

FEB 22 2024


James Feenan

Planning & Building Services

**From:** Ann Giusti-LaRocco <agiusti@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 4:31 PM  
**To:** pbscommissions  
**Subject:** Re: CDP\_2021-0011 update - new response - 2/22 Public Hearing - image missing

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The last image on my previous email (copy of a text message) did not make it through on the public comment page- can you add it? It's this one. Thanks



On Feb 20, 2024, at 10:04 PM, Ann Giusti-LaRocco <agiusti@pacbell.net> wrote:

I see the update/response was just posted this afternoon. Unfortunately, less than 48 hours before the meeting.

Due to recent storms and possibly of connectivity issues here is my response and a few questions.

First a question: the single family home diagram (in drawings) has existing floor plan = 806 square feet, then a few pages down it states with net addition adding 400 sq feet the total is still 806 sq feet (?) please Fix wherever applicable. It keeps saying none of this applies to structures that are not increasing in size. (806-104+511=1,213). That is 150% of the previous structure. Does this need to be addressed in any other parts of the summary?

### 1) Water

It is untrue that this is the first time they were told about the water concerns. See text message image below from 2017 where I requested she get her own well.

I am happy about the storage tank, but, please ensure the filter is put on that end of the system to lessen the service calls to the well.

We still disagree with the statement there will be no ground disruption. I was told when I had to replace my roof any work in that bluff area is harmful to the habitat. There have been multiple issues over the years with just one rental. Once the water was so low they had to install a submersible pump among other things. I guess this will work itself out naturally. But the ask is still that they obtain their own water source.

We would also like a water study (during the dry months). True, the deed does not specify numbers, but now with the Single Family Residence increasing significantly in size, doesn't that remove all pre-coastal commission exemptions? Don't they have to comply with all current codes and circumstances for that house - one being the need for a water test if there are 2 residential units on one property? I was told by the costal commission there cannot be two single family homes in a costal zone unless one is an ADU. I assume also if one is a grandfathered second home. So now that we are bringing everything up to code does that not qualify for a test?

The comment that less water is used in rentals is not factual. And, they do have landscape maintenance.

### 2) Road.

I do know some of the history of the road maintenance, but that was when everyone used it equally. Either owner occupied or long term rentals. There is exponentially more use on behalf of the tourists. They are in and out all day, then the cleaning crews -back and forth. We do not feel we should have to pay equal amounts for this. They are running a business that has resulted in heavy road use on a non paved road- they should pay the lions share of the road maintenance. Additionally, they should fund paving the road in its entirety.

### 3) Good faith.

They claim to be following all the rules, obeying the laws, yet, they are renting the workshop building (not legal) and the work on it has already been completed.

As Mr Gronendyke has been made aware : the "workshop with 1/2 bath" has a full shower already. Not sure what else was done (see attached images) the red building is the one 2' from my fence that has been transient housing for quite some time now.

He said we needed to bring it up here but we sure hope there is an investigation to this.

I never asked that they move the building, I just asked that it not become a cottage or dwelling.

They have violated the permit process by finishing the project prior to authorization and it is not a structure that is legal for transient housing whether it is a "workshop" or a "cottage"

So, you can see why we are concerned with allowing other ancillary structures to be "improved" and with this process.

Another thing we are frustrated with are all these loopholes to make this happen when the people who live here have clearly have expressed concerns.

We do not have a professional company proficient in all these codes representing us. We are trying to figure out a complex system and no one has returned multiple calls to the Ukiah office. Emails come weeks later if at all and never actually provide specifics.

We appreciate your time and patience,  
~Ann Giusti LaRocco

First image is a link to the listing, next photos from that listing of the building inside and outside, the last image is the text from 2017 asking her to get a well on her property

<1651a6d6-bde0-4ffa-a06d-303c80046a14.jpeg>

**Guesthouse in Fort Bragg · ★4.88 · 1 bedroom**  
**· 1 bed · 1 bath**

<image0.jpeg>

<image1.jpeg>

<image2.jpeg>

<image3.jpeg>

<image4.jpeg>

<image5.png>

<image0.jpeg>

Sent from my iPhone