Attachment 6



Received by: K. Vo	Jdovinos
Via: Counter	
Copy to: CAO, City	Mananer
Planning CC	<u> </u>

City Clerk Department 300 North Coast Highway Oceanside, CA 92054 NOV 0 1 2024 Tel (760) 435-3000 Fax (760) 967-3922

OCEANSIDE CITY CLERK

# APPEAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

## APPEALS MUST BE FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE WITHIN <u>10 CALENDAR DAYS</u> OF THE DATE OF FINAL ACTION

PROJECT/ACTION BEING APPEALED		
PROJECT NAME	DATE OF FINAL DECISION	
RESOLUTION NUMBER D23-00009		
FORM OF API	PEAL	
APPEAL FEE - \$1,838 PETITION (PLEASE SEE BELOW FOR EXPLANATION/SIGN OFF)		
LETTER INCLUDING A STATEMENT SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFYING THE PORTION(S) OF THE DECISION BEING APPEALED AND THE BASIS FOR THE APPEAL IS ATTACHED		
PERSON FILING	APPEAL	
NAME Oceanside Community Assoc	Daytime Telephone: (702) 596-6219	
ADDRESS CITY	STATE ZIP	
APPEALED BY APPLICANT INTERESTED PARTY PROPERTY OWNER (COMPANY/REP) WITHIN NOTICE AREA		
SIGNATURE Marciel	DATE October 31, 2024	
CONTACT PER (IF DIFFERENT FROM PERSO		
NAME Ellen Marciel		
ADDRESS 3808 Vista Campana 5, #40 Oceansid		
Daytime Telephone (702) 596-6219 Fax Number	Email Address ellenmarciel 39 @ gmailion	
Section 4604: To appeal by petition for a waiver of the appeal fee, the appeal must be accompanied by the signatures of 50% of the property owners within the noticed area or 25 signatures of the property owners or tenants within the noticed area, whichever is less.		
I hereby certify that this appeal is being submitted in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance and meets the criteria specified in Section 4604 for an appeal by petition.		
Signature: Ell Marcuel Date: October 31, 2024		
NOTE: All petitions must contain original signatures, along with the printed name and address of each signer.		

Oceanside City Clerk 300 N. Coast Highway Oceanside, CA 92054

Subject: Appeal of Planning Commission Action 10/28/2024 D23-00009

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please allow this letter to serve as the required statement to accompany the appeal form for the subject land use application. The residents of Oceana are requesting that the City Council hear this item for the following reasons:

1) Planning Commission approved the application even though we had demonstrated 5 health/safety impacts:

1. Ingress/egress for Oceana residents; 2. Emergency vehicle safety/access; 3. Pedestrian safety, 4. Slope instability, including the design of the wastewater/stormwater cistern adjacent to the 28' retaining wall; and 5. Health of residents whose homes will be impacted

2) The Planning Commission's action did not include, as conditions of approval, any of the 5 mitigating measures that we had requested:

1. The developer should participate in the cost of the City acquiring land to create an Evacuation Plan for Oceana; 2. Make the new building age restricted, to reduce vehicular traffic; 3. Install pedestrian flashing beacons with call buttons at the intersection of Vista Campana and Vista Bella; 4. Provide engineered drawings now, before final approval, showing the building and the retaining walls can be supported; and 5. Establish a trust fund of \$200,000 to help neighbors restore their interior home temperatures

- 3) Oceanside is a California Charter City, and Article 5, Section 500 of the City's Charter reads, in part: "In the event of any conflict between the provisions of this Charter and the provisions of the laws of the State of California, the provisions of this Charter shall control." The state Density Bonus Laws should not apply here. As found in <a href="https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Albuquerque3">https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/Albuquerque3</a> the "home rule" provision should allow the City of Oceanside to deny land use application D23-00009.
- 4) The Planning Commission's action did not take into account the Coastline Baptist Church's easement and parking agreement, nor the Religious Land Use And Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA), which prohibits zoning and landmarking laws that substantially burden the religious exercise of churches.

Sincerely,

Marciel

Ellen Marciel, Chair Oceana 503 Vista Bella Ad Hoc Committee

The undersigned respectfully request that the \$1,838 appeal fee be waived.

3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 54Oceanside, CA 92057 Name Address 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 35 2 Oceanside, CA 92( 92057 Address Name 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 55 3 Oceanside, CA 92057 Address Name 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 💪 / Oceanside, CA 92( 92057 Riddel Name 🛂 Address SKelton KATRINA 5 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 52 Oceanside, CA 920 92057 Address Name Was 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92057 Address Name Ton 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 35 Oceanside, CA 92( 7 92051 Address Name 8 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92( 92097 Gerald Name Address 9 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 7/ Oceanside, CA\_92( 9205 ian Name Address 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92057 Name Address William 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92( 92057 Name Address villa 60 125 3685 Vista Campana N Unit # -Oceanside, CA 92( 92057 Name Address Rou San

1.0

. .

The undersigned respectfully request that the \$1,838 appeal fee be waived.

Suzanne L. Schaefer	
1 Suzanne & Schaefer	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # $\mathscr{9}$ Oceanside, CA 92057
Name 1 Ken Schaefer	Address
2 Kid	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 9 Oceanside, CA 920
Name	Address quist
3 Alan Wishad	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 58 Oceanside, CA 92057
Name Alon W.B. Nash - Course greysite	Address
4 Soury	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # 74 Oceanside, CA 920
Name Caroline Greyshock	Address 42057
5	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 920
Name	Address 42057
6	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92057
Name	Address
7	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 920
Name	Address 92057
8	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 920
Name	Address 92057
9	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA_920
Name	Address
10 ·	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92057
Name	Address
11	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA 92(
Name	Address 9205
12	3685 Vista Campana N Unit # Oceanside, CA_92(
Name	Address 9w51

The undersigned respectfully request that the \$1,838 appeal fee be waived.

2	Kain Messe	100 3685 VON #8, 92057	
	Name Karin M	lessaros Address	
0	Armand Sci Name Armand	hubb 3655 NISta Campana N.11 Oce Schuab Address	anside A
4	Ella Rus	cell. Athan 3 bir virto Bellt. OCENSIL, CA 9:	1057
	Name Ella Russ	vell Attaway Address	Le 62057
2	Man J. M	- total stast for actempting the	<u>de</u> (2007
	Name Koven M	coure Address	
	Name	Address	
	Name	Address	
	Name	Address	
	Hamo		
	Name	Address	
	Name	Address	
	Name	Address	
	Name	Address	
• 1	Name	Address	

Unit 8

The undersigned respectfully request that the \$1,838 appeal fee be waived.

3621 VINa Campana S. #105 9205 Address Name 3621 VISL Address Name -8 VISTA CAMPANA 5, 92057 3621 Hoopix Address Janica Name 92057 1-8 Vista Campana Address Name Karen Lipscig BALDEV LAKHANPAL 3621-5 VISTA CAMPANA 5 CA 92057 Name Bolder Lakhanpal Address 92057 3621-5 Vista ( 5 oma a Address Name Pouran Lakhanpa 700 92057 3621 Se Vista om pana Address Nichols Name Lori 92057 57100 3621 VISTA Address elson M Namę 3621 Address Name #Z. 3621 Visto Campanosta Address Name mana So #6.5 3621 Áddress pana S. # 88 92057 Shall Vista Cam Address Goyette Name Jacqui

Unit 8 The undersigned respectfully request that the \$1,838 appeal fee be waived.

2 Vista Campana So # 72 Address lap 76 9 Address Nam mabua Set TO Address Name 2 Address Name 91 ? Address Name Vista ( Clande 3621 36 2 Olnog 12 m Dana 7 Address brnog Name OSIDF. VISTA CAMPANI 2 3621 Ħ Address LI Addres Jaelea Name Address Name Address Name Address Name Address Name

## Manuel Baeza

From:	Ellen Marciel <ellenmarciel39@gmail.com></ellenmarciel39@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, November 7, 2024 4:24 PM
То:	Zeb Navarro
Cc:	cityclerk@oceansidecs.org; Manuel Baeza; Jonathan Telles
Subject:	503 Vista Bella appeal

#### Warning: External Source

Hello Dr. Navarro,

I am writing to submit an additional point for our appeal regarding the decision on the proposed development at 503 Vista Bella. While I understand that the office closed at 4 PM today, I appreciate your consideration of this additional information via email.

## Additional Point for Appeal:

Structural Protection Due to Soldier Pile Wall Construction

The City should take into account the potential impacts of the proposed soldier pile wall construction on Coastline Baptist Church's property. Soldier pile walls, which involve driving large beams into the ground and excavating from the developer's side, may pose significant vibration risks to the church's building due to the proximity of the construction site. This method, while effective when excavation onto neighboring property is not an option, generates strong vibrations that could lead to structural damage. A proactive approach ensures responsible development and protects adjacent community structures, especially given the church's role as a long-standing institution in Oceanside.

Per city code, this request still falls within the 10-day period for submission in writing to the city clerk. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

If you require any further information, please feel free to contact me.

-Ellen Marciel (702) 596-6219



Mayor Sanchez and Honorable Members of the City Council,

This letter responds to the Oceanside Community Association's ("Oceana") appeal of the Vista Bella Mixed-Use Project. By way of background, the Planning Commission approved the Project on October 28, 2024, and at that meeting, our team addressed all of the concerns Oceana has now raised on appeal. Each issue is addressed below. Our team values community feedback and remains committed to addressing all concerns thoroughly and transparently.

## 1. Health and Safety

Oceana claims five purported health and safety impacts: ingress/egress for Oceana residents, emergency vehicle safety/access, pedestrian safety, slope instability, and health of residents.

The Fire Department reviewed the Project and determined that there is no safety issue, either with respect to the Project's ingress/egress or with respect to Oceana's ingress/egress. The Project is not in a high fire zone and does not present any emergency vehicle safety or access concerns. Likewise, neither the Fire Department nor City Planning identified any pedestrian safety or health concerns. Finally, a traffic study was prepared for the Project and did not identify any significant traffic impacts or safety issues.

With respect to slope stability, a preliminary geotechnical report has been prepared and did not identify any soil conditions that would represent a risk to Oceana or any other neighboring properties. The Project, including its retaining walls, wastewater, and storm water systems, will be designed with careful consideration of the slope adjacent to the site and the soil underlying the site. Further, the City will review and approve all engineering plans prior to the issuance of permits. There is simply no basis for a slope instability concern. Finally, the grading and construction of the retaining walls will be observed by the City engineering staff, the Project geo-technical engineer and the engineer tasked to design grading and the retaining walls.

## 2. Mitigation Measures

Oceana requests five mitigation measures to be incorporated into the Project, listed below with the reason each is not warranted.

Requested Mitigation	Reason Mitigation Measure Is Not Warranted
Measure	
The developer should	The Fire Department concluded that the Project is not in
participate in the cost of the	a high fire zone and would not pose a safety concern to
City acquiring land to create	ingress/egress for Oceana. Because there is no
an evacuation plan for	environmental impact, an evacuation plan is not
Oceana	warranted and cannot be imposed as a mitigation
	measure.
Make the Project age	The traffic study prepared for the Project concluded that
restricted to reduce vehicular	the Project would not result in a traffic impact.
traffic	Therefore, no mitigation measures to reduce traffic are

Utah Nevada Washington California

1177 Idaho Street Suite 200 Redlands, California 92374 P 909.335.7400 F 909.335.7299 An Architectural Corporation

	warranted.
Install pedestrian flashing	The Project has been analyzed in a traffic study and no
beacons with call buttons at	safety issues were identified. As such, a flashing beacon
the intersection of Vista	is not warranted and cannot be imposed as a mitigation
Campana and Vista Bella	measure.
Provide engineered drawings	The Project engineer designed retaining walls to be
now, before final approval,	supported. Further, the conditions of approval for the
showing the building and the	Project require that grading plans must be reviewed and
retaining walls can be	approved by the City prior to issuance of building
supported	permits. As the preliminary soil report did not identify
	conditions that cannot be mitigated through proper
	design, requiring the applicant to design final grading
	and retaining walls prior to entitlement is unnecessary
	and would force City staff to review them prematurely.
Establish a trust fund of	There is no evidence that interior home temperatures in
\$200,000 to help neighbors	Oceana will be affected by the Project. As such, no
restore their interior home	mitigation is justified.
temperatures	

In addition to the measures above not being warranted as mitigation measures under CEQA, they cannot be imposed on the Project as conditions under the Housing Accountability Act because they would have a substantial adverse impact on the viability of the Project and there is no health or safety impact justifying the measures. (Government Code §65589.5(d), (h)(7), and (i).)

## 3. State Density Bonus Law Applicability to Charter Cities

Oceana alleges that based on Article 5, Section 55 of the City's Charter, State Density Bonus Law should not apply to the Project.

Contrary to Oceana's statement, there is no "home town" rule with respect to Density Bonus Law. State law is clear that State Density Bonus Law applies to charter cities. (Government Code §65918 ["The provisions of this chapter shall apply to charter cities."].)

## 4. Coastline Shared Parking Agreement

Oceana claims that that the Planning Commission did not consider the Reciprocal Parking Easement between the applicant and Coastline Baptist Church, and did not consider the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA).

As an initial matter, the Agreement for Reciprocal Parking Easement between the applicant and Coastline is a private agreement that the City need not consider in its decision on the Project. Nonetheless, when the City in 2021 processed an Administrative Development Plan and Administrative Conditional Use Permit for Coastline, the City determined that parking at Coastline was in excess of the City's Zoning Code. Further, the Project meets applicable parking requirements with approval of requested Density Bonus Law concessions/waivers. For these reasons, there is no parking issue caused by the Agreement and no RLUIPA violation because the City has not burdened Coastline's religious exercise in any way by approving the Project.

The Vista Bella Mixed-use Project has been developed with careful consideration of all relevant standards, community input, and the City of Oceanside's planning requirements. As outlined in our responses, the allegations raised in the appeal lack merit. We respectfully request that the City Council uphold the Planning Commission's approval of the project .

MILLER architectural corporation

Gary Miller

Gary Miller, AIA President MILLER Architectural Corporation