

## Exhibit D

This page intentionally left blank.

## Ku, Cheryl x6049

---

**From:** Michael Weaver <michaelrweaver@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 12:18 PM  
**To:** Ku, Cheryl x6049  
**Cc:** Swanson, Brandon xx5334; Onciano, Jacqueline x5193; Holm, Carl P. x5103; VanHorn, Roger W. x4763  
**Subject:** Re: PLN170092 Wayland - request for hearing

*Cheryl Ku, Senior Planner  
Monterey County RMA-Planning  
1441 Schilling Place ~ Second Floor  
Salinas, CA 93901  
(831) 796-6049 work (831) 757-9516 fax  
[www.co.monterey.ca.us/pbi](http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/pbi)*

---

April 13, 2018

Dear Cheryl Ku,

Thanks for returning my phone call and also for sending the well permit and some other information on the water well drilled in year 2016.

The well permit was for a domestic, single connection permit and the Permit was issued in 2015 for APN 173-062-008-000, and was issued for a specific location on that APN. But, this application's APN is 173-062-011-000.

I spent some time on the County Accela website. There are a lot of links that lead to other links, that lead to other links, surrounding this current PLN. The reason for this email letter is I respectfully request a formal public hearing on this application. This project needs clarification.

For example:

Knowing that this "008" parcel and some surrounding parcels were subjects of two Minor Subdivision applications a few years ago I was curious as to where "008" was located.

I learned that APN 173-062-008-000 no longer exists. That parcel, and some nearby parcels owned by Wayland family members have been subjects of not one but two fairly recent lot line adjustments.

There was a PLN050330, circa 2016, that adjusted the boundaries of three existing lots labeled Lot A, Lot B, and Lot C, now 38.3, 38.6 and 10.2 acres

There was also a PLN150624, circa 2016, that adjusted APN's 173-062-008-000 and 173-062-007-000

However, according to the Assessor's website map 007 still shows as existing, but 008 has disappeared and is now a Portion of Lot A 14.9 ac. +/- and Adjusted Portion Parcel B 23.65 acres

Further, there is a PLN170740, Current permit Staus is Void. However it has information on a new road that crosses six APN's and possibly two other parcels whose APN's are not identified on a submitted document.

Also found, a Code Enforcement violation 16CE00463 of unpermitted grading on the following six APN's

173-062-002-000

173-062-003-000

173-062-007-000

173-062-008-000

173-062-009-000

173-062-010-000

It called for a Restoration Plan to clear the code enforcement violation

There is a note on the County Accela site that states (all in capital letters):

NOTE: APNS 173-062-007-000 and 173-062-008-000 WILL NO LONGER BE VALID. BOTH PARCELS WERE PART OF A LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT (PLN150624) AND CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE WERE ISSUED 4/26/17 UNDER CC170012 & CC170013. ANY NEW PERMITS SHOULD BE PROCESSED UNDER NEW PARCEL NUMBERS.

The point to this IS there is enough confusion surrounding this application that it should be carefully reviewed and not just signed off as an Administrative Permit. I'll grant you a SFD is not that big of a deal. However, there are questions surrounding it that should be answered. Why? Because many of the other APN's are now for sale. Clarifying things now, will very likely save RMA both work and headaches

in the near future. It may well clarify things for the current property owners and future property owners.

Some questions:

1) Why does 007 still show on the Assessor's map page? Despite the note on the County Accela webpage 173-062-007-000 shows a recording date of 9/29/2017 on the assessor's site and is 4.730 acres in size. Document 2017052743. A current Googleearth photo shows there is a baseball field on it.

2) The County of Monterey Assessor's Map Book 173, Page 06-2 went from showing 9 APN's to 10 APN's. How did this happen? 008 disappeared, 011 and 012 appeared.

3) The well permit issued for 008 I think is now 011, or part of it. However, where is the language on this SFD application/approval that the well for 008 for a domestic single connection permit now applies to the APN 011?

4) I understand the water quality test for the well drilled on former 008 is high for arsenic, at least at this point in time. Should not that be noted in the staff report and on any approvals? County policy is that it is ok for a SFD to have a new well high in arsenic if used by one SFD, but a well serving two or more connections it will not be allowed. It may save the County some grief if this APN 011 property is subsequently sold to another party. It should be noted for future reference. The staff report for PLN170092, as written states that the water quality was approved by EHB.

5) According to the documents associated with PLN170740, the code enforcement violation is cleared for APN 011 with the issuance of a building permit. What happens to the other five APN's that were a part of 16CE00463? Was there restoration? Are these APN parcels on hold pending building applications?

Thank you for consideration of my request for a public hearing.

Sincerely,

Mike Weaver  
831-484-2243

This page intentionally left blank