

March 31, 2025

Mr. Evan Kort
Associate Planner
City of Carmel-by-the-Sea
Post Office Drawer G
Carmel-by-the-Sea, California 93921

RE: Lim Residence (DS 22-057 / APP 25-038)

APN: 010-225-003
City Council Appeal of the Planning Commission Denial
January 15, 2025

Mr. Kort, Mayor Byrne, and Members of the Carmel-by-the-Sea City Council:

I am writing on behalf of the applicant, Hastings Construction, regarding the proposed Lim Residence located at North Casanova Street 2 southeast of Palou Avenue.

I am a licensed California Architect who has completed dozens of residential and commercial projects in and around the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea since 2009. For the last 12 years, as principal Architect of my own firm, I have successfully obtained permits for more than 28 houses and represented my clients at the Planning Commission for all these projects. I am not the Architect for the subject Project; however, I have been asked to advise the applicant on the proposed residence in view of my experience, acute knowledge of the guidelines and municipal code, and familiarity with the design study process.

The project is considered a “tear-down/rebuild” new residence in an established neighborhood on a typical 40’ x 100’ lot. All new dwellings in Carmel-by-the-Sea are required to conform to the municipal code standards, including: floor area, site coverage, building height, setbacks, and design study findings. The code standards and guidelines work together to ensure an objective review of each project, with specific findings applicable to the particular circumstances of each lot.

The Project was considered by the Planning Commission on three separate occasions for Concept Design review, and on each occasion, the project planner recommended approval of the new residence: stating the project conforms to all zoning standards and is fully consistent with the design guidelines. The project was carefully analyzed with respect to site design, simplicity of building forms and roof plan, human scale and mass, public and private views, and tree preservation. In sum, the applicant followed all required codes and guidelines in their application, design process, and project plans.

I strongly agree with the Planning department’s assessment and recommendation for approval at the three previous Planning Commission hearings on July 12, 2023, August 14, and December 11, 2024.

On many of my own projects, objections have been raised by neighbors in response to the perceived impacts of new construction. For better or worse, the usual process to address these concerns is to initiate a meaningful dialogue with the neighbor (/s) about those impacts, study possible modifications to the design, and return to the Planning Commission with a revised set of plans that includes changes to mitigate impacts. The Lim residence followed this process to the letter, with design revisions that include the following to address specific objections of the north neighbor:

- The plate height at the 1st story was reduced to 8', and the plate height at the 2nd story was reduced to 7'-3".
- The ridge height (top point of the building) was reduced from 57.16' to 54.5' (a total of 2'-8").
- The 2nd story footprint was reduced by 31 SF.
- The distance from the stairwell to the property line was increased from 7'-8" to 11'-3".

These significant changes were described in detail by the staff report, illustrated by photographs and renderings to support the findings, and thoughtfully presented by the applicant. Unfortunately, the Planning Commission failed to take action consistent with staff's findings. In the design guidelines, from the section regarding views, the code states:

" Designs should respect views enjoyed by neighboring parcels. This objective is intended to balance the private rights to views from all parcels that will be affected by a proposed building [...] No single parcel should enjoy a greater right than other parcels except the natural advantages of each site's topography. Building which substantially eliminate an existing significant view enjoyed on another parcel should be avoided." (17.10.010 K)

The proposed Lim residence follows the municipal code objectives and respects the neighbors. It is unreasonable to enjoy a completely unobstructed view from a window that faces the side yard on a 40' x 100' lot with 3' setbacks. Every home in town sees at least a portion of one, if not more than a dozen, of their surrounding neighbors' homes. This is the beauty of living in our village in the forest, and the reason for a process that includes objective standards, adherence to the guidelines, and a public hearing process. I urge the city council to follow these documents and accepted process in their review, and grant the appeal by Hastings Construction for the Lim Residence, Concept and Final Design Study.

Thank you,



Adam Jeselnick AIA
aejarch@gmail.com
[831.620.5164](tel:831.620.5164)

**Carmel-
by-the-Sea**

Nova Romero <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Comment on Agenda Item #2, 4/1/25 City Council Mtg.

'Kevan' via cityclerk <cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Mon, Mar 31, 2025 at 9:52 PM

Reply-To: Kevan <[REDACTED]>

To: dbyrne@ci.carmel.ca.us, rdelves@ci.carmel.ca.us, jbaron@ci.carmel.ca.us, hbuder@ci.carmel.ca.us, adramov@ci.carmel.ca.us

Cc: cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us, crerig@ci.carmel.ca.us

Dear Mayor & Council Members:

Please decide on how to get us a USPS listed home address by any means and in any format necessary ASAP! This does not need a vote! Do not waste time and money, and risk the City's funds defending the inevitable lawsuit(s) for willfully refusing to comply with modern laws, and government mandates. We can have BOTH legally recognized home addresses AND mail delivery only to the USPS local post office, as well as continue the tradition of the option to not post an address and instead name your house.

Please see examples below of the effects that not having a street-address in the USPS-database has had on the citizens of Carmel by the Sea, and all of which I have personally experienced.

- 1) Many vendors will not ship to a PO Box due to rampant mail order fraud via PO Box addressees. This can include essential medicines or medical devices that many insurance plans restrict you to getting through their contracted on-line vendor. They won't pay local pharmacy pricing. Blocking people from receiving essential medicines or medical devices at their real home address is a clear and unequivocal violation of the ADA, for which a predatory lawsuit could be filed any day, and the City would definitely lose and pay damages.
- 2) Many vendors will not ship even to a business using our common local's format of: X NW of Y on Z, since it does not appear in the national USPS database of verified addresses.
- 3) Thus due to #1 + #2 we are blocked from ordering from a significant number of vendors. For some items there are no longer any local, nor multiple national vendors, so this means you can't buy a product you need or want. This is a real problem in these days of supply chain delays/interruptions, and lack of local store inventory. This artificial restriction on commerce is illegal, and likely would fail a court challenge [e.g., restraint of trade, ADA, etc.].
- 4) I have been affected multiple times by #3 above and have been forced to stop and try and find items while on road trips outside of the Monterey

Peninsula, or wait to have visiting friends buy & bring them from elsewhere.

5) Many of us are retired and no longer have work addresses outside of town to use as alternative delivery addresses. Many employers prohibit or restrict such personal deliveries in any case.

6) Those who work full time out of town as I used to, can't take of work to drive here and access the PO to do business 10-4, M-F. They can only pick up packages 12-2 on Saturday, which is unfair to them. This shipping bottleneck also forces them to rely more heavily on our inconsistent UPS/FedEx home delivery services, undermined by our lack of official addresses.

7) Returned mis-deliveries have also forced me to pay reshipping fees to a sole source vendor, or they won't redeliver, even to a different address.

8) Vendors don't always tell you that they are going to use UPS/FedEx "Drop to USPS" services to cut shipping costs. When that occurs the item is immediately returned to the shipper by the local USPS without any notification to the local purchaser. You then often have to spar with the vendor to not pay shipping/reshipping fees, since they'll contend that you misaddressed the package in the first place. You are not allowed to put BOTH a PO Box and a simulated street address on the same package. Some vendors don't print more than one street address line, so the Business Name or "#XXXX" as a placeholder for your PO Box in lieu of an apartment or suite # doesn't make it onto the address label.

9) FedEx Ground out of Watsonville now uses subcontracted independent drivers that rotate routes daily, so they don't know and will never effectively learn Carmel by the Sea. They often drop packages in the wrong part of town or deem them undeliverable and return them to sender. Since ~50%+ of the homes aren't occupied full time, you are at great risk of having your mis-delivered package stolen. We've had stuff delivered to the right street but at the other end of town on some vacant vacation home's porch. Unlike UPS or FedEx Overnight & 2nd Day Air ONLY services based in Ryan Ranch, FedEx Ground does not allow any public access at any time to the locked and fenced local distribution warehouse in Watsonville.

10) Many Federal, State, and Local on-line government contact forms [e.g., St. Senate/Assembly legislative contact forms] require you to input a USPS-database-verified street-address to leave a comment for your legislator. We don't have any, so we are locked out of that option with some of our legislators, and forced to sit on long phone wait lines only during business hours/M-F, or do business by mail instead. Many don't have on-line chat options either. This is unfair, and would likely fail a legal challenge as it interferes with modern communication methods to petition your government. Many government

agencies and essential service businesses are de-emphasizing phone support, and forcing you to do most business via their web pages.

11) The CA St. Attorney General's corporate reporting web pages DO NOT accept our local simulated street addresses for legally-mandated LLC/Corporate report submissions. They now want these done only on-line. You have to call, wait on hold a long time, and argue with a clerk in Sacramento have them either somehow manually force the report entry, & you then have to e-mail directly to them, or give you a case number to mail it in with.

12) It is very difficult and time consuming to get a State & Federal Corporate Tax ID # for a new business without a USPS-database-verified address. They assume you are a con-artist or a fraud, and require extra time consuming documentation, creating unnecessary delays.

13) You have a hard time getting a new Personal or Corporate Credit Card. Instead of instantly on line with good credit as it is for the rest of the USA. Instead you have to call in live during business hours, explain Carmel by the Seas address system to an incredulous clerk, then and FAX or certified mail in a multiple sources of alternative documentation to prove you are real. This process takes many weeks for residents vs hours for anyone living anywhere else.

14) When you want to open or change addresses on a bank or investment account, you have to prove our unrecognized and legally unofficial home/business address are real by time consuming means. When I moved here in 2001, I had to take 3 separate days off work to stay home and wait for an overnight FedEx/UPS delivery to the physical Carmel by the Sea address I was claiming as our real legal home address, and sign for and verify myself in person. This is getting worse under ever more restrictive banking and finance fraud protection laws and procedures

15) If you have an identity theft, credit card, or bank fraud incident it can be very difficult and time consuming to get it corrected, as you cannot give the telephone support staff a physical, USPS-database-verified street address. They may require you to text/FAX/overnight them documentation, or go in person to their local service center, if they even have one. The documents [e.g. multiples of CA ID, Passport, SS Card, Utility or Property Tax bills/Voter or Vehicle Registration] will be accepted as adequate >ONLY IF< they show the simulated street address. It can actually make it impossible to solve if you are traveling! A national bank with a branch in town locked up my son's account erroneously due to perceived fraud while he was in Asia, yet required he come in-person to unlock his accounts. Yes, they expected him to somehow buy a ticket and fly home with his bank account & CCs locked up! Even though all three of us were well known to local bankers who vouched for us, we had to

take multiple IDs for us, and copies of his ID, his original SS Card, and officially stamped original copy of his birth certificate to sit with the local banker on the phone to their HQ to get them to make an exception to their rules. We sat there while the local banker verified we and the paperwork were real and present in – person, then texted copies in real time to a reviewer at their HQ. That took two days while he had no funds. Good luck if you don't have relatives in town to help you with a friendly local banker who knows you.

16) Private/Legal Courier services usually can't find our addresses. The Moss Landing fresh fish cooperative "Real Good Fish" that drops weekly deliveries at EcoCarmel, uses a courier service with random drivers from out of area that have botched deliveries of perishable goods multiple times a year. For some drivers I have to give them the GPS UTM coordinates or Latitude/Longitude. Same problems for non-local Uber/Lyft & food delivery drivers.

17) On my street there are two homes that are down narrow pathways and invisible from the street. A failure of emergency services to reach these sites in a timely manner would be a slam dunk lawsuit against the City. This also makes it impossible for a delivery person to use our default unofficial address naming process, as they can't see the houses to be able to count from the intersection accurately.

This long tediously detailed list is probably not exhaustive, and other local residents could likely submit different, equivalent, or even worse examples of what they have had to endure.

The City Council needs to find a creative way to have the town effectively join the rest of the nation to live in 21st century using modern commerce & communication, while still preserving the social benefits of the USPS PO for all but ADA mail deliveries. I have no objection to going there every day as I always do.

Sincerely,

Kevan Urquhart



Carmel by the Sea, CA 93921-2612



**Carmel-
by-the-Sea**

Nova Romero <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Emailed comments for the April Council Meeting

'Betty Maurutto' via cityclerk <cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Mon, Mar 31, 2025 at 4:56 PM

Reply-To: Betty Maurutto [REDACTED]

To: "cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us" <cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Dear Mayor Byrne and Council members,

As a VERY STRONG advocate for assigning street addresses to our homes in Carmel;-by-the-Sea, I have the following comments:

- 1) Assigning each home an address will not change the charm/quaintness of our village. Please see the attached photo of my front entry that has my descriptive address. Once given an address (which is a mandated law), We will merely have a new sign of equal charm made with my real address.
- 2) Please stop listening to the emotional reactions of those fearing our village will have ugly, cluttered signage. Our residents have more sense and class than that!!
- 3) Stop waffling around making our city leadership look foolish and unable to follow through on decisions made! A decision was made to assign addresses - DO IT!! Abide by the law and move on!! Use your time efficiently and wisely and stop all the meetings, after meetings, after meetings going over things already decided!

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael and Betty Maurutto

Michael and Betty Maurutto 🏡
 NEC Mountain View and Guadalupe
 P.O. Box [REDACTED]
 Carmel, Ca. 93921
 949-510-0570

m



IMG_1284.jpeg
5082K

**Carmel-
by-the-Sea****Nova Romero <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>**

Please distribute to all city council members

Carolyn <[REDACTED]>
To: cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us

Mon, Mar 31, 2025 at 1:34 PM

I am writing in support of being assigned an address in Carmel that works with the USPS data base. I am concerned about the confusion for safety (police, fire, ambulance, etc.) and for all the issues associated with utilities, maintenance, deliveries and services. It is also very difficult with financials, the DMV, passports and other institutions. Some simply will not allow us to even request a service as their software requires a USPS database address.

This issue needs no further study. Nothing new is going to come to light. The address must meet the USPS data standard or you will not be solving the problem. Consistent physical addresses and signage will never meet the USPS standard. It might be "cute", but it will not solve the problem. Please recognize that it is now time for implementation, not for ignoring the reality of the standard requirement in today's world.

I wish I could attend the Council meeting this week and express this in person, but I can not. I hope that someone will express or read this message to the City Council and hear the pain that this causes Carmel residents.

Carolyn Ticknor
[REDACTED]
Carmel, CA 93921
[REDACTED]



**Carmel-
by-the-Sea**

Nova Romero <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Public Comment

Charles Najarian <c[REDACTED]>

Mon, Mar 31, 2025 at 1:51 PM

To: Nova Romero <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Cc: Dale Byrne <dbyrne@cbts.us>

Nova,
Please provide this as public comment to the City Council for the April 1st meeting.
Please copy the Planning Commission, City Attorney, and staff's CEQA consultant attorney.
Confirmation of receipt would be appreciated.
Regards,
Chuck Najarian

Mayor Byrne and City Council members,
I'm provided input for the street address agenda item. The purpose of my input is to raise awareness of possible CEQA applicability. In doing so I'm offering Al's response to this important question for your consideration moving forward, as follows:
Chuck Najarian

STREET NUMBER ADDRESSES:

Would a discretionary decision to require street number addresses in Carmel on every house and business with over 260 historic structures, when the city has never had street numbers, require CEQA review?

Yes, a **discretionary decision** to require street number addresses on every house and business in **Carmel-by-the-Sea**, a city known for its historic character and **over 260 historic structures**, could trigger **CEQA review** if it has the potential to result in a **physical change to the environment**—including **aesthetic, historic, or cultural impacts**.

Why CEQA Review May Be Required

1. CEQA Applies to Discretionary Decisions

- The decision to **require street numbers** is **not purely ministerial** (automatic approval with no agency discretion).
- Under **CEQA Guidelines § 15378(a)**, discretionary actions that can cause a physical change in the environment qualify as a **“project”** under CEQA.

2. Potential Adverse Impact on Historic Resources (§ 15300.2(f))

- CEQA prohibits categorical exemptions if a project **may affect historic resources**.
- Many of Carmel's **historic buildings have never had visible street numbers**.
- Installing numbers could **alter the historic character** of the district, triggering the need for environmental review (*San Diego Trust & Savings Bank v. Friends of Gill*, 1999).

3. Unusual Circumstances Exception (§ 15300.2(c))

- CEQA prohibits categorical exemptions if **“unusual circumstances” exist that may cause significant impacts**.
- Carmel's **unique history of avoiding street numbers** makes this an unusual case.
- The change **could impact the town's identity and aesthetics**, requiring further analysis.

4. Cumulative Impact Consideration (§ 15300.2(b))

- If street numbers **alter the visual setting of an entire historic district**, the cumulative impact may be significant.

Conclusion

- If the City **mandates** street numbers through a discretionary action, it **may be subject to CEQA review**.
- The City would need to **assess potential historic and aesthetic impacts** before proceeding.
- A **CEQA challenge** could argue that the decision is **not exempt** and requires an **Initial Study** to determine if an EIR or Negative Declaration is needed.

**Carmel-
by-the-Sea****Nova Romero** <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Street addresses

3 messages

Richard Luther [REDACTED] >
To: cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us

Tue, Apr 1, 2025 at 12:44 AM

Please distribute this email to all council members. Thank you.

I apologize that my wife and I are unable to attend Tuesday's council meeting. However, we strongly favor having street addresses recognized by the USPS, Google and others.

We believe the "charm" and "character" of Carmel is measured by how the residents look after and care for their neighbors, not whether a street number is attached to a house. The fact is, the lack of standard street numbers slows down first responders and hampers the timely delivery of life saving medicines and medical supplies. It is not just an issue of inconvenience with Amazon; it is an issue of potential injury to life or property. We need to have street numbers to protect ourselves and our neighbors.

In addition to protecting our neighbors, we also need to protect the financial wellbeing of the city. If we don't have numbers, eventually someone will be injured or die due to a slow response time of first responders. The city will find itself financially responsible for that loss due to its willful violation of state laws. And the city's insurer may refuse to cover the loss for the same reason.

There is also a practical problem that needs to be addressed. Under the current system of identifying houses in relation to the number of houses or parcels to the nearest cross street, how will we address new houses and ADUs built under the recently enacted state laws? A neighbor is building an ADU between his house and ours. The ADU is almost the size of our house. Will a first responder stop at that house thinking it is ours as it counts the houses in from the corner? If the neighbor rents or sells the ADU, what number will be assigned to it so that first responders can find it? The same goes for the new law allowing owners to subdivide their property and build multiple houses. Will every other house on the block then need to change its house number under the existing scheme? Our existing address system doesn't work with these newly enacted laws.

This is not an issue for a public vote. This is an issue of utmost importance and urgency that demands strong leadership by the city council. Please move forward with standardized street addresses as soon as possible.

Thank you for your attention.

Richard and Debra Luther

Nova Romero <nromero@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Tue, Apr 1, 2025 at 10:08 AM

To: Jeff Baron <jbaron@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Hans Buder <hbuder@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Alissandra Dramov <renewcarmel@outlook.com>, Dale Byrne <dbyrne@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Robert Delves <rdelves@ci.carmel.ca.us>
Cc: Brandon Swanson <bswanson@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Brian Pierik <bpierik@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Chip Rerig <crerig@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Please see email re: street addresses.