limits, may supersede, alter, or lessen the effect of the Coastal Act.

The County's LCP is not indefinitely excused from noncompliance with the State ADU law, but neither is it rendered void as to ADUs in the meantime. Consistent with § 65852.2 (l), in an April 2020 Guidance Memo<sup>1</sup> to the planning directors of coastal cities and counties, Coastal Commission executive director John Ainsworth advised that despite a spate of recent updates to the state law, "existing ADU provisions contained in certified LCPs are not superseded by Government Code section 65852.2 and continue to apply to CDP applications for ADUs until an LCP amendment is adopted."

### B. San Luis Obispo County Code Title 23 Implements the San Luis Obispo County LCP and is a provision of the County's LCP.

Title 23 of the San Luis Obispo County Code implements the San Luis Obispo County LCP and was adopted pursuant to the authority vested in the County by the Coastal Act. San Luis Obispo County (SLOC) Code §§ 23.01.010 (a) and 23.01.020; Cal Pub Resources Code § 30500 (a) ("Each local government lying, in whole or in part, within the coastal zone shall prepare a local coastal program for that portion of the coastal zone within its jurisdiction"). The development review processes described in Title 23—including section 23.08.169 – Secondary Dwelling Units—are conducted under authority explicitly delegated to the County by the Coastal Act. Cal Pub Resources Code § 30519 (following certification of an LCP, the Coastal Commission authority for development review is delegated to the local

---

<sup>1</sup>

<https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/rflg/California%20Coastal%20Commission%20ADU%20Memo%20dated%20042120.pdf>, accessed 1/12/2021.



## GROUND FOR THIS APPEAL

government implementing the LCP). See Schneider v. California Coastal Com. (2006) 140 Cal.App.4th 1339, 1344-1345.

The fact that the County's LCP Implementation Plan is codified as Title 23 of the County Code and termed "Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance" does not alter its character as a certified provision of the County LCP and not solely a local ordinance. "Under the Coastal Act's legislative scheme, however, the LCP and the development permits issued by local agencies pursuant to the Coastal Act are not solely a matter of local law, but embody state policy." Charles A. Pratt Constr. Co. v. California Coastal Com. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1075.

### **II. San Luis Obispo County CDP PMTR2020-01207 does not conform with the San Luis Obispo County LCP**

The County's LCP does not permit any ADU to be developed on a lot of this size, in this location.

#### **A. ADUs are not allowed within the South Bay Urban Area where the CDP site is located unless certain provisions (not here met) are satisfied.**

Secondary Dwelling Units, also known as ADUs, are excluded from areas of the County's Coastal Zone where the associated "density increases . . . would create adverse cumulative effects on essential community services." SLOC Code § 23.08.169 (c) (1). These limits are consistent with the State ADU law, which allows a local agency to "designate areas . . . where accessory dwelling units may be permitted . . . based on the adequacy of water and sewer services . . ." Cal Govt Code § 65852.2 (a)(1)(A).

## GROUNDS FOR THIS APPEAL

One such area of exclusion is South Bay, Los Osos “as defined by the Land Use Element, Estero area plan.” SLOC Code § 23.08.169 (c)(1)(i). The Estero area plan<sup>2</sup> describes the South Bay urban area as the western end of Los Osos Valley, bounded by Los Osos Creek on the east, Montana de Oro on the west, Morro Bay on the north, and Irish Hills on the South. As explained in the introduction to this Appeal, the severely limited groundwater supply and sewage capacity of the Los Osos area are well documented and currently under debate in the context of the Los Osos Community Plan, which was recently approved by the County but has not yet been submitted to the Coastal Commission.

Detached ADUs **may** only be allowed<sup>3</sup> in the South Bay urban area where the site of the CDP is at least:

- 12,000 square feet and served by community water and sewer;
- One acre (net) and served by community water and on-site sewage; or
- 2.5 acres (net) and served by on-site water and sewage.

*Ibid.* ADUs attached to or incorporated within a primary residence are not mentioned in the exception to the exclusion so it appears they are disallowed entirely within the South Bay urban area.

The site of the CDP that is the subject of this appeal is a 37,520 square foot lot within the South Bay urban area. The proposed ADU would use community water and on-site sewage, which requires a lot size of at least one

---

<sup>2</sup>

<https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Forms-Documents/Plans-and-Elements/Area-Plans/Coastal-Zone.aspx>, accessed 1/12/2021.

<sup>3</sup> Note that the language of this subsection does not guarantee that an ADU will be granted a ministerial permit even if the lot size is sufficient; the ADU “may” be permitted, indicating that a discretionary decision must be made. SLOC Code §23.08.169 (c)(1)(i).

## GROUND FOR THIS APPEAL

acre (net). The lot that is the site of this CDP would need to be 43,560 square feet, but it is only 37,520 square feet, more than 6,000 square feet too small.

**B. The CDP site does not meet the minimum lot size for an ADU anywhere in the Coastal Zone**

Even in areas of the County's Coastal Zone where ADUs are not excluded due to the potential for adverse cumulative impacts on essential services, the minimum lot size for a site served by community water and sewer is still one acre (gross). SLOC Code §23.08.169 (f). The site of this CDP is too small to accommodate an ADU served by on-site sewer anywhere in the County's Coastal Zone.

**C. The fact that the guesthouse already exists does not eliminate the environmental impact of converting it to an ADU**

Guesthouses are a permitted residential accessory use under the County's LCP, provided that the guesthouse "shall not be designed to contain or accommodate cooking or laundry facilities . . . [and] shall not be used for residential occupancy independent from the principal residence or as a dwelling unit for rental." SLOC Code § 23.08.032 (e). These limitations guarantee that the impact of a guesthouse on essential services will be less significant than that of an ADU.

This CDP proposes to convert an existing guesthouse into an ADU by adding the very features that will increase its impact on essential services and allow the ADU to be rented separately from the primary dwelling and therefore occupied full time as a residence rather than intermittently as a guesthouse. The resulting increase in the type and intensity of water usage alone requires that this CDP conform to the County's LCP.

## INTRODUCTION

This is one of eight (8) related appeals from San Luis Obispo County's approval of accessory dwelling units (ADU) in the community of Los Osos by Los Osos Sustainability Group (LOSG), on whose behalf these appeals are filed. LOSG urges the Coastal Commission to grant these appeals and to direct San Luis Obispo County not to approve any more ADUs or any other type of new development that uses water or sewer services in Los Osos until and unless the Coastal Commission (Commission) has approved the Los Osos Community Plan (LOCP) thereby setting buildout limits that reflect the availability of water supplies and sewer services. In the course of its review of the LOCP, which the County has yet to submit to the Commission for review, the Commission will be able to ensure that future development will not jeopardize the resources needed to meet the needs of current development, and valuable coastal resources including Ecologically Sensitive Habitats (ESHA) are preserved.

When the Coastal Commission considered and eventually approved the Los Osos Wastewater Project (LOWWP) in 2010, it recognized the complex problems that affect the continued viability of the groundwater basin on which the residents of Los Osos currently and forever must rely. In this regard, a Commission staff report explained:

potential buildout under the LCP is significantly constrained, including due to public service constraints, habitat, and rural/agricultural protection. Thus, it is not clear at the current time that buildout of that degree is possible, nor whether it could be found consistent with the LCP. The County has committed to rectifying buildout issues through an LCP amendment following the LOWWP. Specifically the proposed project includes condition 86, which states: *(Consistent with condition of approval #34 from CDP A-3-SLO-03-113). To prevent wastewater treatment system from inducing growth*

## INTRODUCTION

*that cannot be safely sustained by available water supplies, the sewer authority is prohibited from providing service to existing undeveloped parcels within the service area, unless and until the Estero Area Plan is amended to incorporate a sustainable buildout target that indicates that there is water available to support such development without impacts to wetlands and habitats.*

The LCP addressed these concerns by including policies that prohibit residential and commercial development unless the availability of water supply and sewer service is established. In recognition of these constraints (as well those caused by the prevalence of ESHA throughout the area), the Coastal Development Permit (CDP) that the Commission issued in connection with the LOWWP in 2010 (CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069) explicitly prohibits additional residential and commercial development reliant on the LOWWP until the County establishes appropriate limits on growth based on the basin's true carrying capacity based on "conclusive evidence" of an adequate water supply, adequate sewer treatment capacity, and ESHA protection.

Condition of Approval No. 6 specifically provides:

**Wastewater Service to Undeveloped Properties.**

Wastewater service to undeveloped properties within the service area shall be prohibited unless and until the Estero Area Plan is amended to identify appropriate and sustainable buildout limits, and any appropriate mechanisms to stay within such limits, based on conclusive evidence indicating that adequate water is available to support development of such properties without adverse impacts to ground and surface waters, including wetlands and all related habitats.



## INTRODUCTION

Condition 6 has not been satisfied because the County has yet to submit the LOCP for consideration to the Commission, and the LOCP thus has not been vetted or approved by the Commission.

Moreover, the recently approved LOCP does not present “conclusive evidence” of an adequate water supply and fails to adequately analyze the myriad of complex factors that affect the reliability of Los Osos water supplies. As more thoroughly explained in LOSG’s detailed comments to the County, the LOCP and EIR are woefully inadequate because both documents simply assume that the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Los Osos Basin Plan will eventually reverse sea water intrusion that continues to threaten the long-term viability of the water supplies. This conclusion is not supported by the monitoring reports and other data. Sea water intrusion and nitrite contamination continue to threaten the viability of the Los Osos groundwater basin casting doubt on the availability of water supplies for the current residents, let alone support any new development.

To make matters worse, the County recently adopted a Growth Management Ordinance (GMO) that does not set any limits on the number of ADUs and other “exempt” housing the County may approve in Los Osos. Accordingly, the County’s practice of approving ADUs without appropriate consideration of water supply and sewer limitations raises the specter of rampant ADU development in Los Osos as an end-run around the limits on development set by the Coastal Development Permit the Coastal Commission issued in connection with the Los Osos Wastewater Project (LOWWP). By approving coastal ADUs without any consideration of the individual or cumulative impact on water supplies, the County would set a dangerous precedent by creating the expectation that a coastal ADU is simply available for the asking, regardless of impacts on the water basin, unsustainable water

## INTRODUCTION

supplies, impacts habitat, the size of the ADU, whether it is consistent with the character of the area, or the total number of applications.

LOSG's appeal of the eight ADUs should be granted because, as explained in detail in our attached appeal forms, the County's approval process ignores the Coastal Act, the LCP and the County's own Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (CZLUO), which clearly require the County to consider the availability of water before approving any ADUs. ADUs are subject to San Luis Obispo County Code §23.08.169 - Secondary Dwelling Units - which prohibits Secondary Dwelling Units in the South Bay, because it is understood that secondary dwelling units are "incompatible with existing development, or the density increase resulting from secondary units pursuant to this section would create adverse cumulative effects on essential community services and natural features. Such services and features include but are not limited to water supplies, storm drainage facilities, roadway traffic capacities, and soils with "limited suitability for septic system sewage disposal or subject to erosion" (i.e., outside of the wastewater service area). The Code provides an exception under certain circumstances, providing that the County "may" allow an ADU within a Residential Single-Family land use category, for example where "the site area is 12,000 square feet or larger and the site is served by community water and sewer; ..." These provisions make it clear that the County must consider the ADUs' potential impact on water supplies and sewer services, which in turn means that County may not consider the ADUs consistency with §23.08.169 on a ministerial basis. The discretionary nature of the County's process for approving ADUs in the South Bay means the County was required to conduct environmental review as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Protecting Our Water & Env'tl. Res. v. Cty. of Stanislaus, (2020) 10 Cal. 5th 479, 501

## INTRODUCTION

(“when an ordinance contains standards which, if applicable, give an agency the required degree of independent judgment, the agency may not *categorically* classify the issuance of permits as ministerial.”)

Pursuant to §23.08.169, the County could not lawfully approve these ADUs on a ministerial basis, without any consideration as to whether these ADUs would result individually or cumulatively in significant impacts on water supplies, sewer or ESHA.

LOSG anticipates that the County will claim its approval of these ADUs was consistent with the State regulation of ADUs, in particular, the provisions of Government Code §65852.2, which generally govern the processing of ADU applications by cities and counties. It appears that the County believes the provisions of §65852.2 trump and supersede the provisions of the County’s Local Coastal Plan, including but not limited to the provision of the County Code §23.08.169. The County’s position is wrong as a matter of law because the County’s position is specifically inconsistent with Government Code §65852.2(l), according to which, §65852.2 cannot be construed to “supersede or in any way alter or lessen the effect of or application of the California Coastal Act of 1976 ...” It is important to note that the LCP embodies and effectuates the policies and concerns of the Coastal Act and the County’s authority to issue Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) in accordance with the LCP, which is delegated by the Commission. Charles A. Pratt Constr. Co. v. California Coastal Com. (2008)162 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1075. The County has no authority to issue ADUs in contravention of the LCP, including §23.08.169 and LCP policies that are intended to protect and preserve the Los Osos water supplies, sewer capacity and ESHA.

## INTRODUCTION

The LOSG also anticipates that the County will claim that approval of these ADUs will not have an adverse impact on water supplies and will ensure an adequate water supply for the new development, current development, and ESHA because the ADUs are subject to a Title 19, 2:1 retrofit ordinance. The County has even claimed on occasion that new development subject to this requirement provides a “net benefit” to the water supply. These claims are not unavailing because compliance with Title 19 does not guarantee conformity with the Coastal Act policies reflected in the LCP and CZLUO provisions designed to ensure orderly and sustainable coastal development for the following reasons:

- a. The Title 19 retrofit requirement does not establish that the Groundwater Basin is sustainable and an adequate water supply exists for the current population, added population, and ESHA. The most recent Basin metrics and monitoring show seawater intrusion is continuing to move inland and threaten supply wells in the Basin and the true sustainable/safe yield of the Basin has not been established.
- b. The Title 19 requirement uses conservation potential at twice the rate of a program for current residents because approved new development uses half, and possibly more, of the offset (also see E below). The Commission itself has in the past recognized that any remaining conservation potential in the Basin is needed and must be used to promote a sustainable Basin to meet the current needs and ESHA.
- c. The Title 19 program competes with the Special Condition 5 conservation program of the LOWWP CDP, which requires the County to spend \$5 million to “help Basin residents to reduce potable water use as much as possible” including with enforceable mechanisms as needed.

If any additional conservation potential exists (as evidenced by use of

## INTRODUCTION

the Title 19 program) it ought to be realized by the County through expenditure of the portion of the \$5 million that remains unspent (based on Annual Monitoring Reports prepared for the Basin Management Committee).

- d. Although the Title 19 Ordinance has a provision for verifying the effectiveness of the program, the provision has not been used and there has been no follow-up review or study, to our knowledge, to confirm actual long-term reductions in water use from the program.
- e. The retrofit formula for the program assumes ADUs use half the water of single-family homes, so it does not offset the water use of many ADUs (e.g., larger ADUs and ADUs on properties) that may well use more than the assumed amount. Further, water use has gone up in 2020 due to COVID 19.

We incorporate by reference our letter to the Commission dated October 1, 2020, with attachments, which include various cited documents and letters submitted to the SLO County Planning and Building Department between August 25, 2015 and August 11, 2020. We also include by reference our letter to the SLO Board of Supervisors dated December 15, 2020.

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
FAX: (831) 427-4877  
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



August 3, 2017

Mark Hutchinson, Deputy Director  
San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works  
County Government Center, Room 206  
San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408

**Subject: Your letter to Dan Carl (Central Coast District Director) dated July 25, 2017  
regarding potential amendments to CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 (Los Osos  
Wastewater Project)**

Dear Mr. Hutchinson:

We received the above-referenced letter from you on July 31, 2017 in which you indicate that the County Board of Supervisors authorized the landowner of a property at 2045 Pine Street in Los Osos (Rick Kirk) to apply to the Coastal Commission: to amend the County's coastal development permit (CDP) for the Los Osos Wastewater Project (CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069) to include the subject parcel (APN 074-052-033) in the Wastewater Service Area; and to clarify the applicability of CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 conditions to this and other undeveloped properties in the Los Osos area subject to the Estero Area Plan. The purpose of this letter is to respond to both of those issues, and to provide direction to the County on the nature of the requirements that continue to adhere by virtue of CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069.

As you know, CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 Special Condition 6 **prohibits** wastewater service to undeveloped properties unless and until the Estero Area Plan is updated to identify appropriate and sustainable buildout limits, and that update is certified as an LCP amendment by the Coastal Commission. The County has been working on the required update to the Los Osos component of the Estero Area Plan, including the complementary Habitat Conservation Plan, for many years, but that update remains incomplete at the County level, and thus it has never been submitted to the Coastal Commission. Importantly, the LCP growth and buildout standards applicable to Los Osos that were required by the Coastal Commission to be updated have not yet been updated. As a result, and as we have discussed with you and your staff and other County staff in other departments, per the CDP **undeveloped properties are not allowed wastewater service at this time.**

With respect to potential amendments to the CDP to potentially add properties to the wastewater service area, such as the aforementioned request related to the property at 2045 Pine Street, the intent of the CDP (including Special Condition 7 allowing for it to be amended under certain circumstances) is **not** to facilitate development of undeveloped properties in Los Osos absent the required LCP update. On the contrary, and as we have discussed with you and your staff and other County staff at the time of the original CDP approval, as well as since then, the intent of the potential amendment provision of the CDP is to consider minor modifications that address potential anomalies associated with **already developed** properties. For example, the Coastal



Commission approved a service area adjustment through a CDP amendment in June 2016 to allow the Monarch Grove area to be added to the service area so as to better protect coastal resources by connecting that area to the wastewater plant instead of continuing use of their failing package plant. At the same time, it is clear under the CDP that undeveloped properties (including significant intensifications of use and expansions on developed properties (e.g., such as the proposed expansion of the Sea Pines Golf Resort and Morro Shores Mobile Home Park), cannot be allowed sewer service and/or be brought into the service area absent the required Estero Area Plan LCP update. The County acknowledged and agreed to be bound by these terms and conditions when it accepted the CDP to construct the Los Osos Wastewater system.

As a result, please understand that we cannot support allowing undeveloped properties, such as the property at 2045 Pine Street, to be added to the service area or to be allowed wastewater service unless and until the LCP's Estero Area Plan is updated as required by CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069. In addition, and as we have informed you and other County staff, including as recently as May 31, 2017 (i.e., in an email from Daniel Robinson in the Central Coast District Office to you and Kerry Brown of the County's Planning and Building Department) it would appear quite clear at this point that any application proposing to amend CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 to allow same **would be required to be rejected** by Coastal Commission staff because it would lessen and avoid the intended effect of the Commission's CDP approval (see California Code of Regulations Section 13166(a)). Again, the Commission required the County to update the Los Osos portion of the Estero Area Plan through an LCP amendment subject to certain criteria before any undeveloped properties in Los Osos can be served. Thus, unless and until the Estero Area Plan is updated as required, modifications to service area boundaries to include undeveloped properties and/or allowing wastewater service to undeveloped properties are not allowed by CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, questions have arisen recently about the potential to allow development on properties prior to the required Estero Area Plan update that have been awarded wastewater or water saving credits (otherwise known as 'Title 19 Retrofit Certificates') in the past. In terms of wastewater credits, the RWQCB has indicated that any credits available from past actions were intended for properties that were already eligible to connect to the sewer. For example, if someone has a property that is eligible to connect to the community sewer system and wanted to build prior to being hooked up to the sewer, then they could utilize a credit to install a temporary septic system. However, as detailed above, only already developed properties are eligible for sewer connection at this time, and thus they would not need a temporary septic credit. In terms of the retrofit certificates, these certificates alone do not somehow entitle development at this time. Although these water conservation certificates were previously issued to properties in the septic prohibition zone, the certificate does not somehow guarantee the right to develop parcels upon completion of the sewer. As described above, the key threshold before wastewater service can be provided to any undeveloped property is certification of the Los Osos portion of the Estero Area Plan by the Coastal Commission.

**In short, the requirements of the CDP prohibit the extension of wastewater service to undeveloped properties, and to do so would be a knowing and intentional violation of the CDP.<sup>2</sup>**

We understand that the certain members of the community are interested in developing their properties now that the wastewater treatment plant is up and running, and we can appreciate their desire to do so, including after the significant efforts by many to bring the wastewater treatment plant and system in Los Osos online. At the same time, however, the County is obligated to finalize the update to the Los Osos portion of the Estero Area Plan through LCP amendment before that occurs, and that requirement has been in existence for over a decade, dating back to a similar requirement associated with the since abandoned wastewater treatment plant CDP approved by the Commission in 2004, and also because the County itself required the same as part of its approval of the wastewater treatment plant in late 2009 (i.e., County Condition 92, which was part of the County's proposed project before the Commission when the Commission approved CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 in 2010). We would strongly suggest that the County put its efforts towards completing the required LCP planning instead of pursuing any measures designed to avoid its CDP obligations.

Finally, despite the Board authorizing a private citizen to apply to amend the County's CDP, we note that it is the County that is the Permittee of the subject CDP, and it is the County that would have to be the Applicant for any amendment to it. The County could apply on an individual's or group's behalf, as was done for the Monarch Grove CDP amendment request described above, but the County would have to be the entity to request the amendment. We would not be able to accept an application by a private individual or group.

In closing, we again note that the Coastal Commission's CDP requirements that prohibit wastewater service to undeveloped properties in Los Osos are unambiguous, and we strongly suggest that the County recognize that requirement in all County actions (including in accepting any CDP applications, and in any County CDP actions).

We continue to be available to assist County staff as it attempts to complete the required LCP update, and we strongly recommend that the County concentrate its resources on those efforts. If you have any questions or wish to discuss this further, please contact me or Daniel Robinson of my staff at (831) 427-4863.

---

<sup>2</sup> We note that the County correctly denied a CDP for development of the proposed *Novy* residence on Pasadena Drive on these grounds in September 2016. We further note that on August 4, 2017 the County Planning Commission will hear a CDP application to develop another undeveloped property in Los Osos (i.e., the proposed *Watterworth* residence on Mitchell Drive), and the Planning Commission should deny this project for the very same reason. Again, approval of development that uses wastewater services on undeveloped properties would be a violation of the County's CDP, and would be subject to enforcement proceedings.

Mark Hutchinson  
CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 Requirements  
August 3, 2017  
Page 4

Sincerely,

Dan Carl  
District Director  
Central Coast District Office  
California Coastal Commission

cc: (via email)

Supervisor Bruce Gibson  
Supervisor John Peschong  
Supervisor Adam Hill  
Supervisor Lynn Compton  
Supervisor Debbie Arnold  
Planning Commissioner Michael Multari  
Planning Commissioner Julie Hawkins  
Planning Commissioner Jim Harrison  
Planning Commissioner Don Campbell  
Marvin Rose, County Department of Planning and Building Interim Director  
Wade Horton, County Public Works Department Director  
Jeff Edwards (Representative for Rick Kirk)

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
FAX: (831) 427-4877  
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



December 8, 2017

Kerry Brown  
San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building  
976 Osos Street Room 200  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

**Subject: Coastal Development Permit (CDP)/Minor Use Permit (DRC2017-00029)**

Dear Kerry:

We are writing in regards to a proposed project to be heard at the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the San Luis Obispo (SLO) Planning Department to construct four single family residences on four separate lots, located at 282 Mar Vista, 294 Mar Vista, 284 Highland Drive, and 289 Highland Drive in Los Osos (Shear Development Company LLC).

As described accurately in the County's staff report, Special Condition #6 (as well as County project condition #86 and #92) of the Los Osos Wastewater Treatment Plant CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069 prohibits development on vacant parcels at this time. Specifically, Special Condition 6 prohibits new development on undeveloped properties in the prohibition zone until such time as the Estero Area Plan has been amended and certified by the California Coastal Commission.

We are writing in support of the SLO County Planning staff's recommendation for denial in this case. Because the proposed project cannot hook up to the sewer based on the conditions of the LOWWP permit, and cannot utilize a septic system (the Regional Water Quality Control Board prohibition on new septic discharge is still in effect), the project cannot be approved at this time.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (831) 427-4863 if you have any questions regarding the above letter of support.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel Robinson".

Daniel Robinson  
Coastal Planner  
Central Coast District Office

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
FAX: (831) 427-4877  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



August 29, 2016

San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building  
976 Osos Street Room 200  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Subject: **Frederick G. Novy Single-Family Dwelling (SFD), 1325 Pasadena Drive, Los Osos (APNs 038-732-016 and -017)**

Dear Rob Fitzroy, Hearing Officer,

I am writing to express our support for the Planning Department's denial recommendation of the proposed SFD located on an undeveloped property at 1325 Pasadena Drive in Los Osos, which you will be considering at a Planning Department hearing on September 2, 2016. Initially the project proposed to obtain wastewater service from the new Los Osos Wastewater Treatment Plant (LOWWP); the project now includes a proposed onsite septic system.

We previously worked very closely with the County, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and other interested parties on the LOWWP project, dating back to the approval of a coastal development permit (CDP) for that project in 2010 (Coastal Commission appeal number A-3-SLO-09-055/069). Approval of the Novy SFD project with a connection to the LOWWP would directly violate Special Condition 6 of CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069, which states:

***"Wastewater service to undeveloped properties within the service area shall be prohibited unless and until the Estero Area Plan is amended to identify appropriate and sustainable buildout limits, and any appropriate mechanisms to stay within such limits, based on conclusive evidence indicating that adequate water is available to support development of such properties without adverse impacts to ground and surface waters, including wetlands and all related habitats."***<sup>1</sup>

As the County is aware, a Local Coastal Program (LCP) amendment to the Estero Area Plan for this purpose has not been certified by the California Coastal Commission (Commission), although we have had multiple discussions with the County's planning and building staff and have collaborated on draft portions of the Los Osos Community Plan (LOCP) to help expedite this process, and will continue to do so. Given this reality, however, wastewater service for the proposed Novy SFD may not be provided by the LOWWP at this time.

In terms of the project now including an onsite septic system, the RWQCB imposed a moratorium on current sewage discharges, new sources of sewage discharge, and increases in the

<sup>1</sup> Special Condition #6 is similar to County Condition of Approval #86 for the LOWWP, which is entitled "**No Service to Undeveloped Properties.**"

volume of existing sewage sources in the community of Baywood-Los Osos on January 8, 1988. The primary effect of the moratorium is that the County is prohibited from issuing any permits for new onsite sewage disposal systems (commonly called septic systems) within the prohibition area. Further, we also agree with the RWQCB that the “septic system credits” identified in their letter dated May 8, 2014 were intended to be temporary credits for lots that were already eligible to connect to the community sewer. Given that the Novy lots are not eligible to connect to the sewer at this time because the update to the Estero Area Plan has not been certified, these credits should not apply to the Novy property. Thus, because there is an ongoing moratorium, because the proposed project cannot hook up to the sewer based on Special Condition #6 of the LOWWP permit and cannot utilize a septic system based on the August 8, 2016 letter from RWQCB, the project will not have adequate means to dispose of wastewater, and therefore cannot be approved at this time. Based on the above reasons, Commission staff supports County staff’s recommendation of denial at this time.

While denial of the project is appropriate at this time, certification of the LOCP should appropriately guide future development of infill lots within the urban area of Los Osos in the future. When that occurs for this site, Commission staff believes that a wetland setback reduction should not be allowed. At this time, a reduction is recommended to be allowed from 75 to 62 feet. However, it does not appear that a single-family residence of nearly *4,000 square feet* (i.e., a 3,048-square-foot residence, with a 484-square-foot attached garage and a 351-square-foot attached workshop) is the “*minimum*” size that would enable a single-family residence to be established on the site, as required by CZLUO Section 23.07.172.(d)(2). We also do not agree that the site would be “*physically unusable*” for a single-family residence unless the setback was reduced, again as stated by CZLUO Section 23.07.172.(d)(2). Thus, Commission staff does not support the proposed reduction in the wetland setback given that it appears readily feasible, based on project plans associated with the project, for the project to be modified to provide consistency with the LCP’s 75-foot wetland setback requirement.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts on this project. We look forward to continuing to work with County staff on the Estero Area Plan update (LOCP), which will facilitate future approvals of proposed residences, such as the Novy SFD, within the urban area of Los Osos.

Sincerely,

Daniel Robinson  
Coastal Planner  
Central Coast District Office

cc: Brandi Cummings, San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building  
Jon Rokke, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Jeff Edwards

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

45 FREMONT STREET, SUITE 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219  
VOICE (415) 904-5200  
FAX (415) 904-5400



To: Planning Directors of Coastal Cities and Counties  
From: John Ainsworth, Executive Director  
Re: Implementation of New ADU Laws  
Date: April 21, 2020

---

The Coastal Commission has previously circulated two memos to help local governments understand how to carry out their Coastal Act obligations while also implementing state requirements regarding the regulation of accessory dwelling units ("ADUs") and junior accessory dwelling units ("JADUs"). As of January 1, 2020, AB 68, AB 587, AB 670, AB 881, and SB 13 each changed requirements on how local governments can and cannot regulate ADUs and JADUs, with the goal of increasing statewide availability of smaller, more affordable housing units. This memo is meant to describe the changes that went into effect on January 1, 2020, and to provide guidance on how to harmonize these new requirements with Local Coastal Program ("LCP") and Coastal Act policies.

**Coastal Commission Authority Over Housing in the Coastal Zone**

The Coastal Act does not exempt local governments from complying with state and federal law "with respect to providing low- and moderate-income housing, replacement housing, relocation benefits, or any other obligation related to housing imposed by existing law or any other law hereafter enacted." (Pub. Res. Code § 30007.) The Coastal Act requires the Coastal Commission to encourage housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households. (Pub. Res. Code § 30604(f).) New residential development must be "located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it" or in other areas where development will not have significant adverse effects on coastal resources. (Pub. Res. Code § 30250.) The creation of new ADUs in existing residential areas is a promising strategy for increasing the supply of lower-cost housing in the coastal zone in a way that may be able to avoid significant adverse impacts on coastal resources.

This memorandum is intended to provide general guidance for local governments with fully certified LCPs. The Coastal Commission is generally responsible for Coastal Act review of ADUs in areas that are not subject to fully certified LCPs. Local governments that have questions about specific circumstances not addressed in this memorandum should contact the appropriate district office of the Commission.

## **Overview of New Legislation**<sup>1</sup>

The new legislation effective January 1, 2020 updates existing Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22 concerning local government procedures for review and approval of ADUs and JADUs. As before, local governments have the discretion to adopt an ADU ordinance that is consistent with state requirements. (Gov. Code § 65852.2(a).) AB 881 (Bloom) made numerous significant changes to Government Code section 65852.2. In their ADU ordinances, local governments may still include specific requirements addressing issues such as design guidelines and protection of historic structures. However, per the recent state law changes, a local ordinance may not require a minimum lot size, owner occupancy of an ADU, fire sprinklers if such sprinklers are not required in the primary dwelling, or replacement offstreet parking for carports or garages demolished to construct ADUs. In addition, a local government may not establish a maximum size for an ADU of less than 850 square feet, or 1,000 square feet if the ADU contains more than one bedroom. (Gov. Code § 65852.2(c)(2)(B).) Section 65852.2(a) lists additional mandates for local governments that choose to adopt an ADU ordinance, all of which set the “maximum standards that local agencies shall use to evaluate a proposed [ADU] on a lot that includes a proposed or existing single-family dwelling.” (Gov. Code § 65852.2(a)(6).)

Some local governments have already adopted ADU ordinances. Existing or new ADU ordinances that do *not* meet the requirements of the new legislation are null and void, and will be substituted with the provisions of Section 65852.2(a) until the local government comes into compliance with a new ordinance. (Gov. Code § 65852.2(a)(4).) However, as described below, existing ADU provisions contained in certified LCPs are not superseded by Government Code section 65852.2 and continue to apply to CDP applications for ADUs until an LCP amendment is adopted. One major change to Section 65852.2 is that the California Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) now has an oversight and approval role to ensure that local ADU ordinances are consistent with state law, similar to the Commission’s review of LCPs. If a local government adopts an ordinance that HCD deems to be non-compliant with state law, HCD can notify the Office of the Attorney General. (Gov. Code § 65852.2(h).)

If a local government does *not* adopt an ADU ordinance, state requirements will apply directly. (Gov. Code § 65852.2(b)–(e).) Section 65852.2 subdivisions (b) and (c) require that local agencies shall ministerially approve or disapprove applications for permits to create ADUs. Subdivision (e) requires ministerial approval, whether or not a local government has adopted an ADU ordinance, of applications for building permits of the following types of ADUs and JADUs in residential or mixed use zones:

- One ADU or JADU per lot *within* a proposed or existing single-family dwelling or existing space of a single-family dwelling or accessory structure, including an expansion of up to 150 square feet beyond the existing dimensions of an existing accessory structure; with exterior access from the proposed or existing single-family

---

<sup>1</sup> This Guidance Memo only provides a partial overview of new legislation related to ADUs. The Coastal Commission does not interpret or implement these new laws.



dwelling; side and rear setbacks sufficient for fire and safety; and, if a JADU, applicant must comply with requirements of Section 65852.22; (§ 65852.2(e)(1)(A)(i)-(iv))

- One detached, new construction ADU, which may be combined with a JADU, so long as the ADU does not exceed four-foot side and rear yard setbacks for the single family residential lot; (§ 65852.2(e)(1)(B))
- Multiple ADUs within the portions of existing multifamily dwelling structures that are not currently used as dwelling spaces; (§ 65852.2(e)(1)(C))
- No more than two detached ADUs on a lot that has an existing multifamily dwelling, subject to a 16-foot height limitation and four-foot rear yard and side setbacks. (§ 65852.2(e)(1)(D))

ADUs and JADUs created pursuant to Subdivision (e) must be rented for terms greater than 30 days. (Gov. Code § 65852.2(e)(4).)

### **What Should Local Governments in the Coastal Zone Do?**

#### **1) Update Local Coastal Programs (LCPs)**

Local governments are required to comply with both these new requirements for ADUs/JADUs and the Coastal Act. Currently certified provisions of LCPs are not, however, superseded by Government Code section 65852.2, and continue to apply to CDP applications for ADUs until an LCP amendment is adopted. Where LCP policies directly conflict with the new provisions or require refinement to be consistent with the new laws, those LCPs should be updated to be consistent with the new ADU provisions to the greatest extent feasible, while still complying with Coastal Act requirements.

As noted above, Section 65852.2 expressly allows local governments to adopt local ordinances that include criteria and standards to address a wide variety of concerns, including potential impacts to coastal resources. For example, a local government may address reductions in parking requirements that would have a direct impact on public access. As a result, we encourage local governments to identify the coastal resource context applicable in a local jurisdiction and ensure that any proposed ADU-related LCP amendment appropriately addresses protection of coastal resources consistent with the Coastal Act at the same time that it facilitates ADUs/JADUs consistent with the new ADU provisions. For example, LCPs should ensure that new ADUs are not constructed in locations where they would require the construction of shoreline protective devices, in environmentally sensitive habitat areas, wetlands, or in areas where the ADU's structural stability may be compromised by bluff erosion, flooding, or wave uprush over their lifetime. Our staff is available to assist in the efforts to amend LCPs.

Please note that LCP amendments that involve purely procedural changes, that do not propose changes in land use, and/or that would have no impacts on coastal resources may be eligible for streamlined review as minor or de minimis amendments. (Pub. Res. Code § 30514(d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 13554.) The Commission will process ADU-specific LCP amendments as minor or de minimis amendments whenever possible.

## **2) Follow This Basic Guide When Reviewing ADU or JADU Applications**

### **a. Check Prior CDP History for the Site.**

Determine whether a CDP was previously issued for development of the lot and whether that CDP limits, or requires a CDP or CDP amendment for, changes to the approved development or for future development or uses of the site. The applicant should contact the appropriate Coastal Commission district office if a Commission-issued CDP limits the applicant's ability to apply for an ADU or JADU.

### **b. Determine Whether the Proposed ADU or JADU Qualifies as Development.**

Any person "wishing to perform or undertake any development in the coastal zone" shall obtain a CDP. (Pub. Res. Code § 30600.) Development as defined in the Coastal Act includes not only "the placement or erection of any solid material or structure" on land, but also "change in the density or intensity of use of land[.]" (Pub. Res. Code § 30106.) Government Code section 65852.2 states that an ADU that conforms to subdivision (a) "shall be deemed to be an accessory use or an accessory building and shall not be considered to exceed the allowable density for the lot upon which it is located, and shall be deemed to be a residential use that is consistent with the existing general plan and zoning designations for the lot." (Gov. Code § 65852.2(a)(8).)

Conversion of an existing legally established room(s) to create a JADU or ADU within an existing residence, without removal or replacement of major structural components (i.e. roofs, exterior walls, foundations, etc.) and that do not change the size or the intensity of use of the structure may not qualify as development within the meaning of the Coastal Act, or may qualify as development that is either exempt from coastal permit requirements and/or eligible for streamlined processing (Pub. Res. Code §§30106 and 30610), see also below. JADUs created within existing primary dwelling structures that comply with Government Code Sections 65852.2(e) and 65852.22 typically will fall into one of these categories, unless specified otherwise in a previously issued CDP or other coastal authorization for existing development on the lot. However, the conversion of detached structures associated with a primary residence to an ADU or JADU may involve a change in the size or intensity of use that would qualify as development under the Coastal Act and require a coastal development permit, unless determined to be exempt or appropriate for waiver.

### **c. If the Proposed ADU Qualifies as Development, Determine Whether It Is Exempt.**

Improvements such as additions to existing single-family dwellings are generally exempt from Coastal Act permitting requirements except when they involve a risk of adverse environmental effects as specified in the Commission's regulations. (Pub. Res. Code § 30610(a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 13250.) Improvements that qualify as exempt development under the Coastal Act and its implementing regulations do not require a CDP from the Commission or a local government unless required pursuant to a previously issued CDP. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 13250(b)(6).)

Typically, the construction or conversion of an ADU/JADU contained within or directly attached to an existing single-family residence would qualify as an exempt improvement to a single-family residence. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 13250(a)(1).) Guest houses and “self-contained residential units,” i.e. detached residential units, do not qualify as part of a single-family residential structure, and construction of or improvements to them are therefore not exempt development. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 13250(a)(2).)

d. If the Proposed ADU is Not Exempt from CDP Requirements, Determine Whether a CDP Waiver Is Appropriate.

If the LCP includes a waiver provision, and the proposed ADU or JADU meets the criteria for a CDP waiver the local government may waive the permit requirement for the proposed ADU or JADU. The Commission generally has allowed a waiver for proposed *detached* ADUs if the executive director determines that the proposed ADU is de minimis development, involving no potential for any adverse effects on coastal resources and is consistent with Chapter 3 policies. (See Pub. Res. Code § 30624.7.)

Some LCPs do not allow for waivers, but may allow similar expedited approval procedures. Those other expedited approval procedures may apply. If an LCP does not include provisions regarding CDP waivers or other similar expedited approvals, the local government may submit an LCP amendment to authorize those procedures.

e. If a Waiver Would Not Be Appropriate, Review CDP Application for Consistency with Certified LCP Requirements.

If a proposed ADU constitutes development, is not exempt, and is not subject to a waiver or similar expedited Coastal Act approval authorized in the certified LCP, it requires a CDP. The CDP must be consistent with the requirements of the certified LCP and, where applicable, the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act. The local government then must provide the required public notice for any CDP applications for ADUs and process the application pursuant to LCP requirements, but should process it within the time limits contained in the ADU law if feasible. Once the local government has issued a decision, it must send the required final local action notice to the appropriate district office of the Commission. If the ADU qualifies as appealable development, a local government action to approve a CDP for the ADU may be appealed to the Coastal Commission. (Pub. Res. Code § 30603.)

**Information on AB 68, AB 587, AB 670, and SB 13**

**JADUs – AB 68 (Ting)**

JADUs are units of 500 square feet or less, contained entirely within a single-family residence or existing accessory structure. (Gov. Code §§ 65852.2(e)(1)(A)(i) and 65852.22(h)(1).) AB 68 (Ting) made several changes to Government Code section 65852.22, most notably regarding the creation of JADUs pursuant to a local government ordinance. Where a local

government has adopted a JADU ordinance, “[t]he ordinance may require a permit to be obtained for the creation of a [JADU].” (Gov. Code § 65852.22(a).) If a local government adopts a JADU ordinance, a maximum of one JADU shall be allowed on a lot zoned for single-family residences, whether they be proposed or existing single-family residences. (Gov. Code § 65852.22(a)(1).) (This formerly only applied to *existing* single-family residences. Now, proposals for a new single-family residence can include a JADU.) Efficiency kitchens are no longer required to have sinks, but still must include a cooking facility with a food preparation counter and storage cabinets of reasonable size relative to the space. (Gov. Code § 65852.22(a)(6).) Applications for permits pursuant to Section 65852.22 shall be considered ministerially, within 60 days, if there is an existing single-family residence on the lot. (Gov. Code § 65852.22(c).) (Formerly, complete applications were to be acted upon within 120 days.)

If a local government has *not* adopted a JADU ordinance pursuant to Section 65852.22, the local government is required to ministerially approve building permit applications for JADUs within a residential or mixed-use zone pursuant to Section 65852.2(e)(1)(A). (Gov. Code § 65852.22(g).) That section is detailed in bullet points on pages two-three of this memorandum and refers to specific ADU and JADU approval scenarios.

#### **Sale or Conveyance of ADUs Separately from Primary Residence – AB 587 (Friedman)**

AB 587 (Friedman) added Section 65852.26 to the Government Code to allow a local government to, by ordinance, allow the conveyance or sale of an ADU separately from a primary residence if several specific conditions all apply. (Gov. Code § 65852.26.) This section only applies to a property built or developed by a qualified nonprofit corporation, which holds enforceable deed restrictions related to affordability and resale to qualified low-income buyers, and holds the property pursuant to a recorded tenancy in common agreement. Please review Government Code Section 65852.26 if such conditions apply.

#### **Covenants and Deed Restrictions Null and Void – AB 670 (Friedman)**

AB 670 added Section 4751 to the California Civil Code, making void and unenforceable any covenant, restriction, or condition contained in any deed, contract, security instrument, or other instrument affecting the transfer or sale of any interest in a planned development, and any provision of a governing document, that either effectively prohibits or unreasonably restricts the construction or use of an ADU or JADU on a lot zoned for single-family residential use that meets the requirements of Section 65852.2 or 65852.22 of the Government Code.

#### **Delayed Enforcement of Notice to Correct a Violation – SB 13 (Wieckowski)**

SB 13 (Wieckowski) Section 3 added Section 17980.12 to the Health and Safety Code. The owner of an ADU who receives a notice to correct a violation can request a delay in enforcement, if the ADU was built before January 1, 2020, or if the ADU was built after January 1, 2020, but the jurisdiction did not have a compliant ordinance at the time the request to fix the violation was made. (Health & Saf. Code § 17980.12.) The owner can request a delay of five (5) years on the basis that correcting the violation is not necessary to protect health and safety. (Health & Saf. Code § 17980.12(a)(2).)