

# Exhibit I

This page intentionally left blank.

**From:** [Blanco, Maira x5052](#)  
**To:** ["Michael Weaver"](#); [Onciano, Jacqueline x5193](#); [Pham-Gallardo, Son x5226](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Pending Admin. permits for PLN170817 and PLN170872. Request for further study and hearing.  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 20, 2018 4:23:00 PM

---

Dear Mr. Weaver,

We are in receipt of your email and will look into the matters presented below.

Thank you,

Maira

---

**From:** Michael Weaver [mailto:michaelrweaver@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 20, 2018 3:59 PM  
**To:** Onciano, Jacqueline x5193 <oncianoj@co.monterey.ca.us>; Pham-Gallardo, Son x5226 <Pham-GallardoS@co.monterey.ca.us>; Blanco, Maira x5052 <BlancoM@co.monterey.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Re: Pending Admin. permits for PLN170817 and PLN170872. Request for further study and hearing.

Monterey County RMA Planning

c/o Jacqueline Onciano, Chief of Planning

Son Pham-Gallardo, Asst. Planner

Maira Blanco, Asst. Planner

March 20, 2018

Dear Ms. Onciano, Ms. Pham-Gallardo, and Ms. Blanco,

I have had the opportunity to review both PLN170817 and PLN170872 on Accela. I have concerns and am respectfully requesting these two not be signed off tomorrow as Administrative Permits, but rather be studied more closely and be referred to the Zoning Administrator.

PLN170817  
Paul Hiss Trust  
8360 Monterra Views  
APN: 259-211-002-000  
LOT 145, Monterra Ranch

I have the following concerns and observations;

1) This lot has a designated Building Envelope with surrounding dedicated Scenic Easement. However, the

building plans submitted don't make these very clear. Where is the designated scenic easement? Plans call for 835 c.y. cut, 635 c.y. fill, but where it is being cut from and filled to, not sure. I cannot find an average natural grade on the building elevations although the building height, I believe, is listed as being feet above sea level. 406.40 Max Height minus 379.50 Main Floor is 26.9 feet. Plans call for 30 ft height.

2) The APN is 259-211-002-000. However the Staff Report for the Chief of Planning to sign, contains Exhibit B, a Draft Resolution with APN 259-101-115-000. The APN doesn't match, but owner, PLN and Situs Address do.

3) The lot is highly visual sensitive and the report says it is subject to regulations in a Design Control District "D". The "D" design Control should, I believe, trigger a referral of the plans to the Greater Monterey Peninsula LUAC for review.

I phoned Ms. Pham-Gallardo and she in turn, emailed me photos she took of staking and flagging on Lot #145.

I note these photos were then uploaded to Accela under attachments. Although not visible from Highway 68, at least at ground level, the photos show Ryan Ranch roads as well as South Boundary Road from the project site. These are both public roads with South Boundary Road bordering the Fort Ord National Monument. This is another reason for a referral to the GMP LUAC.

4) The submitted materials show no reference to the location of the easements for the public hiking trails on Monterra Ranch. Nor, does the staff report analyze compatibility with ongoing Conditions and Mitigations for the Monterra Ranch. A previous approval of a SFD in Monterra allowed, apparently in error, a driveway to cross a public hiking trail easement on Lot #75.

PLN170872  
Paul W Hiss (TR)  
8380 Monterra Views  
APN: 259-211-011-000  
LOT 154, Monterra Ranch

I have the following concerns and observations;

1) This lot also has a designated Building Envelope and surrounding Scenic Easement that is better depicted on the submitted plans. However, plans call for 200 c.y. of cut and 895 c.y. of fill and it is not clear where this will be. Thus one cannot really tell where the average natural grade of 401.8 comes from.

2) This lot is also categorized as highly visual sensitive, however, there are no photos online on Accela of staking and flagging.

Is it also visible from public roads in Ryan Ranch and on South Boundary Road? I believe Highly Visual Sensitive and "D" should be referred to the GMP LUAC for review.

3) I read the following:

"The City has no objections to this project; however, the City is requesting the two (2) Oaks proposed for removal be replaced in kind.

The project has not been conditioned to require the replacement planting of two oak trees. After reviewing the Tree Assessment and

Tree Protection Plan submitted with the application packet, staff concurs with the arborist's recommendation to not have the applicant

replace the two Oaks. This determination was made for the following reasons: Removal of these specific trees will not impact the public

viewshed and the replacement trees would result in overcrowding of trees on the lot."

I ask, what about Monterey County's requirement for oak tree protection and replacement? Usually they are replaced at a ratio greater than

one to one, I think, two or three replaced for every one cut down. Is there no room in the designated Scenic Easement area of this lot

for oak trees? And if not, there must be room in nearby Monterra to replace oak trees with enough to ensure survivability of at least two.

4) The submitted materials show no reference to the location of the easements for the public hiking trails on Monterra Ranch.

Nor, does the staff report analyze compatibility with ongoing Conditions and Mitigations for the Monterra Ranch.

A previous approval of a SFD in Monterra allowed, apparently in error, a driveway to cross a trail easement on Lot #75.

Analysis is needed to prevent mistakes like this from happening again.

Thank you,

Mike Weaver

Phone: 831-484-6659

This page intentionally left blank