



**CITY OF SALINAS  
PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT**

---

**DATE:** APRIL 15, 2026

**TO:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**FROM:** COURTNEY GROSSMAN, PLANNING MANAGER

**BY:** SON PHAM-GALLARDO, SENIOR PLANNER

**TITLE:** **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 2024-067; REQUEST FOR RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW TO CONSTRUCT A 1,614 DETACHED SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING UNIT WITH A 748 SQUARE-FOOT ATTACHED THREE CAR GARAGE, AN 818 SQUARE-FOOT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) AND AN ATTACHED 470 SQUARE-FOOT JUNIOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (JADU) LOCATED AT 110 CHESTNUT STREET IN THE RESIDENTIAL LOW DENSITY-AIRPORT OVERLAY (R-L-5.5 - AR) ZONING DISTRICT**

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

A motion to approve a resolution finding the project exempt pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines, affirming the findings, and approving Conditional Use Permit 2024-067.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Julio Monroy (Monroy Designs), on behalf of Jose and Dolores Castillo, is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Residential Design Review to construct a 1,614 detached single family dwelling unit with a 748 square-foot attached three-car garage on a vacant 6,500 square-foot lot. Although not subject to a CUP, the project also includes construction of an 818 square-foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and an attached 470-square-foot Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU). On March 16, 2026, a Notice of Intent to Approve the CUP was mailed to all property owners located within 300 feet of the subject property and interested parties. Prior to the proposed March 26, 2026, approval date, protest letters were received from nearby property owners. Therefore, the CUP was scheduled for Planning Commission consideration. A new public hearing notice was mailed on April 3, 2026, to the same property owners and interested parties regarding the scheduled public hearing before the Planning Commission on April 15, 2026. The public hearing notice was also published in the Monterey Herald on the same date as the mailing.

## DISCUSSION:

### Background:

The proposed detached single family dwelling unit consists of three-bedrooms (3), two and a half bathrooms, and is two-stories (2) 24'-10" tall. The project includes an attached JADU above the three-car (3) attached garage that is accessed from an exterior staircase that would be attached to the primary dwelling unit. A detached ADU is proposed in the backyard. Both the proposed detached single-family dwelling and detached ADU include front porches totaling 223 square feet. Proposed colors and materials are consistent with the residential design standards and include white stucco, light grey board and batten, grey architectural grade shingles, and black vinyl window frames.

Per Zoning Code Section 37-50.110(c)(1)(A) and (e), construction of the proposed single-family dwelling unit is subject to consideration of a CUP for Residential Design Review / infill residential development in the R-L district. Pursuant to California Government Code Sections 66310 - 66342, construction of the proposed ADU and JADU is permitted by right under State law and is not subject to a CUP if in connection with the construction of a single-family dwelling unit.

The property is located in the Residential Low Density (R-L-5.5) District and is within the Airport Overlay (AR) District. An Avigation Easement is conditioned to be executed prior to Building Permit issuance. The following provides an overview of the land uses and zoning districts adjacent to the project site:

- North: Detached Single Family Dwelling Unit / Residential Low Density-Airport Overlay (R-L-5.5-AR)
- South: Detached Single Family Dwelling Unit / Residential Low Density-Airport Overlay (R-L-5.5-AR)
- East: Detached Single Family Dwelling Unit / Residential Low Density-Airport Overlay (R-L-5.5-AR)
- West: Detached Single Family Dwelling Unit / Residential Low Density-Airport Overlay (R-L-5.5-AR)

## ANALYSIS:

### General Plan Consistency:

The site is designated Low Density Residential by the 2002 Salinas General Plan. Per the General Plan, Low Density Residential land use provides for the development of single-family detached dwelling units. The proposed dwelling is consistent with General Plan Goals and Policies. Located on an infill site, the project would help maintain a compact City form, consistent with Land Use Policy LU-2.4. The proposed single-family dwelling conforms to Community Design Element Policy CD-2.3, which requires infill development to be consistent with the scale and character of existing neighborhoods.

Zoning:

As shown on the official Zoning Map, the site is located in the Residential Low Density (R-L) District. Per Section 37-30.050, the purpose of the Residential Low-Density District is to provide appropriately located areas for single-family dwellings, achieve design compatibility through the use of site development regulations and design standards, encourage attractive and interesting single-family residential streetscapes, and provide adequate light, air, privacy, and open space for each dwelling unit.

Infill Residential Development regulations (Section 37-50.110) include design standards to protect the character of the city’s established (built-out) single-family residential neighborhoods and are intended to supplement the base zoning district regulations to ensure that all new single-family detached residential dwelling units and applicable residential additions are constructed as follows:

- 1) Preserve existing residential patterns and development, and reinforce the character and functional relationships of established neighborhoods;
- 2) Are compatible in scale and height with the neighboring single-family detached residential dwelling units through the use of similar proportions, level of details, and scale; and
- 3) Reflect some of the best characteristics of adjacent dwelling units in the choice of materials and colors, windows, height, and roofline.

Development Standards:

**Development Regulation Compliance Table**

<b>Development Regulation</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Use Classification	Must comply with Residential Low Density Use Classifications and Infill Development Regulations	Lot is vacant. A detached SFD previously occupied the lot, but was demolished due to fire damage	Detached SFD with an attached JADU and detached ADU. CUP required for new infill development, but not for the ADU or JADU	Compliant w/ Use Classifications and Infill Dev. Regs., which require a CUP. ADU and JADU allowed pursuant to State law

<b>Development Regulation</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Front Yard and Interior Side Yard	Must meet Infill Dev. Regulations	n/a	-	See Infill Development Regulation Table Section 37-50.110 50.110(g)(1)(A-F)
Side Yard – Minimum (ft.)	5’ Interior for SFD 15’ Corner for SFD 4’ for ADU	n/a	7’-6” SFD 4’ ADU	Compliant
Rear Yard – Minimum (ft.)	10’ for SFD 4’ for ADU	n/a	48’-2” for SFD and 5’-6” for the detached ADU	Compliant
Distance Between Structures – Minimum (ft.)	6’	n/a	10’-8”	Compliant
Usable Open Space per Dwelling Unit – Minimum (sf.)	1,000 sf.	n/a	1,105 sf.	Compliant
Landscaping and Irrigation	Front yard is required to include landscaping and irrigation	n/a	CUP requires final landscape plan per Zoning Code requirements	Compliant
Driveway Length – Minimum (ft.)	20’	n/a	43’	Compliant
Driveway Width – Maximum (ft.)	20’	n/a	11’-6” (This is the maximum allowed due to the proposed layout of the SFD)	Compliant
Off-Street Parking - Min.	2 garaged parking stalls; however, the site is located within ½ mile of a major transit stop. Per AB 2097 parking is not required.	n/a	3 garaged parking stalls	Compliant. Provided parking is considered optional and complies with development standards.

The proposed single-family dwelling with an attached JADU and ADU conforms with development standards and design standards as demonstrated per Section 37-30.050 and compliance table 37-30.40 as described above.

The project will not adversely impact the character of the existing neighborhood because it would be in compliance the height and scale design requirements contained in Zoning Code Section 37-50.110(g)(1)(A-F) with the Infill Development Regulations in Section 37-50.110(f) as identified in the table below:

**Infill Development Regulations Compliance Table**

<b>Infill Development Regulation – Zoning Code Section 37-50.110(f-g)</b>	<b>Development Standard</b>	<b>Proposed Development</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
The minimum front and corner side yards shall be determined based on the average of the existing front and corner side yards for single-family detached dwelling units located within the neighboring block face. For purposes of calculating the average, the smallest yard and the greatest yard shall be disregarded. For an addition to an existing single-family detached dwelling unit, the existing front or corner side yard may be maintained, if less than the average for the neighboring block face	Average front yard setback in neighboring block face is 13'	16', front porch encroaches 5', which is allowed per Building Projection allowances	Compliant
The rear yard shall be in accordance with the base district regulations	Minimum 10'	48'-2"	Compliant
The minimum interior side yard shall be five feet for the first twenty feet in building height with an additional two and one-half feet of yard required for each additional five feet, or a fraction thereof, of building height as measured to the peak of the roof.	Minimum 7'-6" per the proposed height of the dwelling unit, which is 24'-10"	7'-6" along westerly interior side yard lot line, and 11'-6" along easterly interior side yard lot line	Compliant
Maximum dwelling unit size: .40 FAR or 2,500 square feet or the square footage of the existing house plus 1,000 square-feet, whichever is greater	2,600 sf. (.4 x 6,500 sf. = 2,600 sf.)	1,614 sf. The 818 ADU & 470 sf JADU are not subject to FAR.	Compliant
The maximum height to the peak of the roof shall not exceed the height of the highest roof peak on the neighboring block face, or thirty feet, whichever is more	Maximum 30'	24'-10"	Compliant

<p>The perceived scale of new dwelling units and additions should be minimized. To achieve this, two-story buildings should be stepped back from streets and adjacent smaller residential dwellings units, broken up into smaller architectural components, or include a substantial single-story element</p>	<p>Stepped back from streets and adjacent smaller residential dwellings units, broken up into smaller architectural components, or include a substantial single-story element</p>	<p>The second floor is stepped back from the street approximately 5'. The dwelling unit is proposed to be stepped back in the side yard to reduce scale</p>	<p>Compliant</p>
<p>The height and scale of new dwelling units shall follow the context of the residential block face and not overwhelm existing dwelling units with disproportionate size</p>	<p>The proposal should not overwhelm other dwellings in the neighboring block face</p>	<p>The proposal is taller than the abutting dwellings but matches the scale of others in the block face and does not overwhelm existing dwellings. For example, the dwelling three lots to the west is larger than the proposal and includes a larger 2<sup>nd</sup> story component visible from Pajaro and Chestnut Streets</p>	<p>Compliant</p>
<p>Placement of windows and openings should not create a direct line sight into the living space or the backyard of adjacent properties. Where privacy is a concern, windows should be</p>	<p>Should not create a direct line sight into the living</p>	<p>2<sup>nd</sup> story side windows are frosted on the</p>	<p>Compliant</p>

staggered, frosted, louvered, or placed above eye level at the top third of the wall	space or the backyard of adjacent properties	bottom 2/3 of the window	
--	--	--------------------------	--

Design:

The project will be compatible with scale, bulk, height, and location of existing dwellings on the Neighboring Block Face. The Neighboring Block Face is defined by Zoning Code Section 37-50.110(b)(1) as those single-family detached dwelling units situated on lots or parcels located within 150 feet of the nearest property line of the subject site. Such lots or parcels shall include, but not be limited to, those lots or parcels that abut, face, or are located on the same street as the subject site. If a lot or parcel is vacant, undeveloped, or contains another use other than a single-family detached dwelling unit within the Neighboring Block Face, the next closest lot with a single-family detached dwelling unit shall be deemed part of the Neighboring Block Face. If any piece or portion of a lot or parcel is located within the Neighboring Block Face, the entire parcel or lot shall be deemed to be in the Neighboring Block Face.

Per Section 37-50.110(a), the purpose of Infill Residential Development is to preserve existing residential patterns and development, and reinforce the character and functional relationships of established neighborhoods; development is compatible in scale and height with the neighboring single-family detached residential dwelling units through the use of similar proportions, level of details, and scale; and development reflects some of the best characteristics of adjacent dwelling units in the choice of materials and colors, windows, height, and roofline. The proposed 16-foot front yard setback measured from the front property line to the dwelling unit, which meets the minimum 13-foot front yard setback. The proposed 24'-10" height does not exceed the maximum 30-foot height allowed in the R-L-5.5 Zoning District, nor dominate the adjacent structures in the Neighboring Block Face. The proposed main dwelling is taller than abutting units but, is also narrower and includes interior side yard setbacks meeting the minimum requirement of 7'-6" pursuant to Sec.37-80.110 (f)(C)(ii), the minimum interior side yard shall be five feet for the first twenty feet in building height with an additional two and one-half feet of yard required for each additional five feet, or a fraction thereof, of building height as measured to the peak of the roof. Proportional relationships are maintained, the proposed design achieved to minimize the perceived scale by meeting the guidelines as described in 37-50.110(g)(1)(A-F).

The height and scale design requirements contained in Zoning Code Section 37-50.110(g)(1)(A-F) are met as follows:

- a) The height and scale of new dwelling units and additions shall follow the context of the neighboring residential block face and not overwhelm existing dwelling units with disproportionate size.
- b) The new dwelling unit shall preserve and reinforce the character of established streetscapes by maintaining similar horizontal and vertical proportions with adjacent

facades. First and second floor plate heights shall generally be consistent with those of existing dwelling units in the neighborhood.

- c) The dominant existing scale of an established neighborhood should be maintained. Special attention shall be given to the design of a new two-story dwelling units or an addition constructed in a predominately one-story neighborhood to ensure that it is similar in scale and mass with surrounding structures and contributes to a harmonious transition between the new development and the existing development. In neighborhoods with both one-story and two-story dwelling units, second story additions shall generally reflect the scale, bulk, and height of other two-story dwelling units located in the neighborhood.
- d) The perceived scale of new dwelling units and additions should be minimized. To achieve this, two-story buildings should be stepped back from streets and adjacent smaller residential dwellings units, broken up into smaller architectural components, or include a substantial single-story element.
- e) New dwelling units should maintain a proportional relationship with buildings on adjacent properties including roof ridge height and eave height; and
- f) Accent materials or varied wall planes are encouraged to break up the vertical mass of two-story units and additions.

While the proposed project is taller than the abutting dwellings, it resembles the scale of other units in the block face and does not overwhelm existing dwellings. A nearby residential dwelling located three lots to the west of the proposed project is larger than the proposed project and includes a larger second story component visible from Pajaro and Chestnut Streets.

#### Notice of Intent to Approve/Protest Letter:

The Notice of Intent to Approve was mailed to neighboring properties within 300 feet of the subject property on March 16, 2026. Prior to the intended approval date of March 27, 2026, staff received phone calls and emails protesting the project. The attached protests received between March 19, 2026, to March 25, 2026, focus on the following concerns:

- Neighborhood Compatibility and Design (mass, height, colors)
- Privacy and Fire Egress
- Parking and Traffic
- Accessory dwelling units (ADU/JADU)
- Landscaping plans
- Drainage

Correspondence from neighbors note concerns on the design based on the scale and massing of the proposed project. Due to the three proposed residential units (SFD, ADU and JADU), neighbors are concerned with impacts relating to parking, traffic and privacy.

Protest letters received are summarized below with staff responses:

*Protest Letter 1: “The horrible plan that we have been shown is absolutely not in keeping*

*with a neighborhood of one-story, single-family homes. Physically, visually, it will not match a single home currently on the street. Three families or couples and their vehicles will add to the current parking problem, despite the 3-stall garage, which will likely not be used much.”*

Staff Response:

As discussed above, pursuant to Section 37-50.110, the purpose of Infill Residential Development is to preserve existing residential patterns and development and reinforce the character and functional relationships of established neighborhoods. The original application showed a boxy two-story design that was not consistent with the neighborhood. The original design did not illustrate a stepped back approach from the street and adjacent smaller residential dwellings. The structure was not broken up into smaller architectural components nor did it include a substantial single-story element. Staff worked with Mr. Monroy, the designer, who updated and resubmitted plans on December 17, 2025. The revised plans demonstrate a Modern Farmhouse/French Revival style with traditional components including materials such as wood, stucco, board and batten siding with a stone facade finish which are compatible with the neighboring properties. The asymmetrical front elevation shows classic historic features similar to structures across the street. Furthermore, the applicant submitted a 150-foot Neighboring Block Face exhibit demonstrating conformance with the development regulations per Section 37-50.110 (Infill residential development in the R-L district).

*Protest Letter 2: “Reject plans of 110 Chestnut. Not cohesive for 1930’s neighborhood also privacy issues with 2 story 3 family housing also parking and traffic congestion we have high school and elementary school at both ends of Chestnut Street traffic and parking is ridiculous.”*

Staff Response:

Pursuant to California Assembly Bill 2097 (AB 2097), public agencies or cities are prohibited from imposing a minimum automobile parking requirement on most development projects located within a half-mile radius of a major transit stop. The closest bus stops within a half-mile radius of the subject property are along W. Alisal, Soledad and Monterey Streets. Therefore, the City is prohibited from imposing parking requirements for this development. However, the applicant is proposing a three-car garage as part of this project. Furthermore, Gov. Code 66322 prohibits local agencies from imposing parking in a number of other specific circumstances related to accessory dwelling units. Per Salinas Municipal Code Sections. 9-50.75 and 9-50.78, traffic impacts are triggered by the change in land use. Any increase in trip generation rates trigger traffic impact fees with exception of JADU’s and ADU’s less than 500 square-feet. Public Works did assess the Regional Development Impact Fees as part a condition prior to the issuance of the building permit (See Exhibit G). In terms of design, refer to response to Protest Letter 1.

Protest Letter 3:

*“ADU Ordinance. The current ADU ordinance (Municipal Code Section 37-50.250), appears to have been adopted on 11-5-2019 by Ordinance No. 2581. The City of Salinas 2023-2031 Housing Element indicates that the current ADU/JADU ordinance is out of date (Page 89). If there is not a current ADU Ordinance, the public is unable to meaningfully comment on any objective design standards the City might impose on the overall development, including the primary single-family residence (Government Code Section 66314 et. seq.)”*

Staff Response:

Pursuant to Government Code Section 66323, also known as “state exempt” or “state mandated” ADUs, certain ADUs and JADUs must be approved ministerially and are not subject to standards set forth in Government Code sections 66314 - 66322. For example, 66323 units do not have to comply with lot coverage, front setbacks, or design standards. Government Code 66314 allows the total floor area for a *detached* ADU not to exceed 1,200 square feet and *attached* ADU not to exceed 50 percent of the existing primary dwelling. JADUs must also comply with the provisions of JADU Law contained in Government Code Sections 66333 - 66339. An ADU application cannot be denied due to lot density pursuant to Government Code Section 66314, Subdivision (c). The current City of Salinas ADU ordinance is outdated and out of compliance with the State ADU law given the numerous changes to State ADU Law since that have occurred the adoption of the ordinance. Accordingly, the City of Salinas ADU ordinance has been repealed. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66325, the State’s ordinance shall supersede a conflicting local ordinance and does not limit the authority of local agencies to adopt less restrictive requirements for creation of an accessory. ADUs must also comply with residential building code and health and safety requirements for dwellings. The proposed project with an ADU and JADU is within the regulations of the State HCD’s ADU ordinance.

1. *“Density. The project will effectively result in a three-unit rental project on a 6,500 SF lot. This would result in a density of 20 units/acre. The RL 5.5 Zoning allows 6 - 8 units per acre (Salinas Municipal Code Section 37-30.050(a)). Without an ADU Ordinance, and without the property zoned for mixed use development, the proposed population density appears to be inconsistent with SMC Section 37-30.050(b). SMC Section 37-50.250(b)(4), which indicates that a maximum of one accessory dwelling unit shall be permitted per lot or parcel.”*

Staff Response: Refer to Staff Response Protest Letters 1 and 3.

2. *“ADU Design. Salinas Municipal Code Section 37-50.250(C)(5) limits the primary ADU size to no more than 50% of the main home, which is proposed as 1,614 SF. The Notice of Intent for the project indicates that the ADU proposed is 816 SF, which exceeds the 50% size limit.*

Staff Response: Refer to Staff Response Protest Letter 1.

3. *Junior ADU Height. Can a new ADU be proposed above 16 feet (i.e., above a garage)?*

Staff Response:

A height of 16 feet for a detached ADU on a lot with an existing or proposed single family or multifamily dwelling unit is allowed (18 feet for lots within one-half of a mile walking distance of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor). In addition, one JADU per lot is permitted within the proposed or existing space of a single-family dwelling or accessory structure which must have exterior access and side and rear setbacks for fire and safety. For an ADU that is attached to the primary dwelling, a height of 25 feet or the height limitation in the local zoning ordinance that applies to the dwelling unit, whichever is lower. In this case, the JADU contained is within the proposed single family dwelling unit which is 24'-10" high and complies with section 66321(4)(D).

4. *Junior ADU. Are ADU's required to be ADA compliant? If so, won't stairs exclude this population from housing opportunities?"*

Staff Response:

The California Residential Code and California Building Code do not prohibit 2<sup>nd</sup> floor JADUs.

5. *Deed Restriction. Any ADU should be deed restricted to rental at terms not less than 30 Days [Government Code Section 66323(e)]. Ideally, this would be for related individuals and not unlimited numbers of single individuals within each of the proposed units."*

Staff Response:

No additional standards, other than those provided in Section 66314, shall be used or imposed, including an owner-occupant requirement, except that a local agency shall require that the property may be used for rentals of terms 30 days or longer.

6. *Farm Worker Housing. I am also concerned that to further maximize the financial benefit of this level of density, the main residence could be rented out for use as farmworker housing, increasing the overall population densities in the neighborhood. One SFD residential unit on Pajaro street now appears to be rented by at least nine individuals. It is my understanding that a neighboring house may also be used for farmworker housing. I believe this housing is important but must only be allowed through permit by the City. I would ask for a deed restriction on the main house to limit use to owner-occupied housing."*

Staff Response:

Pursuant to Section 37.30-060 Use Classification, Employee Housing (Small and Medium) is listed as a permitted use in the R-L 5.5 district.

7. *Privacy. The proposed "frosting" of upper story windows overlooking the neighboring houses seem inadequate. For fire egress, these windows need to be opened and opening windows looking into the rear portions of adjacent homes will detrimentally affect the privacy currently enjoyed by these residents.*

Staff Response:

Placement of windows and openings should not create a direct line of sight into the living space or the backyard of adjacent properties. Where privacy is a concern, windows should be staggered, frosted, louvered, or placed above eye level at the top third of the wall. The second story side windows are required to be frosted on the bottom 2/3 of the window (See Condition number 11). For emergency egress (CRD R319), the bedroom windows must be operable. Other habitable spaces must meet ventilation area requirements with operable windows or doors (CRC R325). Both requirements are part of the California Building and Residential Code requirements.

8. *"Drainage. Sheet 1 suggests the majority of the lot is covered by structures or concrete. Sheet U shows runoff lines flowing toward the street, with water flowing through the (E) Landscape area on the lower right-hand side of the Sheet. During storm events, water currently backs up along the curb at the intersection of Pajaro and Chestnut Street due to uneven gravity drainage to the storm drain system. Shouldn't on-site storm water retention be required for this level of development? At a minimum, pervious treatments to the proposed concrete paving should be required to minimize peak rainfall period runoff."*

Staff Response:

Conceptual stormwater plans were submitted to Engineering for review. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall comply with City of Salinas Stormwater Design Standards to mitigate Performance Requirement 1 (See Exhibit G).

9. *"Building Massing. The massing for the main residence does not fit within the historic single-family residential design aesthetic found in the neighborhood ("Front" and "Left" elevations on Sheet 2)."*

Staff Response: See Staff response to Protest Letter 1.

10. *"Building Height. The overall massing and height is incompatible with the neighborhood, which are generally single-story residence. The height is driven by the design necessitating a demand for lot coverage to accommodate a three-car garage, and a detached ADU,*

*forcing the junior ADU to be located at a second-story level. It's a bad design that overpowers the adjacent homes and the neighborhood.”*

Staff Response: See Staff response to Protest Letters 1 and 4.

11. *“Colors. White stucco will be highly reflective. Earth tones should be required.”*

Staff Response: A portion (approx. 25%) of the front elevation contains a white stucco finish. Light beige/yellow color stone and light grey board and batten will be incorporate the remaining portions of the front elevation. Per Section 37.30-080(i)(1), exterior building and roof colors shall be appropriate to and generally compatible with the architectural style of the dwelling unit. In general, subdued colors are more appropriate on the body of a structure with bright or bold colors generally limited to architectural details and window and door trim. Garish or overly bold colors should be avoided.

12. *“Materials. The stone material will likely be an applied veneer that will appear unauthentic. I would suggest a lower ban, if at all, for an accent and not the whole front entry will look fake. Were color and material renderings provided?”*

Staff Response: Refer to Conditional Use Permit Exhibit I.

13. *“Design Licensure. Isn't an architect license required to design a multi-family home? I am wondering whether or not Monroy Designs possesses the appropriate qualifications for a multifamily unit plan set?”*

Staff Response:

A structure with 2 dwelling units can be designed under the California Residential Code. A detached ADU can be designed under the California Residential Code. A designer can prepare plans for this project if designed under the California Residential Code (CRC1.1.3).

14. *“Landscaping Plan. There is no landscape plan in the plans provided. Given the intensity of the development proposed, a landscape plan approval should be required and part of any hearing for CUP 2024-067).”*

Staff Response:

As a condition of approval prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit detailed final landscape and irrigation plans for review and approval by the City Planner.

15. *“Code Question. On two separate occasions, dirt was dumped on the property. One pile of dirt is currently on the site at the rear of the lot. The other pile was used as fill material and was spread out along the front part of the lot. Was this clean, uncontaminated fill?”*

*Where did it come from? Salinas Municipal Code Section 9-06.15 suggests that regulations include minimum requirements for grading. I can find no specific section of the City code that provides any further discussion of permit requirements for grading. Is this a violation? If so, can new permits be issued if the property is in violation.”*

Staff Response:

A Code Enforcement case for this property was opened on April 2, 2026. Code Enforcement Officer conducted an inspection on April 6, 2026, and observed overgrown weeds. A Notice of Violation was issued to the property owner for overgrown weeds with a compliance date of April 23, 2026. A Code Enforcement Officer has been in communication with the property owner to try to resolve this violation before the scheduled hearing. The property was inspected by the Inspection Services Manager on April 8, 2026, who confirmed the dirt is less than 2 cubic yards and the trench at the back of the sidewalk is not near the runoff. Weeds have also been removed from the property.

Findings:

The Planning Commission may approve an application for Conditional Use Permit to construct a single-family dwelling unit with an ADU and JADU if all the findings set forth in the proposed Planning Commission Resolution are established.

Time Consideration:

The project was deemed complete on January 16, 2026. Final action was required by March 16, 2026, pursuant to Government Code Section 65950(a)(5) as amended by Section 21 of AB130. However, the project was protested before the NOI deadline and a public hearing is required before the Planning Commission.

Alternatives Available to the Commission:

The Planning Commission has the following alternatives:

1. Affirm the findings set forth in the attached Resolution, find the application exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and approve Conditional Use Permit 2024-067 with modifications; or
2. Find that the proposal is not appropriate and establish findings at the public hearing that the required findings pursuant to Zoning Code Sections 37-60.500(f) and 37-60.520 cannot be established and stating the reasons for not approving Conditional Use Permit 2024-067.

Conclusion:

The project (single-family dwelling, ADU and JADU) is consistent with the Zoning Code, the

General Plan and State ADU ordinance per Government Code 66314-66324.

CEQA CONSIDERATION:

The environmental impacts of the project have been analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project has been determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Section 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) and Section 15332 (In-Fill Development) of the CEQA Guidelines.

ATTACHMENTS:

Proposed Planning Commission Resolution

Draft Conditional Use Permit 2024-067 with the following exhibits:

- Exhibit "A" Vicinity Map
- Exhibit "B" Site Plan (Sheet 1)
- Exhibit "C" Floor Plans and Elevations (Sheets 2-3)
- Exhibit "D" Utility Plan (Sheet U)
- Exhibit "E" Elevations of Abutting Dwelling Units
- Exhibit "F" Properties within 150-foot neighboring block face
- Exhibit "G" Engineer's Report, dated December 23, 2025
- Exhibit "H" Fire Prevention Bureau Requirements, December 23, 2025
- Exhibit "I" Colors and Materials Board
- Exhibit "J" AB 2097 Map: Major Transit Stop within ½ Mile of the Site

Protest Letters from Neighboring Properties:

- Protest Letter 1 Received via letter dated March 19, 2026
- Protest Letter 2 Received via email dated March 20, 2026
- Protest Letter 3 Received via letter dated March 25, 2026

Email from State Housing and Community Development (HCD) dated April 2, 2026

Cc: Julio Monroy, Applicant  
Dolores and Jose Castillo, Property Owner