

Caitlin Schafer - Fwd: Comments on ADU ordinance (7/18/19 Planning Commission Agenda)

From: PBS PBS
To: Julia Acker
Date: 7/17/2019 11:34 AM
Subject: Fwd: Comments on ADU ordinance (7/18/19 Planning Commission Agenda)

Planning & Building Services Staff

County of Mendocino

Main Office:

860 N. Bush St, Ukiah CA 95482

Phone: [\(707\) 234-6650](tel:(707)234-6650)

Coast Office:

120 W. Fir St, Fort Bragg CA 95437

Phone: [\(707\) 964-5379](tel:(707)964-5379)

Web: www.co.mendocino.ca.us/planning/

>>> Chris Wuest <chriswuestb15@gmail.com> 7/16/2019 6:46 PM >>>

Chris Wuest
46680 Iversen Lane
Gualala 95445
[\(707\)884-9282](tel:(707)884-9282)
chriswuestb15@gmail.com

July 16, 2019

Re:
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT OA_2018-0009/GP_2018-0003
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 18, 2019

To the Mendocino County Planning Commission,

I am unable to attend the July 18 hearing in person and would therefor like to enter the following comments and remarks regarding the above referenced draft ordinance into the record.

With regard to Coastal Resource Protection (Section 20.458.045)

A. "On parcels zoned FL and TPZ, an ADU may only be permitted in locations where **no timber removal is necessary.**"

As the comments by the Coastal Commission in the Letter from 6/13/2019 point out,

3. There seems to be a high desire to maintain an intact forest for visual reasons alone as indicted by the preference for hiding housing in the wooded areas of a parcel, preventing ADU's from being visible, too far away from the primary residence, too close to an ESHA, not allowed as VHR's.

4. The inclusion of VHR's in the ADU regulations obviously aims at promoting tourism and allowing some property owners (but not all equally) to benefit from it.

Letting everyone have a share of the tourist trade by allowing VHR ADU's in all zoning districts would bring a certain fairness to the local property owners but would likely have a detrimental effect on the housing policies.

If there is a desired discrimination, the ordinance should make a connection between the two opposing policy intentions and set out criteria for resolving it rather than using "resource protection" as an excuse for creating different classes of ownership.

I am expecting my County government to prioritize the needs of the County residents over the desires of the Coastal Commission and to stand up for fairness and clarity.

C. With regard to:

- An ADU may not be permitted **on a parcel** within 200 feet of lands that are designated AG, RL, FL or TPZ unless.....
-

This does not clearly qualify which parcels are affected.

Please clarify the language to state that this refers to a **parcel zoned residential** (see Coastal Commission comment highlighted below:)

*"Standard for **residential development** adjacent to agricultural and timber lands: Certified LUP Policies 3.2-9 and 3.3-8 require that site plans **in a residential area** not result in a residential structure being closer than 200 feet from a parcel designated for agricultural and forest lands use, respectively, unless there is no other feasible building site on the parcel. To carry out these policies, we recommend adding a criteria to proposed §20.504.020 prohibiting ministerial CDPs for ADUs (**in residential zones**) located within 200 feet of agricultural and forest land parcels."*

I appreciate your consideration and look forward to an improved draft sent onward to the Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,
Chris Wuest