



703 North Main Street, Fort Bragg CA 95437  
ph: 707-964-2537 fx: 707-964-2622 www.WCPlan.com

March 30, 2022

Keith Gronendyke, Planner III  
Planning Commissioners

Mendocino County Planning & Building Services  
860 North Bush Street  
Ukiah, CA 95482

RE: CDP\_2021-0024 – Comments on Staff Report and Request for Clarifications  
Owner: Matt Rowland  
Site: 18001 N. Highway 1, Fort Bragg  
APN 017-160-67

Dear Keith,

Thank you for your continued attention to this project. We are pleased that this item is coming before the Coastal Permit Administrator next month.

There are a few items in the Staff Report that I believe should be revised or clarified. To that end, please see my commentary and requests on the following pages.

Please let me know how you will be addressing these items; once we have come to an agreement, we would like to see a Memo prepared for the April agenda.

Thank you.

All the best,

  
Amy Wynn  
Principal Planner

RECEIVED  
MAR 31 2022

Planning & Building Services

Encl: n/a

CC: Matt Rowland, Applicant/Owner; file

**AGENCY COMMENTS:**

The staff report notes that there has been comments from the following agencies:

Department of Transportation  
Division of Environmental Health  
Sonoma State University, Northwest Information Center  
Calif. Department of Transportation  
Calif. Department of Forestry & Fire Prevention  
Calif. Department of Fish & Wildlife  
Calif. Coastal Commission

We have only received notice of commentary from NIC, CCC, Caltrans and CDF via email correspondence on 09/10/21.

Please provide us with PDFs of all the commentary you have received.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS:**

Staff notes that a "driveway encroachment exists on the State Route 1 frontage, but there are no dedicated turn lanes to the driveway in either direction." This statement is somewhat misleading, in that there is a center turn lane for both travel directions at this section of Highway 1.

**RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS RECEIVED:**

Commentary noted in the Report as being from CDFW was summarized to us via email from County Staff on 09/10/21 as coming from CCC. We'd like to clarify which agency authored the comment and note that it may need to be corrected in this staff report. This item is referenced in multiple locations of the staff report.

If this request is from CDFW, and not as a recommendation from CCC, we'd like to request that the Open Space Deed Restriction be removed as a condition of approval. The LCP, by nature, protects ESHA and we have designed the project in such a way that no EHSA will be within 100' of development.

For each item in this section the Conditions of Approval are mis-cited  
Cited Conditions to be corrected:

Calif. Department of Transportation:

The staff report reads COA's #9 and #10; it should read COA's #10 and #11

Calif. Department of Fish & Wildlife:

The staff report reads COA's #11 #12; it should read COA's #12 and #13

Calif. Department of Forestry:

The staff report reads COA #14; it should read COA #15

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

We request that the Condition of Approval be modified as below:

Condition #9

9a. The staff report warns against Geologic Hazards. We have not had any indication of this being an issue and the property is not a bluff-top property. We'd like clarification of the purpose of this item in condition #9.

9d. We'd like to request that if there is to be a deed restriction on the property, that the restricted portion of this property be not a 100' buffer, but rather a 50' buffer. We did not ask for a reduced buffer for this project, but we'd like it to remain a viable option for future applications.

Condition #12

We'd like to request the required fence be a symbolic fence rather than a 6' fence. We propose something like or similar to a split-rail fence, which can be low in height.

Condition #13

This condition seems to be similar in nature and related to Condition #9d. We are wondering if this item should simply be incorporated into Condition #9 or deleted.

Condition #16

We'd like to ask to change the language from "storage [...] shall be within the two new storage buildings" to "storage [...] shall be within the existing and proposed structures"

Condition #17

This is repeated in Condition #20. We believe this condition (#17) can be removed.

Condition #18

We would like to obtain clarification from the County that "temporary displays on site to demonstrate sample product selection, including tents and tableaux", as written in the project description, will be permissible.