

**From:** [Annemarie](#)  
**To:** [CDD User](#)  
**Cc:** [O'Neal, Chantell](#)  
**Subject:** public comments Formula Business Resolution Spec. Planning Commission meeting 6-2-21 Item 6A  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 2:55:51 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Comment Sp. Planning Comm. meeting 6-2-21 item 6A, 21-268 .odt](#)

---

Hi,  
Please accept my comments.  
Thanks, Annemarie Weibel

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Public Comment Special Planning Commission meeting 6-2-21 item 6A, 21-268

I want to thank the Planning Commission, City Council and City staff for being close to adopting a resolution for a formula business ordinance to amend the Inland Land Use and Development Code (provide additional regulations).

This has been a long overdue issue. It has been in the works for 4 years.

Reading the staff report I want to share with you that I am very concerned with the already current proliferation of small fast food/quick service restaurants. Already some gas stations offer these products. We definitely do not need a Burger King, Arby's, Chick-fil-A, Chipotle, Wendy's, Applebee's etc.

As this ordinance will only be addressed in the Inland Land Use and Development Code there will be an increased proliferation of these small fast food/quick service restaurants in the Coastal Zoning areas.

Please exclude all future small fast food/quick service restaurants from the exemption. Many of these encourage unhealthy food habits, empty calories (have little or no nutritional value), provide a diet based on sugar and salt, are not homegrown, have no mineral value, cause diabetes, obesity even in children and are potentially cancer causing as they might also contain red, yellow and green dyes. These meals are often packaged in styrofoam, plastic, or aluminum that end up in the land fill.

With a potential Grocery Outlet and a potential Dollar General there would be plenty of small fast food/quick service food items available.

In addition I would like to bring to your attention that the Consistency with Planning Policies lists Policy CD-2.1 on page 11 of staff report, but not under Amendment Findings on page 12. See 18.94.060(B)(1)(a), neither is it listed in the Resolution (see a).

In addition, the staff report lists information on page 12 twice (see 18.94.060(B)(1)(b)).

It would be helpful if the public and also the Commissioners would have a map that clearly defines the Coastal Zoning Areas and the Inland Zoning Areas.

Even though the City Council on April 12, 2021 failed to adopt an Urgency Ordinance for a Formula Business Moratorium in the Coastal Zoning Areas it is still very much needed in order for Fort Bragg not to turn into "Anywhere USA!" We know that having it approved by the Coastal Commission will take close to a year alone. With the mill site opening up we need to be more proactive.

Please work on an Ordinance for a Formula Business Moratorium in the Coastal Zoning Areas. A lot of the research done with this Ordinance can be used also for the Coastal Zoning Areas.

AN ORDINANCE ADDING CHAPTER 18.46 FORMULA BUSINESS REGULATIONS TO TITLE 18.4 under section 4 page 8 & 9 of 11 pages lists UP(2). What does it refer to? Also on page 9 it is referred to Formula Business- less than 2,001 sf, when everywhere else it is referred to as less than 2,000 sf?

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel

**From:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**To:** [CDD User](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public comment for 6A  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 8:45:30 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Megan Caron <megancaroon27@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 8:44 AM  
To: Lemos, June <JLemos@fortbragg.com>  
Subject: Public comment for 6A

Planning Commisioners,

Please consider keeping large formula businesses with a footprint larger than 3000 ft.<sup>2</sup> off of Franklin street between Walnut and Fir streets. Allowing large scale commercial development on a narrow 2 lane street that is often shared with residential properties is simply poor planning. It would be extremely shortsighted to jeopardize the stability and vitality (and real estate values) of the existing neighborhoods along Franklin Street with large scale commercial development.

As a community that has very limited space to develop and expand its neighborhoods, we should be developing the available land for much-needed workforce housing. Large scale commercial development belongs along the highway 1 Corridor where it will not have a negative impact on existing residential neighborhood.

Thank you,  
Megan Caron  
Fort Bragg

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Paul Clark](#)  
**To:** [CDD User](#)  
**Cc:** [CMAR \(CMAR@MCN.ORG\)](mailto:CMAR@MCN.ORG)  
**Subject:** Planning commission 06022021  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:31:59 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

## **6. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Receive Report, Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt a Resolution  
Providing a Recommendation to City Council Regarding an Inland Land  
Use and Development Code Amendment Regulating Formula Business  
**6A 21-268**

A few comments on the ordinance proposed. Section 1 paragraph 1 “the coastal views and beauty are critical to what makes Fort Bragg Special”. Well we now have 3.5 miles of ocean front trail available, Pomo Bluff park and miles of State owned parks and land. The views have never been this good in over one hundred years, but it is never enough.

“a strong sense of community that values its roots in the fishing and timber industries” Really? The commission worries about planted trees on Franklin street. The timber folks all had chain saws in their trucks, and heated often with wood. What roots was being referred too? You would need an arborist to tell if a tree can be cut down if many had their way. Not much value shown to timber history. Fishing too, for that matter. Trees are crops to the timber world. They grow back.

8 “ exempt from CEQA” hmmm I have heard this one recently. This is a huge impact to the town and it is “ exempt”?

Section 2 take a look at the sign requirements, they all look like any other city in the country. Gone are the big signs that were here, no off site signs allowed but for directional for parks etc. Who would find Colombi Motel or the Colonial Inn, signs all gone from Main Street. Part of the historic Fort Bragg I would think, but now banned.

As you know I oppose this ordinance and I promise you I will be the first to say “ I told you so” when some good business walks or just says no to Fort Bragg.

I am reminded that the County of Mendocino said no to Costco years ago and housing on the Masonite site, still industrial, but Costco is of course now in the city of Ukiah generating untold sales tax that could have been in the county. Be very careful in what you are doing.

There is the chance that some businesses could locate out of Fort Bragg, in the County, remote, but not totally out of the question. And their business license fees are quite reasonable as compared to Fort Bragg.

As spoked at the last planning commission, the road over the hill is used daily by locals to shop. This will insure that continues forever.

I just don't see a lot of common sense being applied here. Wishing that Amazon had not changed the world of retail does not change the facts.

Paul Clark

**From:** [Star Decker](#)  
**To:** [CDD User](#)  
**Subject:** Re: public comment on box stores  
**Date:** Thursday, May 27, 2021 11:07:41 AM

---

TWIMC;

We are local, coastal shoppers who do not want to see a grocery outlet or other kinds of big box stores selling cheap products in our town of Fort Bragg. We support Harvest Market, Safeway, Down Home Foods and farmers markets. Let folks who want to buy cheap goods go to Willits or Ukiah like they always do. Our vacant stores need to be filled with interesting products that are useful and attract tourists. Landlords need to be encouraged and helped (with funds?) to fix up their property. Local industry making biodegradable products?

Please take in to consideration that our town is unique and quaint. Don't turn it into "every other strip mall look". When tourists ask for Walmart we say go back to the strip malls where you live and buy that cheap land fill crap!

We love our town and SHOP LOCAL!!! And we are not rich! We grow food as well. Times are changing and we need to get on board.

Thank You,

Star Decker

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**From:** [Jacob Patterson](#)  
**To:** [Peters, Sarah](#)  
**Cc:** [Miller, Tabatha](#); [CDD User](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment -- 6/2/21 PC Mtg., Item No. 6A, Formula Business Ordinance  
**Date:** Saturday, May 29, 2021 3:32:01 PM

---

Paragraph 8 of the ordinance concerning CEQA needs to be revised to correct grammatical errors and incomplete sentence structure. That said, the City's reliance on this exemption seems appropriate under the circumstances. However, reliance on the categorical exemption does not make the project exempt from CEQA, it only means that the project is exempt from further environmental review under CEQA. Since corrections are necessary, that technical distinction should be corrected at the same time.

I also think the findings need to be applied to Design Review permits if the design review applies to a formula business, not just the new formula business use permits. The need for these specific design review findings is demonstrated in the recent Grocery Outlet entitlement review, IMO. Only applying the design-related findings to the use permit process and not the design review process leaves a large regulatory loophole. The easiest way to address this is to add design review to Section 18.46.040 to read "In addition to the findings required by 18.71.060 (F) as prerequisite to the issuance of a use permit, the Planning Commission shall make all of the following findings prior to the issuance of a Use Permit **or Design Review** for a Formula Business, unless the project is exempt in conformance with Section 18.46.050:"