

**pbscommissions - CDP\_2020-0024 comments from Flint & Janet Pulskamp**

---

**From:** FLINT PULSKAMP <fpulskamp@comcast.net>  
**To:** "pbscommissions@mendocinocounty.org"  
<pbscommissions@mendocinocounty.org...>  
**Date:** 6/7/2021 7:11 PM  
**Subject:** CDP\_2020-0024 comments from Flint & Janet Pulskamp  
**Attachments:** CDP public meeting notes 03.docx; View Looking West from Hwy 1.jpg

---

Hello Mendocino County Coastal Permit Administrator,  
Please see the attached comments and concerns for the Public Hearing scheduled this Thursday, June 10, 2021 at 11am for CDP\_2020-0024.  
I have 5 photos/files that are referenced and are to be included with this word document. Because the photos are rather large, I will send them in separate emails so your mail server will accept them. Let me know if you have any questions or need clarification or do not receive them  
best regards,  
Flint and Janet Pulskamp  
2751 White Gull Court,  
Albion, CA 95410  
APN: 123-340-10

Mendocino County  
JUN 10 2021  
Planning & Building Services

FROM: **Flint and Janet Pulskamp**

**2751 White Gull Court**

**Albion, CA 95410**

TO: **Mendocino County Coastal Permit Administrator**

REFERENCE: **CDP\_2020-0024**

SUBJECT: **Concerns and Comments from an Adjacent Property Owner and Interested Party for the Public Hearing and Review of CDP\_2020-0024**

DATE: June 6, 2021

We are responding to the Mendocino County Coast Permit Administrator for public review for the hearing of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Case #: CDP\_2020-0024.

We are concerned neighbors and we own the property two lots to the east of the subject development. (2751 White Gull Court, Albion, CA) We have objections to this development application as detailed below.

### **Development Objections**

As a direct neighbor we have an objection to this CDP application due to the significant detrimental visual impact this development would have on the neighboring properties. This proposed development is located closer to the bluff edge (46') than the houses on either side of this site. From the observation of any aerial view of this proposed development, it is apparent that the footprint of this proposed development would protrude toward the bluff further than any of the adjacent houses and would significantly obstruct the views from the neighboring properties, negatively impacting and damaging the property values of several of the neighboring properties. We believe at least three of the neighboring properties would suffer a loss in property value if this development is approved and built as proposed.

Several neighbors sent notices to the county staff planner last year, before the staff report was submitted to the Coastal Permit administrator, with objections to this development. To date, we have had no response whatsoever to our concerns.

In the Coastal Permit Administrator Staff Report for Standard CDP, in the section "Visual Resources", the concerns and/or interests of the immediate neighbors have not been acknowledged or documented. The neighbors on either side of the development were not contacted or solicited for their input about any negative visual impact. There are several inaccurate and mis-statement in this report:

1) The Staff Report states that "The proposed residence would not be visible from State Route 1, or any park, beach or recreation areas". This statement is not true. See the attached photograph titled "View looking west from Hwy 1". It is clear that this structure would be seen from "State Route 1". The report analyses only seem to be concerned about visual impact from "public" areas. It does not mention at all the visual impact to the neighbors living on either side of the proposed development.

2) The staff report states the development “would not be out of character with surrounding development”. This statement is also not true. As stated above, this development if located 46’ from the bluff edge, would be completely out of character with the surrounding development, and would be located closer to the bluff edge than any of the four houses (2 to the east and 2 to the west) on either side. See the attached photograph titled “View Looking West from property line 2”. This photo clearly shows a similar setback for the four houses adjacent to the subject property (2 houses to the east and 2 houses to the west). See the attached photographs titled “View Looking West from living room 2” and “View looking West at property line 2” to see the visual impact this development would have from the neighboring properties. The shaded blocks are our estimate of the walls of the proposed building site.

3) The staff report states that development is “subject only to the Policy 3.5-1 of the Coastal Element which states: The scenic and visual qualities of Mendocino County coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas...” The approval of this development would violate the “Policy 3.5-1 of the Coast Element” because it would NOT “protect views to and along the ocean and scenic areas” and would NOT be “visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas” as noted above.

The 74 page staff report does not include a single plot map showing the outline of the proposed building site relative to the neighboring homes. This information is crucial and would clearly show how the proposed building footprint protrudes beyond all of the neighboring homes. Incredibly, this report has 17 pages of plot maps showing only the outline of the proposed property (pgs 20-23, pgs 29-41), without a single page showing the location of the proposed building site relative to the neighboring homes. This report includes only a single plot map showing the proposed building site (pg 24, attachment E), but it does not include the location of the neighboring homes. The inclusion of this omission would have made clear the concerns the neighbors have voiced with this development for almost a year now.

Interestingly, the “presumed ESHA map with proposed development” (pg 3 of 33 from Wynn Coastal Planning and Biology) that was included in the original referral packet last year and is the footprint being proposed, does show the relative location of the proposed building site relative to the neighboring homes. See the attached file taken from the referral packet titled “Proposed Development Site-Plan View”. It can be clearly seen from that plot map the extent to which the proposed site protrudes beyond the implied setback line of the neighboring houses.

In our concerns expressed to the county staff planner starting last year we made a request that story poles be installed to mark the outline of the proposed building, so the visual impact could be assessed. We received no response to our requests until last week during an in-person meeting at the county offices, when we were told that the story poles request was rejected because they were not considered material to this application. If story poles would have been in place, then the visual impact of this development would be much clearer to the neighbors and the county Coastal Permit Administrator and staff.

In our concerns expressed to the county staff planner last year we also noted that the alternative “Development Alternative B” site plan that was offered by Wynn Coastal Planning and Biology in the

Referral Packet would be satisfactory to us. This building site is set further back from the bluff edge and would not have the negative impact that the current proposed site plan would have. We were told by the county staff planner that the alternative site plans were rejected because they would have greater impact on habitats and natural resources. The proposed site plan being considered now (see the attached file referenced above titled "Proposed Development Site-Plan View") shows special status animal habitats, plant habitats and wetlands on and just across the street from this project. Interestingly, there is a house in the process of being built today located exactly on top of all three of these "special status buffer zones" at parcel #123-340-18 just across the street. We are concerned there are serious inconsistencies in how the county applies Biological, Botanical, and Wetland analyses and compliance in their plan approval and permitting decisions. Apparently, the same special plant, animal and wetland buffers that are affecting this permit CDP\_2020-0024 had no affect at all on the plan approval and permitting of the house currently being built at parcel #123-340-18.

Finally, as a direct neighbor who owns the property two lots to the east of the subject development, we were never contacted in regards to this project. We were never contacted by county staff regarding this CDP or my original written concerns despite my request to be kept updated on any developments. On the Staff Report, my property/name is not even listed in the section "neighboring properties" even though my property is the 2<sup>nd</sup> adjacent property on the east side and one of the three owners most affected by this development. (BTW, the second property on the other side of the subject property was listed). We were not sent notice nor notified of this public review meeting, even though my contact information was registered as an "interested parties" for this project. When I saw the notice of public hearing posted at the development site just a few days ago, I again tried to contact the county staff planner, with no response and no returned phone call. I personally drove to Ft Bragg to speak with the staff planner on Thursday, June 3, 2021 to get more information in preparation for the scheduled public review. As of today Sunday, June 6, 2021, the Notice of Public Hearing for CDP-2020-0024 is still not available on the county's website, even though county policy states that it would be available 21 days prior to the public hearing.

In conclusion, as a concerned neighbor, we are requesting the Mendocino County Coast Permit Administrator deny this development application CDP\_2020-0024 as currently proposed for the reasons outlined above.



CDP 2020-0024

View looking West from Hwy 1

upward subject property