

# Attachment G

This page intentionally left blank.

**Sidor, Joe (Joseph) x5262**

---

**From:** Natalie Nielsen & Tom O'Brien <taonrn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 6:11 PM  
**To:** 'Jim Anderson'  
**Cc:** 'Fred Miranda'; 'chad Brown'; Sidor, Joe (Joseph) x5262  
**Subject:** RE: Project next door

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ]

Hi Jim,

Thank you for the email. We greatly appreciated when Chad reached out in November to discuss alterations to the plans. Now, without any explanation of how the houses are all of a sudden consistent with the neighborhood character, you demand we waive our objections. We can only read this as revealing your disinterest in meeting the concerns of the neighbors or Planning Commission.

Before we address the substance of your demands, however, we are compelled to respond to the fact that the county planning staff would be representing your appeal to the Board of Supervisors. We find that level of advocacy odd, and wildly inappropriate. After the Planning Commission failed to approve your development, we would think it would be up to you—not County employees—to explain why these houses merit approval, notwithstanding widespread opposition from neighbors, the advisory committee, and planning commissioners.

As we mentioned on the December call, we speak only for ourselves. There is no “group,” as your email accuses. Many neighbors have voiced a variety of concerns at LUAC and Planning Commission meetings. We would strongly suggest you reach out to them as well, as no voice is more important than the others. Some of the neighbors who have repeatedly lodged objections include Robin Robinson, Sue Benjamin, Peter Brickey, Cindy Jensen, Pat Roberts, Derek Daley, and Sandra Salyer. Many others have shown up at various meetings since this process began.

Our stance all along has been that we are not opposed to development but strongly believe that any development must comply with the law. This includes the legal requirement to be consistent with the neighborhood character. The call we had in December was a constructive exchange in which all parties sought to find common ground. It was also a belated acknowledgment that the plans you presented to the county were inconsistent with the neighborhood. On the call you promised to continue to iterate changes that would bring the development into compliance with the law and continue the productive dialogue we started. Now, instead, you send an email trying to bully us into dropping our objections, citing such oddities as probate laws in Columbia and the expansion of the Pebble Beach Lodge as reasons we should help you strengthen your case. Today’s email, with its bullying tone, came out of the blue and completely ignored the common ground we thought we had begun to find in December. It would have been far more productive for you to explain how the plans have changed and why the development is, in your opinion, now consistent with the neighborhood character.

The time you have expended trying to muscle houses that do not fit with the neighborhood is not our concern. It is, however, the fault only of your decision-making and obstinance. In the face of repeated objections, you chose to continue forward with only minimal changes that all—including the Planning Commission—agreed were inadequate. At the Planning Commission hearing, the commissioners expressed regret that this process has taken a long time. Commissioner Daniels noted that the problem was the attempt to seek approval for two houses that simply do not belong. Had you put forward houses consistent with the neighborhood or altered them in light of the objections that have been consistently raised since the first LUAC meeting in June 2019, the houses would now be completed and occupied.

From the tone of your email and its bald demand that we should drop our legitimate concerns, we can see that you are reverting to the tactics that have failed you so far. That is unfortunate, particularly given our conversation in December that seemed to signal a new approach.

After your email and only with encouragement from Chad, you did send along plans. Your strategy of first demanding that we waive our objections and only then sending us plans, raises serious concerns about what those plans actually contain. Obviously, without a searching review, we will not be waiving any of the legitimate concerns we have raised. Rest assured, we will review them, but we can see already that the 24418 San Juan house is markedly different than what was presented to us on the December call and there is no image of the other house. Why is it different now and how is it consistent with the neighborhood? Your email does not provide a clue.

As of this email, we cannot tell you our position. Consistent with our position throughout, we believe the development must be consistent with the neighborhood character. We will judge the plans by that legal standard. If the revisions respond to previous concerns, we will be happy to express that through official channels. If, however, these plans are simply another inconsequential change, our objections will remain. Moreover, you must contact the other neighbors with regard to their views, which are not necessarily the same as ours. We do not speak as a group, so even if the two of us were to drop our concerns we do not know if others would do the same.

In the end, your fate is in your hands. All along, you have had the opportunity to avoid the fate that befell Pebble Beach Lodge and of those who have fallen victim to Columbian probate laws by revising the plans and putting forward houses that conform with the neighborhood. The choice is yours and the consequences of your decisions are owned solely by you.

Yours,

Tom O'Brien and Natalie Nielsen

---

**From:** Jim Anderson <jaseeyou199@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:29 PM  
**To:** Natalie Nielsen & Tom O'Brien <taonrn@gmail.com>  
**Cc:** Fred Miranda <mirandamd@hotmail.com>; chad Brown <Chad@montereydesign.center>; Joe Sidor <SidorJ@co.monterey.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Project next door

Dear Natalie

I am writing to you in the role of project manager for the 2 houses next door to you. Joe Sidor, the county planner assigned to our application, will be presenting our appeal to the Planning Commission on March 16. If the appeal is rejected, we will have to wait one year before re-submitting. You may have read that Pebble Beach Corp. took 26 years to finally get approval for their project. to expand the Lodge etc. 3 years ago.

It would strengthen our case substantially if you would drop your groups' objections. Over the course of 3 versions of the plans we have reduced the site coverage of the house nearer to you (PLN 190098) from 2900 to 2776 sq. feet and the house next to the canyon (PLN190097) from 2863 to 2593 sq. feet. Similarly the height above the street has been reduced by 6 feet and 5 feet respectively. A short E-mail to Joe at [SidorJ@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:SidorJ@co.monterey.ca.us) is all it takes.

In the worst case scenario, if the Appeal is denied, the mud hole next to your house will be a blight on the neighborhood for years to come. The Planning Commission requires one year before the project can be resubmitted, then if the actuarial tables catch up to Fred, his estate will go to Probate. Four years is about average for a large estate in California. In his case because he owns real estate in Mexico and Columbia there needs to be Ancillary Probates in those countries. Add a couple more years for those 2 countries to settle and taxes paid. If any of the inheritors Contest the will, add more time to settle that. Again, this is the worst case but it could add up to a decade or more.

I will forward to you a drawing set of the latest design revisions although we may have already sent them to you.

Please E-mail Joe removing your groups' objections so we can proceed with our part in improving the appearance and value of the neighborhood.

Regards, Jim Anderson

**Sidor, Joe (Joseph) x5262**

Received by HCD-Planning  
on January 28, 2021.

**From:** Jim Anderson <jaseeyou199@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:29 PM  
**To:** Natalie Nielsen & Tom O'Brien  
**Cc:** Fred Miranda; chad Brown; Sidor, Joe (Joseph) x5262  
**Subject:** Project next door

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ]

Dear Natalie

I am writing to you in the role of project manager for the 2 houses next door to you. Joe Sidor, the county planner assigned to our application, will be presenting our appeal to the Planning Commission on March 16. If the appeal is rejected, we will have to wait one year before re-submitting. You may have read that Pebble Beach Corp. took 26 years to finally get approval for their project. to expand the Lodge etc. 3 years ago.

It would strengthen our case substantially if you would drop your groups' objections. Over the course of 3 versions of the plans we have reduced the site coverage of the house nearer to you (PLN 190098) from 2900 to 2776 sq. feet and the house next to the canyon (PLN190097) from 2863 to 2593 sq. feet. Similarly the height above the street has been reduced by 6 feet and 5 feet respectively. A short E-mail to Joe at [SidorJ@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:SidorJ@co.monterey.ca.us) is all it takes.

In the worst case scenario, if the Appeal is denied, the mud hole next to your house will be a blight on the neighborhood for years to come. The Planning Commission requires one year before the project can be resubmitted, then if the actuarial tables catch up to Fred, his estate will go to Probate. Four years is about average for a large estate in California. In his case because he owns real estate in Mexico and Columbia there needs to be Ancillary Probates in those countries. Add a couple more years for those 2 countries to settle and taxes paid. If any of the inheritors Contest the will, add more time to settle that. Again, this is the worst case but it could add up to a decade or more.

I will forward to you a drawing set of the latest design revisions although we may have already sent them to you.

Please E-mail Joe removing your groups' objections so we can proceed with our part in improving the appearance and value of the neighborhood.

Regards, Jim Anderson