

**From:** [Jacob Patterson](#)  
**To:** [Peters, Sarah](#); [CDD User](#)  
**Cc:** [Miller, Tabatha](#); [O'Neal, Chantell](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment -- 7/21/21 Special PC Mtg., Item No. 4C  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 6:09:33 PM

---

Fort Bragg Planning Commission,

I am perplexed that the draft Planning Commission denial resolution prepared by staff is not consistent with the clear direction of the Planning Commission from the last meeting. Although it has been narrowed and the extra findings were removed per your direction, it only includes one of the two findings for denial that you made at the initial public hearing and it omits the other finding for denial based on inadequate notice. The Planning Commission was very clear that the denial resolution should include both findings of denial and the finding that the necessary notice had not been made has been omitted without explanation. This should be remedied by the Planning Commission by requiring both findings for denial in the resolution you adopt. The other finding concerning posted notices provided distinct grounds for denial in addition to the finding that was included in the draft resolution. The direction to staff was very clear and it has not been followed. Please fix this issue when you take up this item at your special meeting.

Thanks,

--Jacob

**From:** [Jacob Patterson](#)  
**To:** [Peters, Sarah](#); [CDD User](#)  
**Cc:** [Miller, Tabatha](#); [O'Neal, Chantell](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment -- 7/21/21 Special PC Mtg., Item No. 4C  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 20, 2021 8:00:07 PM

---

Planning Commission,

Correction to my prior comment.

Upon a more careful reading, the draft resolution doesn't actually include any findings, only recitals (aka "whereas" clauses) and then a statement that the Planning Commission denies the permit. The middle section of a resolution where the review authority actually makes findings was deleted in its entirety, although one piece was moved to the factual recitals without any clear context to why it is being included there. This is usually written in a similar manner to the following:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fort Bragg Planning Commission makes the following findings and determinations: ...

OR

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Fort Bragg Planning Commission, based on the entirety of the record before it, hereby finds as follows: ...

In the least, the resolution should include a simple finding that the Planning Commission is incorporating the foregoing recitals as formal findings, otherwise you aren't actually making any findings, only reciting relevant facts and then resolving to deny the permit. I believe the focus of the discussion in the prior meetings was on making sure the Planning Commission had supportable findings for denial so having a resolution that actually involves the Planning Commission making these findings is important.

Also, the resolution states that the meeting is a regular meeting when it should read special meeting.

Thanks,

--Jacob

On Tue, Jul 20, 2021 at 6:09 PM Jacob Patterson <[jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com](mailto:jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Fort Bragg Planning Commission,

I am perplexed that the draft Planning Commission denial resolution prepared by staff is not consistent with the clear direction of the Planning Commission from the last meeting. Although it has been narrowed and the extra findings were removed per your direction, it only includes one of the two findings for denial that you made at the initial public hearing and it omits the other finding for denial based on inadequate notice. The Planning Commission was very clear that the denial resolution should include both findings of denial and the finding that the necessary notice had not been made has been omitted without explanation. This should be remedied by the Planning Commission by requiring both findings for denial in the resolution you adopt. The other finding concerning posted notices

provided distinct grounds for denial in addition to the finding that was included in the draft resolution. The direction to staff was very clear and it has not been followed. Please fix this issue when you take up this item at your special meeting.

Thanks,

--Jacob

**From:** [Jenny Shattuck](#)  
**To:** [Peters, Sarah](#)  
**Subject:** public comment, planning commission meeting July 21, 2021  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 21, 2021 2:52:52 PM

---

I am very concerned for many reason about tonight's agenda. This seems that it is a near repeat of last week with the same issues. When planning commissioners give explicit direction to staff regarding decisions. From the start of this project, before denial, it seemed city staff informed commissioners that they did not need to attend the meeting it was set to be heard on. Then, city staff says, since no one is in attendance we will have to hear this administratively. So it is approved. Then goes to Commission on appeal. How was it approved in the first place when proper notice, dates and more were not correct? Then, last meeting, commission gives direction for corrections. However, it is still not correct. This seems to be the new normal, and is not only unfair to applicants and the public, but also the planning commissioners who put much time and effort into making informed decisions. When the information provided is not truthful, for example, Goodies, was not a pizza delivery establishment, it changes the narrative, because one would most likely believe that staff is presenting the truth. Public comment is the only way that the community, that city staff work for, has input at meetings. To hear city staff say they would prefer there be no public comment, as if it is a joke, was a slap in the face to those who had paid to be heard that night. I know that I am not the only one frustrated with what has been happening. Many of us appreciate the hard work off staff and the commission, and it is shocking, that once again, the commission may have to repeat their direction to staff. Again.

Jenny Shattuck  
Fort Bragg

**From:** [Mary Rose Kaczorowski](#)  
**To:** [mrkaczorowski](#)  
**Subject:** To Those Who Care about The Mendocino Coast and Fort Bragg  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:32:43 PM

---

Dear All,

I think there is something radically out of kilter regarding the implementation for the vision of Ft. Bragg's future. I hope you arrive at the same conclusion.

Please kindly take some quality time to read this.

As we all know municipal officials have a responsibility to attract economic development to their communities to provide jobs and tax revenues to support a variety of services in a manner that allows them to achieve the vision for the region to preserve a rural character of life for current and future residents.

Municipal actors can amend and adopt local development and conservation ordinances consistent with a plan to achieve these various goals and objectives provided that a fair share of regional housing growth is planned for the region.

I see this as working with the County of Mendocino regarding areas adjacent to the City of Ft. Bragg. Various federal and state agencies rely on multi-municipal plans and ordinances when reviewing applications for funding, projects and permitting of facilities.

Cooperative planning has always led to the identification of common needs and common solutions while each municipal and county entity has the ability to retain its own autonomy and governing bodies.

**Fort Bragg is a tiny town with a relatively small land footprint that cannot accommodate every development whim. The problem Fort Bragg faces is the siting of commercial development near residential and pedestrian areas which then create for the city a lack of control over commercial uses which might have a negative impact on residential uses located near them.**

**Please look at these City Generated Documents (just a random sampling of many).**

Think about the time, energy and cost and where are we now in relation to all this

paper that no one looks at or adheres to.

Do note that many public scoping sessions with archived results are difficult to find.

NOTE: There is not a substantive dedicated analysis or outreach to bring commercial enterprises or employers other than the most promising and innovative Noyo Center for Marine Sciences which could be accelerated. However - there is no housing to accommodate visiting researchers etc.

Also, the opportunity to partner with Mendocino College can turn available parcels near the Fort Campus into student and visiting faculty housing that would meet CEQA and Coastal Commission standards. We already have a world-renowned woodworking school. **Are we not overlooking existing local successes and not amplifying it?**

**From 2018**

<https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/1809/Downtown-Vision-Poster-Front-PDF?bidId=>

**2014 HOUSING ELEMENT**

<https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/3659/Element-10--Housing-Element-2014-PDF>

**From 2009**

<https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/1522/Illustrative-Vision-Plan?bidId=>

**Community Design Element 2008**

<https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/1257/Element-06--Community-Design-PDF?bidId=>

**City Council Goal-Setting Retreat.** from CITY NOTES April 21, 2011

"The City Council spent an entire Saturday in early

April reviewing progress on goals established four years ago and refining its priorities for the future. The Council's vision statement for Fort Bragg still rings true: "Fort Bragg is a small town with a strong sense of community that seeks to preserve its natural beauty while providing exceptional public facilities and infrastructure, safe streets, and a well-planned framework for sustainable development and prosperity." While the Council was justifiably proud of the City's accomplishments, the City's current budgetary challenges

helped frame the discussion of goals and priority work-activities in the future."

<https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/1720/04-21-2011-City-Notes?bidId=>

Housing for too long has been kicked down the road. Formula Stores and Cannabis get more attention. One DANCO project at a time is not enough if we are to meet the State of California's mandate for Our County and City's housing requirements.

"[California's housing-element law](#) acknowledges that, in order for the private market to adequately address the housing needs and demand of Californians, local governments

must adopt plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for (and do not unduly constrain), housing development. As a result, housing policy in California rests largely on the effective implementation of local general plans and local housing elements.”

The last time that I looked at the Vision Statement for the City of Fort Bragg CHART ( which I cannot find again on the City Website) those two categories of Formula and Big Box Businesses and cannabis businesses development were not a priority!

In the past few months, I spoke with folks who moved here to take jobs in the hospitality industry or medical services. Several planned on leaving due to housing conditions or affordability in relation to wages.

I was taking a walk along a nature trail and came upon a young woman who was on the phone - talking to someone about the "awful housing and lousy liar landlords here" her words not mine. She was looking to leave and sorry she came up here.

Last week I talked to a medical practitioner somewhat new to the area - surprised she could not find dentists taking new patients here.

The few dentists that are still left are not taking new patients. One dental office told me their younger dental hygienist who recently came to work here on the coast is leaving- Fort Bragg. They also cannot accommodate the demand for dental hygienist appointments.

What are the priorities then I ask? Cannabis, Grocery Outlets? Hotel, motel accommodation for visitors? We have “The Bakery” on Main Street, visitors feel fooled when they discover it is a Cannabis dispensary and there is no Glass Beach, Laurel Deli is not a Deli—should I go on?

**Finally- there are a lot of myths and noise about why LOCAL employers cannot find employees.**

Please review the KQED article (link below) entitled: *Low Pay, No Benefits, Rude Customers: Restaurant Workers Quit at Record Rate*

<https://www.kqed.org/arts/13900094/restaurant-workers-quit-record-rate-pay-increases>

Here on the Coast, we have seasonal, part-time jobs and now a housing crisis. Airbnb's, and Vacation Rentals keep getting approved (Countywide).

For every NEW Business Formula and Big Box Store being approved it should be required that they build AFFORDABLE housing to accommodate at least 50% of their part-time and full time LOCAL workers if they cannot pay a Living wage plus full benefits!

Thank you for reading this!

My Best Regards,

**Mary Rose Kaczorowski**, M.T.S.- Judeo-Christian, Islamic & Buddhist Ethical Traditions, Pacific School of Religion/Graduate Theological Union;

B.A. - Public Policy Mills College; A.A. Humanities and Environmental Sciences -  
College of the Redwoods, Fort Bragg/Eureka CA ; Advanced Certificate - Non-Profit  
Management California State University, Hayward

<https://muckrack.com/mary-rose-kaczorowski>

How to pronounce my name? <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5SIk7LKjTY>

"Be calm, like a giant tree in a storm."