

Exhibit G

This page intentionally left blank.

Exhibit G1_Comment Letter_Craig_PLN160373

From: Steve Craig
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:33 PM
To: Guthrie, Jaime S. x6414
Subject: Re: PLN160373 Hopkins Staff Report - comments

On behalf of the Citizens Planning Alliance, we would like to make the following substantive comments about this proposed approval:

1. First, the County should proceed with conditioning, as this is a Code Enforcement item, that the owners are not familiar with planning law, permitting and related tasks common to rural homeownership. Therefore, we believe a constructed (not mobile home) house completion bond, with an attached timeline with corresponding timelines for bond reduction should be required. Had the owners been lawfully using their land in the first place, this type of condition would not be required.
2. Exhibit A was not contained in the emailed staff report, only a placeholder page, so we request this approval be postponed for one week.
3. item 1 findings, issues d and e: does this amount of tree removal include the work to comply with a fuel modification plan or grading of the road. If the pre-lawful grading of the road was done without permits, replacement planting should be done based on a reconstruction of removals by an arborist. Again, does the count of tree removals and slope percentage include roadways?
4. Item f: either an archaeologist or qualified native american should be present during any grading. Otherwise, archaeological sites are often destroyed since they are not recognizable without specialized skills and training. The Owl Clan, Aquiti Foundation, reside in the immediate area and could perform this service, or any qualified SOPA archaeologist could be retained.
5. Item g approves the installation of 5 five) 5,000 gallon water tanks, nearly triple the fire requirement. A condition should be put in place that prohibits the filling of these tanks with water imported from the Salinas or Paso Robles Basins without Monterey County Water Resources approval for temporary emergency use. Such a large water storage system would require a large capacity well, or water import, and further suggests that one use of the rather large garage and workshop is potentially for marijuana cultivation, which is limited in this zone to 100 square feet. There is no evidence in the record suggesting a permitted well of sufficient capacity without impacting a cone of depression that would effect neighboring properties exists.
6. All Code Enforcement reviews should be routed to the LUAC, otherwise, local participation by neighboring properties is not possible until the very end of the planning process. This is upside down planning, and participation should occur at the beginning not the end of the

process.

7. This finding is only true if the capacity of the well to refill the proposed storage is balanced and can occur without cone of depression impacts to neighboring parcels. Also, the canyon where this parcel is located is subject to Convection Burns, which are a danger to human life if a home in this setting is not promptly evacuated. It is also likely the only fire suppression the house will get is air drops given the configuration of the canyon and its steepness and depth.

8. We understand that the intent of this approval is to solve a code violation; however, if the owners need to abandon their efforts due to illness or death, or if the property is sold, the conditions should explicitly state that all requirements in the conditions pass with the ownership. Many people start life in this rugged region with good intentions for retirement, for example, but end up leaving properties for Code Enforcement to clean up. A fine example of the type of real mess that this repeated situation creates is the destroyed mobile home and septic tank along Bryson Hesperia Road that has been in Code Enforcement for years and still remains a mess and property value reducer. Therefore, a mobile home clean up bond should be required to save the County from complex taking procedures to clean up an abandoned trailer home. I am sure Code Enforcement staff would support such a bond to avoid very complex steps to otherwise clean up after abandoned properties.

9. Technically, the only conditions applied to this approval appear in the Notes section at the back of the staff report. This project should be fully bonded and conditioned. Hopefully the owners understand Marijuana Commercial Cultivation is not legal in the RG zone, even if done in an enclosed garage.

Utility services are not mentioned, but I presume this project will be served by PG and E, and a line extension will be required.

Thank you for the "late" opportunity to comment and please use the LUAC in the future as a vehicle for public participation in Code Enforcement items. Code staff is responsible for protecting our property values, particularly for those of us who have "gone through the permit system".

Steve Craig
for
Citizen Planning Alliance
Bryson, California

> On Apr 4, 2017, at 8:13 AM, Guthrie, Jaime S. x6414 <GuthrieJS@co.monterey.ca.us> wrote:

>

> <PLN160373 - HopkinsAP.pdf>

From: charles rowley
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 3:33 PM
To: Guthrie, Jaime S. x6414
Subject: New Development Approval 72961 Bryson Hesperia Road:
PLN160373 / Parcel # 424-051-064-000

Monterey County Planning Staff,

Regarding the notice for a new residence and land use approval on Bryson-Hesperia Road:

1. Water Tank Proposal: I understand that the applicant is applying for five, 5,000 gallon water storage tanks, which well exceeds requirements by CDF for standard rural housing and farming. Based on current development patterns, since the passage of legalizing Cannabis growing operations in Monterey County, the request indicates that Cannabis growing may be part of the plan. I would ask to encourage that the approval of the conventional 10,000 gallons of water storage, or whatever the current minimum might be, is planned to be enforced conforming with conventional residential / farming or whatever the present CDF standards might be. The site is not farmland, but steeply sloped canyon area.

2. Ridgeline Ordinance: Already, in this location, there are questionable “outbuildings” that impact the ridgeline view on Bryson-Hesperia Road in this vicinity. Enforcing current violations (dilapidated modular structures and outbuildings) and ensuring that new Building & Planning requests meet these guidelines prior to approving any new construction. this would seem reasonable. Five requested water tanks on this project may well be set on high points of the ridgeline and will impact views— preventing such impacts was the original point of the ordinance— which many of us have observed.

3. Code Enforcement: In this area of Bryson-Hesperia there are already several reported code enforcement issues that present resident/investors and which have been reported over the past two years-- violations that have not been cleared nor cleaned up— beyond visual ordinances, or health hazzards— in spite of the County’s assurances that these blights and health dept. issues would be cleared by 01/2017. If you need addresses, I can re-provide them to you. For those of us who have significantly invested in quality housing and followed the planning rules, I would add that the County should not approve new projects until code violation properties and roads issues have been fully enforced, cleared and maintained.

4. Public Works & Property Taxes: In addition to the concerns expressed above, before any new development is considered, I would add that Bryson-Hesperia & Sapaque Road have not been re-paved in 28 years— let alone filling current pot-holes. The stragey appears to be filling potholes rather than comprensive road paving and the creation of adequate shoulders. As significant taxpayers, we would like to see our roads improved. This is reasonable, considering the lack of attention to local roads. We do not need more users on the road who do not contribute to either County maintained roads, or to those roads that require local landowners to cover the costs and cooperate, fairly. Pro-rata contributiion to private shared roads is a Civil Code requirement that is broadly unenforced in our region of South County.

5. Cannabis Growing Interests: We have noticed that those who have purchased land over the past several years and who remain non-primary residents seem to aquire land for Cannabis cultivation and do not integrate to local material maintenance— let alone help with increased ingress/egress for water trucks in the dry summer/ heat season to support growing operations that do not meet on-site water support, or current zoning standards— and import water which further degrades our roads and adds to inter-landowner conflict. I am unhappyh to be put in this position due to the County’s lack of involvement in positive solutions that support all interests.

6. Cannabis: As an aside, I am not opposed to Cannabis growing operations at all— that meet our present zoning standards after a lengthy review period, in recent past. In fact, expressing my concerns has created increased and unnecessary division, misunderstandings, local animosity and created unnecessary segmentation within the evolving community. I support medical grows, which I am legally and medically entitled too. So, to be clear: I am not against mecial Cannabis.

7. If this message is not enough to review this application, I request that we have a hearing to continue to support the range of issues at stake, environmental qualtiy and appropriate levels of code enforcement on non-confiming propertyies and land use proposals.

Thank you, Charles Rowley, M.L.A.