

From: Tom Wodetzki, 31901 Middle Ridge Road, Albion CA
To: Mendocino Coastal Permit Administrator, Planning staff and Coastal Commission
Re: CDP_2017-0038, Kirkman & Kawase project

Date: May 12, 2021

I am opposing this Coastal Development Standard Permit application for development of a two story house with attached garage, decks and related porches, accessory buildings, including 3 proposed windmills and the 2 above ground water storage tanks located at the highly scenic designated property commonly known as the Navarro Knoll. The following are reasons to deny this project as submitted.

1. Highly Scenic Designated Property:

The project description in the submitted drawings do not reflect the existing grade correctly and are not designated clearly on the drawings. The house is located on a steep slope with existing topo lines illustrating house and deck foot print to be from 390 ft elevation at lowest point to 402 ft elevation at highest point with the house actually being 34 tall from lowest point of existing grade. That said we request a surveyed topo be provided by applicant to determine the exact height of house that is proposed. Even with averaging the existing grades the house will be overbearing and beyond 28 ft tall.

Addressing the highly scenic designation this parcel 6 .02 acre parcel is almost two thirds designated highly scenic and therefore should meet the 18-foot building height and other requirements for highly scenic designs. The Albion CAC along with the community during the 1985 local coastal plan development requested the Highly Scenic designation for the entire Navarro Knoll and somehow during the sub division of the knoll they cut out a window for this parcel. The coastal commission, Board of Supervisors and the local Mendocino Planning Dept need to review this subdivision file to resolve this discrepancy. I believe there is language in our zoning and planning codes that state when the majority of a parcel zoning is zoned Highly Scenic then that designation could hold true for the entire parcel.

Staff report of the initial study on page 2 lists this project as "**less than significant in all boxes for Aesthetics,**" and I disagree with the staffs findings (A-d). Please just drive by and see the story poles and imagine a 32 foot tall structure on the face of this hillside. The planner played down this significant aspect of this property and its highly visible location form public scenic corridors.

The steep slope as illustrated from the hand drawn topo presented on applicants drawings per sheet A-1 shows and increase of elevation gain from 240 ft elevation to 420 ft elevation which is an elevation gain of 180 just on the partial topo map, so there is an inconsistency by planner referring to this site as a moderate slope.

Because this property is so highly scenic and visible from both Highway One and from a public park located right below this property on west side of Highway One, it is amazing that planning staff did not request the applicant to mitigate the proposal to a single story house.

2. Botanical Survey and ESHA:

This project's Botanical Survey and ESHA's setbacks are being ignored and overridden without a review for a different house location and size.

The planning staff's allowing the consultant providing the botanical report to move forward without Dept Fish and Wildlife submitting a report due to the reduced 50-foot ESHA buffer is unprofessional for a standard CDP application of a parcel this visible from public views. Where is the check and balance that planning staff should of requested to the owners botanical consultant due to the amount of endangered protected species being present within the building envelop? The report map illustrates that most of the site contains Coastal Scrub and other special species to be protected.

There is a void of findings that determine a "taking" for a project. Because the owners hired botanical consultant suggests the county would have to do a "taking" does not justify the disregard for the state's required setback of 50 feet from a described ESHA.

The staff report conditions are not sufficient and thorough in mitigating or satisfying the the state's ESHA requirements, as stated in staffs report page 9 & 10, listed mitigated conditions #18 to #26 .

The planning department failed in not requesting the owner and agent to resubmit CDP application with a more acceptable solution for development of a residence. The project building site may have been reduced to size of house footprint and moved to the top of hill with a reduced southern /southeastern property line setback of 6 foot. The county may have offered a non conforming set back to protect as much ESHA as possible and allowed for a 18 foot tall development. Certainly the coastal commission may entertain this as being a better solution for both protecting more of the ESHA and addressing the Highly Scenic nature of the property.

Why was not another location on property site looked at when the botanical report illustrated the extensiveness of the endangered protected ESHA habitats? Why did not staff nor the owner/agent look at asking the county for a non conforming 6 foot property line set back from the south & southeasterly property lines along with requiring the house to meet the 18 foot height limit for highly scenic designation.

The above listed issues and listed failure for mitigating both the highly scenic and botanical ESHA setbacks are two important reasons why this project should be denied as presented in the applicants package.

Thank you for considering these factors and the photos below.

Tom Wodetzki, Albion resident and past member of the 1985
Albion Citizens Advisory Committee to the General Plan