

RECEIVED

By James Feenan at 8:59 am, Nov 05, 2024

From: [Elise Cox](#)
To: [pbscommissions](#); dantle@mendocinocounty.org
Subject: Re: camping ordinance
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 8:40:01 AM

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.

Dear commission staff,

Per your request, I have individually attached each file in the zip folder and sent them back to you. I will be sending a bill to the county for this administrative work, as these documents are in the custody of the county and should have been provided to the Commission as part of the background information for the Commissioners considering this ordinance. You did not need to consume scarce volunteer resources with an administrative task for which we are currently fully staffed at the county level.

Instead of providing the Commission with internal county records that document the tip of the iceberg of nuisance activity associated with hipcamps, staff opted instead to provide a "model" ordinance that was co-written by Hipcamp for another county and that recommends converting residentially zoned properties on an acre into small commercial campgrounds.

Given the strong community opposition to changing residential zoning to commercial zoning, this is a very questionable use of staff time.

Best regards,

Elise Cox

On Tue, Nov 5, 2024 at 8:12 AM pbscommissions <pbscommissions@mendocinocounty.gov> wrote:

The attachments cannot be opened. Please scan them and attach them to the email.

Thank you,

From: Elise Cox <eliseanncox@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 12:27 AM
To: pbscommissions <pbscommissions@mendocinocounty.gov>
Subject: camping ordinance

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 experience of residents who live next to hipcamps on properties that are 3 acres or less and abutt properties that are even smaller — the impact on air quality from illegal fires and legal cooking campfires, sound pollution from generators and other equipment, the reduction of privacy from campers peering onto private decks and entering private driveways late at night (typically by mistake) — makes this an inappropriate land use for areas that are zoned residential.

The reduction in base value of abutting properties will more than offset the de minimus amount of revenue from the imposition of a tourism tax on hipcamps.

In contrast, hipcamps on large properties in agricultural or timber areas that are accessed by public roads can offer benefits to visitors without associated nuisance activities— but the minimal revenue that is generated is not sufficient to pay for the additional fire protection services needed to compensate for increased risk from this land use.

Commissioners should ask people who are testifying in favor of hip camps to disclose the size and location of their property so that a minimum of due diligence can be done to determine the impact of existing hipcamps on neighbors. I have direct experience with an adjoining hipcamp, and the owners, my neighbors, have not been forthcoming in the testimony they have each separately provided to the commission concerning the impact the hipcamp has had on the property that abuts their camping grounds.

I've attached public records containing a sampling of the complaints that have been received about existing, illegal hipcamps by the county. Note that this is not an exhaustive sample and does not include the use of fire and medical services.

[24-747_2024-11-04_23_21_18_-0800.zip](#) 

Best regards,

Elise Cox