

Mono County Community Development Department

P.O. Box 347
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
(760) 924-1800, fax 924-1801
commdev@mono.ca.gov

P.O. Box 8
Bridgeport, CA 93517
(760) 932-5420, fax 932-5431
www.monocounty.ca.gov

Sent via e-mail and US mail January 29, 2010

January 29, 2010

Mr. Joe Walsh
Intrawest Real Estate
6900 South McCarran Blvd. Suite 3000
Reno, NV 89509

Dear Joe:

The purpose of this letter is to provide notice that the Rodeo Grounds application submittal dated June 8, 2009, and supplemented with a letter from R. Mark Carney dated December 22, received in our office December 30, does not constitute a complete application. The additional information provided is useful in clarifying the proposed project, particularly in reducing the number of general plan amendments associated with the proposal. However, further information is needed before the application can be deemed complete in accordance with California Government Code Section 65943. The primary items missing for a complete application concern phasing, number of units and grading.

In our discussion with Mark Carney January 14, 2010, it was further clarified that the application reflects a change in the previously agreed-upon approach of processing a more specific development proposal. As discussed, the revised application is much more general, and it is understood that discretionary use permits, accompanied by additional design review by the June Lake Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), will be required for each commercial building and phase of development. These discretionary decisions may trigger additional environmental review under CEQA.

The following summarizes our understanding of the revised submittal:

General Plan Amendments Requested

- The application is proposing a General Plan Amendment to allow structures in the proposed "Resort Core" up to 90 feet tall. In our meeting January 14, you clarified that one building is proposed up to a height of 90 feet. The specific location of this building is described in the June 8, 2009, submittal as Building "P".
- The application is proposing a General Plan Amendment to modify the Area Plan Objective J, Policy 1, Action 1.1 to exclude the employee housing of June Mountain Ski Area's peak-period workforce based on 7,000 skiers-at-one-time build-out.

- The application is proposing a General Plan Amendment to allow transient rentals in the single-family areas.
- The application is proposing a General Plan Amendment to modify the parking requirements for other uses in the development as proposed in sections 4.6.2 (resort core), 4.6.3 (multi-family) and 4.6.6 (affordable housing) of the June 8 submittal document. It is noted that section 4.3.5 (light industrial) does not require a General Plan Amendment.

General Plan Requests Withdrawn

- The application has been revised to comply with standard parking space requirements for single-family and does not seek a General Plan Amendment to require two spaces instead of three spaces.
- The application has been revised to comply with standard front yard setbacks in multi-family and single-family areas and does not seek a General Plan Amendment to reduce the setback to 10 feet.
- The application has been revised to comply with standard maximum lot coverage (40%) on single-family lots that have a secondary unit.
- The application has been revised to comply with standard structure maximum height in multi-family areas and does not seek a General Plan Amendment to increase heights without additional corresponding setback increases.
- The application has been revised to comply with standard maximum secondary-unit size of 500 or 640 square feet (depending on lot size). Sizes larger would require either a Director Review or Use Permit (depending on lot size) pursuant to the existing Chapter 16, which deals with Secondary Units; no General Plan Amendment is being sought for this issue.

Overall Theme

- The application proposes to preserve the mountain village character of June Lake and to “build upon June Lake’s unique sense of place and mountain character.” As discussed on January 14, the specific plan for the project will integrate and be consistent with the recommendations of the June Lake CAC peer review.

Government Code Section 65450 et seq. specifies the minimum necessary components of a specific plan; it does not limit the County from requesting additional information necessary for adequate planning of the area. It is understood that although a number of the approximate 26 comments that were noted in the County’s July 2, 2009, letter have been clarified by Intrawest, many remain to be addressed as the specific plan is developed.

In reviewing the revised application with Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC), the project consultants retained by Mono County to prepare the specific plan and EIR, the major concerns for completing the application focus on phasing, number of units and grading:

Phasing

Specific plans must contain a phasing plan for infrastructure facilities such as major sewer and water lines, roads, affordable housing, and other improvements. It is understood that project development will occur based on market conditions, financing, and economics, and that the phasing plan does not constitute a mandatory construction timeline. Nevertheless, a reasonable phasing plan based on the best available information at this time is needed for both practical and legal reasons in processing the application. Estimates of infrastructure costs and long-term maintenance considerations are necessary components of the specific plan.

Number of Units

Details of the major proposed uses, particularly for core resort buildings, including square footage, unit type (hotel, lock-off, studio, interconnected, suites, etc.), conference and restaurant square footage, retail square footage, etc., should be clarified. This type of information is included in your consultant's Parking Demand Analysis contained in the June 8, 2009 submittal, but it is unclear if your current proposal still reflects these numbers. PMC indicates that information is needed on total square footage and number of beds and bathrooms within the Resort Core and the multi-family land use designation for the EIR analysis.

Current ordinances set the amount and distribution of affordable housing needed for the project. The proposal includes an alternative to the Housing Ordinance in the form of a Housing Overlay Zone, but it is not clear what this entails. Even with clearer definition, such an alternative must demonstrate mitigation value equal to that of the Housing Ordinance. Project details, as noted above, and information demonstrating equal mitigation value, are needed for application processing.

Grading

A rough grading plan is essential to analyze the impacts to soils, drainage, snow storage configurations, vegetation and other environmental factors resulting from the specific plan. A rough grading plan that estimates cuts, fills, quantities and tree / vegetation removal / replacement is needed for a complete application.

Your assistance in concluding this application submittal process is appreciated. We look forward to discussing these items in more detail when we meet February 2. Please contact Larry Johnston, project planner, at (760) 924-1806 if you have questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,



Scott Burns
Community Development Director

cc Mark Magit, Assistant County Counsel
Larry Johnston, Assistant Community Development Director
Dave Wilbrecht, County Administrative Officer
Evan Nikirk, Public Works Director