

Jessie Waldman

From: Mackenzie Skye <winecountryskye@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2022 9:03 PM
To: Russell Ford; Jessie Waldman
Cc: pbs
Subject: Clarification regarding BF 2021-0429 and MHRB# 2022-0002

Date: 11-14-22
From: Robert Schmitt & Mackenzie Skye
Subject: 45020 Ukiah Street Mendocino CA 95460
Permit # BF 2021-0429 and MHRB# 2022-0002

Please ensure that the 'Rego House' is removed from the Historical Index and any other reference on our application/permit # BF 2021-0429 and MHRB# 2022-0002.

The Rego House that historically was included on the Mendocino Town Plan Historical Index of historical homes was completely demolished in 2004. Please see attached picture.



That building no longer exists and any reference to it on our application is in error and complicates our application process.

An entirely new building from the ground up was built in 2006 following that demolition to reflect what the original 'Rego House' looked like in 1864. Please see attached picture.



Please also note the original fencing mid yard. Fencing was always there and prior to our ownership. All we did was paint it white.

Please also remove the Warren Hagenmeyer House as that is also not on our property. It is on our neighbors' property. That is a historical house and site and is owned by a different property owner. Our address of 45020 Ukiah Street for the Warren Hagenmeyer House is in error. The Warren Hagenmeyer House is located at 45010 Ukiah Street. Please see attached picture.



The Warren Hagenmyer House in the green paint color is beyond our white picket fence in the front of our yard on the upper right hand corner of this picture.

Continuing to make a notation in our application under
'Historic Structures:

On Site: Rego House Category IIa'

Warren-Hegenmeyer House Category I

is completely inaccurate as evidence noted above.

This has caused a lot of confusion for all parties that have been working on our building permit and MHRB applications over the last 4 years.

The Past Permit: MHRB 2003-18 (Rehabilitate Rego and Warren Hegenmeyer Houses); MHRB Permit 2014-11 was done by the previous owners, Mendocino Center Associates, not us as the new owners/applicants.

Rehabilitation of the Rego house was never done, it was demolition by neglect as noted in the picture above and as follows.



Demolition began in 2004-5 by Mendocino Center Associates. Our ownership did not begin until 2016.

Additionally, in our Applicant Statement application submittal, we never wrote or authored or included a '13a' following our own #13. "13a Tinted windows when MHRB_2021-0002-approved Clear Glass". This was inserted by PBS. We wrote as part of our Applicant Statement numbers 1-15 including #13 to explain the manufacturers resultant hue in making Low E windows compliant for Title 24 but we never wrote or included a '13a'. Please remove '13a' out of our Applicant Statement in our application submittal. If PBS wanted to make a notation

regarding #13, they should have identified it as such representing PBS as the author but completely and separately and apart from our Applicant Statement and should never have been included as though we had authored this as a part of our submittal to our Applicant Statement.

Due to the various inaccuracies by PBS and 6 MHRB meeting cancellations that were experienced over these last 12 months, the delays and inaccuracies have caused significant delays in the proper permit streamlining and timing in order to receive our final building permit. It is imperative that we have no further delays in order to receive our final building permit. Our CDP will expire on January 23, 2023.

The minimus items or conditions that have been called out for us by PBS was after the fact that we had already been approved last year by both MHRB and PBS. In Staff Notes: "Staff found multiple exterior alterations which are subject to review and approval by the Review Board. The Exterior alterations include alterations to windows, fencing, decking, patios and other exterior features to the existing third residential unit..." Please see as follows:

1. Windows included the addition of decorative corbels v. the use of dentil trim as a result of little room between fascia and roof and were in keeping with the overall town design.
2. 6' Fencing facing Calpella Street at the north side of the new SFD was added by PBS directive as it needed to meet the condition that was set by PBS to 'hide' the EV charging station on the east side of the house. All other fencing existed prior to this application or were previously reviewed and approved for a 42" picket fence in front.
3. The decking has always remained the same from our previously approved plans, design and natural finish. There were never any changes that were made to the decking or railing both at the rear of the house and at the front porch.
4. Brick pathways and areas of brick and sand were designed to meet the needs of ambulation and safety for owners. 'Patio's' were never designed.
5. 'Other exterior' features have yet to be defined or described by PBS to us as the applicants.
6. The 6 small tenant parking signs had already been removed from our own rear parking lot area so that should never have been reinserted.
7. The Natural wood railings had already been reviewed and approved last year and should never have been reinserted.
8. The existing 6'x 5' old panel natural fence had been there for over 15 years and should never have been reinserted as we indicated we were leaving it the way it originally was.
9. DOT has determined a permit was not needed. The previous owner had already received a permit from DOT for the driveway and Calpella Street roadway improvements and should not have been reinserted for review.
10. The trash enclosure was already allowed in the rear yard by right.
11. Paint colors were never changed. They have always remained the same.
12. Side and rear fences around the parking and handicap areas were already present for many years. They were painted white per our approved design.
13. Compacted gravel areas have been in existence since 2006 and prior to our ownership and covered most of the rear yard and parking areas. All we did was supply fresh gravel over the old gravel areas. There was never any grading or removal of dirt. Please see attached picture of old gravel areas:



14. Any surfaces that we used for providing a safer harder surface to ambulate were done in pervious materials of sand and brick in front and rear areas of the yard.

15. Our lot coverage has not changed. We continue to remain under the 25% allowable coverage.

16. The concrete landing at the bottom of the rear deck steps were done per code and for safety meeting ground level.

The exhaustive amount of time that has been provided to MHRB as well as to PBS in meetings, cancelled meetings, paperwork, phone calls, correspondence, countless numbers of resubmittals of design work, research with governmental agencies, CA Title 24 compliance, reviewing the local public agencies policies in assisting owners with building permits have been extraordinary.

A thorough examination of the directives and new conditions made by PBS for our house and yard areas have what we believe to have been excessive and burdensome post our original approval by PBS as well as MHRB.

We hope that the walk through this Friday on November 18 at our property by MHRB members will provide evidence as well as clarity as to what was already reviewed and approved by MHRB last year. Whatever other minimal conditions that were made by PBS have already been addressed and were already corrected by us as the applicants. Those additional new conditions that were made by PBS on our application should no longer be included into a 'list' of new conditions since we were already previously approved. As one MHRB member expressed to PBS through a public meeting and concerns with PBS that in her opinion, that the conditions being levied on us by PBS were excessive and felt in her opinion more like we were experiencing more or a 'house audit' that was being done to us...and words to the effect "what else is PBS going to dictate? What one can plant in their own garden?" etc... It is important to provide clarity for MHRB members to understand clearly and with a resolve to expediency in order for us to obtain our final building permit as it should have been many months ago.

We request continued adherence to the governance of our local planning agency in efforts to help us achieve our final building permit and that it be streamlined and timely to help us meet our objectives and within the rightful timelines that are outlined and importantly, taking into consideration that our CDP will expire in January of 2023.

Submitted,
Robert Schmitt and Mackenzie Skye