

From: Jacob Patterson <jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 12:53 PM
To: cdd
Cc: Whippy, Isaac; City Clerk
Subject: Public Comment -- 6/25/25 PC Mtg., Item No. 6B, Continued Hearing

Planning Commission,

I reviewed the updated information and I have two concerns I think you need to address prior to taking any action. If you don't address them, I think you need to require a traffic analysis that is specifically directed to look into these particular safety concerns rather than the old standard of just looking at LOS issues. (Just because past traffic studies didn't address something, doesn't mean we can't tailor this requirement to our specific safety concerns; the City has that level of discretion and you should exercise it.)

First, Marie said something that is only partially true in her memo but it has a huge impact on this project and her recommendations. She is incorrect that the City has no legal authority to direct the applicant to pay for improvements to Ocean View Drive, particularly at its intersection with Harbor Avenue. If the project itself didn't contribute to the safety concerns based on existing conditions, I would agree with her but that is not the case. It is totally legal and, in fact, a standard practice, to make a developer pay for off-site street improvements to address safety concerns their project contributes to, even if existing conditions are part of the problem. That is why we calculate things called "fair share" contributions to roadway improvements. In some cases, it is even alright to impose the full cost of the off-site improvements on a developer when their project introduces additional pedestrian and vehicular crossings of dangerous intersections.

This project certainly meets those requirements but Marie has incorrectly rejected this option categorically rather than engaging in the necessary analysis to see if the particular improvements have a reasonable relationship to the project's contribution to safety concerns involving the existing conditions. In this case, there is going to be a huge and significant new traffic generator at an already concerning intersection. The safety risks exist for the current much lower level of traffic at the intersection but this project will introduce a lot more traffic and pedestrian crossings than currently occur. The percentage of the traffic from this project compared to the baseline traffic without this project is generally how you calculate what the fair share is. If the percentage is large (e.g., 70%+), it is even fine for them to pay for the full improvements because the safety issues are really the additional potential vehicle and pedestrian conflicts because this project introduces them.

Second, her recommended language for Special Condition 44 (the one dealing with this issue) leaves out all the substance and context and instead refers to an alleged "traffic safety letter dated June 23, 2025 regarding this project." How can any of us evaluate if those improvements are adequate to address our valid safety concerns if the substance is in a mystery letter that isn't provided for our review? Any document that is incorporated by reference into another document you are being asked to approve needs to be provided for your, and the public's, review but it is nowhere to be found. In addition, the letter is supposed to be dated today (Monday) but that means when Marie wrote and published this, it didn't even exist yet so how can she even say that it is sufficient to address the issues? She can't and neither

can you. We don't even know who's writing the letter or what type of expertise they have to be making the recommendations you are purportedly requiring. Please recall that regardless of the City's legal ability to impose off-site improvements to this troubling section of the road, the applicant said they were happy to have a traffic study and to implement whatever it required. If they are agreeing to do that, it is not relevant if we have the authority to require it or not, just require it anyway. If Marie is concerned, she can add in the consent language she discussed at the last meeting. However, in this case, we absolutely have the legal authority to require the developer to make improvements to Ocean View Drive and Harbor Avenue because this project is introducing the safety issues by increasing the pedestrian crossings and vehicles entering the intersection. If you want to do this right, you should require a traffic and transportation study that is tailored to these concerns. A traffic engineer--no one in Public Works is a licensed engineer, let alone a traffic engineer--should be able to analyse the situation and come up with tailored and appropriate solutions to the safety concerns but Marie, PW staff, or even the Planning Commission has the requisite expertise to do that on their own. I'd require an analysis limited to trying to improve the Ocean View Drive and Harbor Avenue intersection in a way that doesn't create any backup concerns for westbound traffic entering Ocean View Drive from Highway One. Frankly, that is what should have already been prepared because the Coastal General Plan requires it even if some standard analysis wouldn't have been useful in this particular situation. We have flexibility and discretion to determine what kind of traffic and transportation study/analysis to require for a particular project, it doesn't have to be a standard, off-the-shelf analysis of LOS or VMT without looking into project-specific safety concerns.

That being said, I am pleased with the direction this review is going and I think your discussion and direction last time was on point. Please keep up the good work but don't drop the ball.

Best regards,

--Jacob

Stump, Valerie

From: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:21 AM
To: Paul Clark; cdd
Subject: 1151 S Main. 0652025 PC meeting

The Public Hearing for the Following Item has Been Continued to July 14, 2025: "Coastal Development Permit Amendment, Use Permit and Design Review Amendments to Modify an Approved Mixed-Use Multifamily Project at 1151 S Main Street to Respond to Coastal Commission Staff Requests to: 1) Change 3 units of Multifamily Housing into 2,450 SF of Hotel Units on the Ground Floor of Building 3; and 2) add a Signed Public Access Sidewalk through the Parcel

this should be the icing on the cake to just about anyone that believes in due process the applicant put in a design opposition was expressed. we were told by Staff that the The project met the intent of the general plan and allowable uses the council approved the project basically the same as the planning commission it was appealed because it does not meet the intent and did not follow all of the required and reasonable CEQA inspections and processes. Low and behold the coastal commission agreed and rather than go to a full hearing we were told that the applicant desired to resubmit their plan. at the city Council meeting last night the above information was read suggesting that the coastal commission was requesting this change maybe it's time for the planning commission and ultimately the city Council to develop some backbone in the city does not work for the coastal commission the City of Fort Bragg has its own approved general plan and we don't need to ask the Coastal commission whether or not we're doing a good job that's what the appellant process is for and if that doesn't follow the plan right or follow all of the regulations then the court system is the next step please don't take this lightly the concerns that many of us have that the process is being trampled on just to get housing that supposedly we have a crisis I have formally requested a copy of the studies that the city used to determine that they needed 200 new units by the end of 2026 have not seen it yet I do not believe it exists but I'll be pleased if something can be produced The impression that the coastal commission is requesting this implies to you decision makers that it is right don't be fooled you've all heard the story about the wolf in sheep's clothing have you not? and sadly it brings into question who is actually pushing this project we were told the applicant but it sounds like the applicant has indirectly the coastal commission on their side that's not the way it's supposed to work I thought a long time about this process and you cannot just stick a hot dog stand outside of a residential building and call it a commercial use no matter how much you want it to be. once again this is a predominantly residential project trying to be placed into a commercially zoned property. the proper path to have taken would be to request the property be rezoned and now that we see the state mandates that are being jammed down our throats the council and planning commission should make sure that the maximum building heights that are desired cannot be overcome by a state mandated bonus of any kind. dictated so it might not come across very well but I think you get the idea thank you

sorry for the multiple emails everyone is busy so it's difficult to block out the time none of us are paid for this as it was pointed out it's a volunteer job to protect our community and keep the rural character of Fort Bragg as alive as we can keep it according to all the plans it is anyway. that's what I'm trying to do and I know most of the community feels the same way they're just not vocal and people are afraid to speak out against housing because you are convinced and have convinced yourselves that there's a crisis it's a concern what's not happening is the ability for homes that people can purchase and build equity that the city Council as I've mentioned for 20 years has gone out of its way to restrict that in the state with all of their rent controls and prop 19 have made it virtually impossible for the private sector to be in the rental business if they choose to

go into the rental business they should follow the same plans and same processes that anyone else has to do including view shed protections whether you like it or say it's not on the map or not doesn't make it right Paul Clark

Paoli, Diana

From: Teresa Skarr <teresa@seanet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 1:08 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Coastal Development Permit Amendment 8-24

Dear Ms. Paoli,

Following are my comments about failures to properly notice public hearings regarding the above-referenced permit application. These comments are in addition to the comments I previously submitted about traffic and pedestrian safety concerns. Please include these comments in the public comments section for tomorrow's Planning Commission meeting.

While preparing for the Planning Commission meeting, I became aware that the City Council's meeting on November 12, 2024, was a public hearing about the above-referenced development permit application. My husband Dave Skarr and I live at 19400 Harbor Ave., very close to the proposed development, but we didn't receive a notice about the November 12, 2024 City Council hearing. The November meeting was important because this was when the proposal was first presented publicly and at which the Council discussed and approved the applicant's density bonus incentives. We weren't notified about the application until shortly before the March 12, 2025 Planning Commission meeting about the project, soon after we first became aware of it from neighbors.

Failure to properly notify close neighbors of a development like this is contrary to legal regulatory requirements and undermines the integrity of the hearing.

In addition, the physical public notice currently posted at the proposed development site is very small for the location, low to the ground and illegible, particularly from the Spanish language side which faces west into thick weeds. See attached photographs taken today at the property from Unnamed Road.

Furthermore, there are no witness poles at the proposed development site to signal the locations and heights of the proposed buildings.

~Teresa Skarr





Paoli, Diana

From: Teresa Skarr <teresa@seanet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 12:34 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Coastal Development Permit Amendment (8-24/A)

Dear Ms. Paoli,

Following are my comments about pedestrian and traffic safety issues relating to the proposed development at 1151 S. Main St. Please include these as part of the public comments for the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow, June 25, 2025.

The amended special conditions on the resolutions for tomorrow's meeting includes a requirement for a pedestrian path through the development, which is stated to be the result of the Coastal Commission's responses to appeals. It is difficult to understand how our appeals about zoning requirements and traffic safety resulted in this amendment. The appellants were not included in any of the discussions with the Coastal Commission and those conversations were all held privately without any public records or hearings. This path raises additional safety concerns in the area, especially for pedestrians, and the proposed sign for the path is misleading.

Proposed Special Condition 43 of the resolutions for tomorrow's Planning Commission meeting includes a requirement for a sign for this proposed path that reads, "Public access trail. Public access is available through the property to Pomo Bluffs Park. Part of this route is NOT ADA accessible." The proposed wording for this sign is misleading because the proposed end of the path at the northwest corner of the subject property is at the middle of Harbor Ave. approximately 1000 feet south of Pomo Bluffs Park. See attached photograph, taken today at the northwest corner of the subject property facing north on Harbor Ave. The park is not visible to pedestrians when they arrive at the end of the proposed path. There is a vacant lot directly northwest of the subject property, which is privately owned and could be confused for a park due to the location and misleading signage on the proposed path. Furthermore, the applicant has no plan to improve the section of Harbor Ave. between the subject property and Pomo Bluffs Park. The road is a narrow, dirt and gravel road with deep potholes and no sidewalks. Cars routinely speed and veer to avoid the many potholes. If the subject development is built, there will be more cars using the road, creating even more hazards for pedestrians using the path through the subject property.

The proposed development at 1151 S. Main St. brings many new questions about traffic and pedestrian safety on the city streets on and around the development. The City's consultants for this project have focused their attention on California's calculations regarding peak hour vehicle trips to determine whether traffic studies are warranted. A more appropriate question would be, does the Planning Commission and City Council have enough data to support their resolution for tomorrow's meeting that *"The proposed location of the use and conditions*

under which it may be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.”

Staff Reports for previous meetings and the Memo from CA Traffic Solution that was attached to the agenda for tomorrow's meeting purport that the previous traffic study done for the AutoZone project is applicable to the current proposed development at the same location. The following table highlights some key differences between these 2 proposed developments.

Characteristic	AutoZone	Fort Bragg Apartments
Driveways	1 driveway to Unnamed Road.	3 total driveways, including 1 to Unnamed Road and 2 to Harbor Ave.
Parking lot	26 parking spots	108 parking spots
Demographics and Use Characteristics	Most auto parts shoppers are adults of driving age	More children playing outside over time, more bicycles and pedestrians, many more people present (~200 residents + visitors).
Hours of operation	Retail daytime hours	Day and night
Visibility	Access to store free of parked vehicles along Unnamed Road and no Harbor Ave. access.	Both sides of Unnamed Road and Harbor Ave. would be lined with parked cars filling the new parking spaces proposed there. Due to driveways from the development to Harbor Ave., many more drivers would have to navigate the dangerous, low visibility intersection of Harbor Ave. and OceanView Drive.

I agree with Chair Jensen that traffic studies are not always helpful. Specifically, I agree the study conducted for the Hare Creek development wasn't very helpful. However, the City has the authority to require robust studies and direct the specific questions to be answered. In the case of the Hare Creek development traffic study, the "GHD Response" attachment to the March 23, 2015 City Council meeting provides the emails the firm received from the city that limited the scope of their study.

The proposed housing development at 1151 S. Main St. raises many new and different traffic and pedestrian safety questions compared with both current conditions in this neighborhood and with previous proposals. At this time, the City of Fort Bragg does not have the data to support a resolution that the development will not be detrimental to public health and safety.

~Teresa Skarr



From: Jacob Patterson <jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:12 PM
To: cdd
Cc: Whippy, Isaac; City Clerk
Subject: Public Comment 2 -- 6/25/25 PC Mtg., Item No. 6B, Continued Hearing

Planning Commission,

Now that I have read the traffic letter Marie mentioned in her revised (and now effectively meaningless) Special Condition # 44, I feel compelled to reiterate my objections to the smoke and mirrors that are being presented. Yet again, the real issues of concern related to traffic and transportation safety are not being addressed at all, instead we have a letter from traffic engineers telling us the conditions do not merit a traditional traffic study focusing on LOS to Highway One intersections or VMT analysis. That is not the point. It doesn't really matter if Marie, traffic engineers at CA Traffic Solution, or even you planning commissioners think a traditional traffic study would be useful because they **are required and are not discretionary** even if not particularly illuminating. (Sometimes planning requirements are somewhat illogical but that doesn't defeat the fact that they might be legally required.) Our CGP policies don't provide any discretion on this requirement for major development projects like this one.

That said, I agree that studying LOS along Highway One intersections isn't a useful exercise and something else makes more sense. In this case, we need a traffic engineer to study the existing conditions at the Harbor Avenue and Ocean View Drive intersection focusing on safety concerns (not traffic delays and greenhouse gas emissions, which is what LOS is about) related to potential vehicle/vehicle and vehicle/pedestrian collisions due to visibility concerns. (CA Traffic Solution didn't do any of that, all they did was try to justify Marie's call of not having a traditional LOS traffic study prepared, which is quite similar to Marie's financial feasibility analysis that only looks at commercial retail rather than the real commercial alternative of short-term lodging, which is actually proposed for this project.) Then the traffic engineer needs to suggest and evaluate different solutions like the ones discussed at your meeting (e.g., a four-way or three-way stop that wouldn't create traffic backup issues back onto Highway One). You can then draft Special Condition #44 to actually do something like install a four-way stop--right now it has them implement all recommendations from the letter but the letter doesn't actually have any recommendations to implement because it didn't look at this issue at all.

A focused analysis of this project-specific concern is well within the scope of what the required, non-discretionary, traffic and transportation analysis could encompass. As a result, you really need to require that analysis or (as a shortcut that probably doesn't pass legal muster but would have a relatively low risk of enforcement) just impose as a special condition installing the improvements like a stop signs on Ocean View Drive or one of those flashing pedestrian crosswalks that light up when in use by someone crossing the street so cars are alerted to slow down and stop. There should also be a pedestrian crossing warning sign between Highway one and Harbor Avenue.

As Dave Jensen pointed out, none of the prior studies looked into anything related to that intersection, including the AutoZone project which didn't direct new traffic to that intersection, its traffic was directed toward the unnamed Frontage road that doesn't have the same concerns because visibility is not impacted there. This political theater masquerading as principled planning is getting tiresome. There is

no scenario where we can let the project proceed without actually and effectively addressing the very real safety concerns at this intersection that has not been analyzed by anyone for this project or for the prior nearby projects that had traditional LOS-focused traffic studies.

One of the main failings of traditional traffic studies is their scope is often too narrow and doesn't always address other transportation-related issues like pedestrian safety concerns and odd street layouts like we have in the area of this project. (Dave touched on this in his comments.) In fact, deficient traffic and transportation analysis, including omitting the specific issues of pedestrian crossing safety concerns, has been one of the most frequently litigated issues in CEQA- and planning-related legal challenges. Instead of pretending this isn't something we need to address, we should properly address it. Moreover, the applicant even said he was fine with having such an analysis prepared and would implement the roadway improvements. Why would we not take him up on that offer? I am sure they don't want avoidable accidents happening next to their properties, particularly for their hotel guests. (It isn't good business to have your customers run over.)

In short, if you want this project to work, you need to require a targeted analysis of this intersection and ways to address the pedestrian and vehicular safety concerns that nearly everyone acknowledges exist. As Marie pointed out, that kind of thing normally has to happen prior to the approval not as a condition for something to happen afterward, but there are ways to structure such requirements to apply after-the-fact by establishing the quantitative and qualitative review criteria up front that would trigger different requirements. We actually defer these kinds of things all the time, by delegating further reviews to the Director's discretion to determine if the requirements are met. I don't think that is the best way to handle this for the current situation but it is an option. The better approach is to require this analysis before you recommend anything for approval, which shouldn't be that involved or difficult based on how quickly they were able to get the letter from CA Traffic Solution for this meeting. Yes, that would involve another continuance but isn't that better than having a potential approval just get appealed and challenged. The delay and expense are much higher going that (stubborn) route rather than addressing this issue adequately up front.

Best,

--Jacob

Stump, Valerie

From: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:05 AM
To: cdd
Cc: Paul Clark; Colin Morrow
Subject: FW: 1151 S Main. 0652025 PC meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

A further thought on this How would you planning commissioner react if this was the direction you got from City Council on an item you were to decide? I am assuming I am not the only one that sees the problem with this. Coastal Commission Staff should not put themselves in this process, and you should not allow it. Just makes the appeal again more likely. They did that before when you were told the original application was fine. It was not as you now know. This should in my mind put the brakes on this entire project. The density bonuses were poorly handled, the project again should be commercial, but the bonuses were applied as if it were only residential. Open to an appeal and of course court actions. I was shocked when this was read last night, and the mayor just brushed it off as if it were of course correct. The modified application should be at the request of the applicant and no one else.

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

From: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:21 AM
To: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>; Commission Fort <cdd@fortbragg.com>
Subject: 1151 S Main. 0652025 PC meeting

The Public Hearing for the Following Item has Been Continued to July 14, 2025: "Coastal Development Permit Amendment, Use Permit and Design Review Amendments to Modify an Approved Mixed-Use Multifamily Project at 1151 S Main Street to Respond to Coastal Commission Staff Requests to: 1) Change 3 units of Multifamily Housing into 2,450 SF of Hotel Units on the Ground Floor of Building 3; and 2) add a Signed Public Access Sidewalk through the Parcel

this should be the icing on the cake to just about anyone that believes in due process the applicant put in a design opposition was expressed. we were told by Staff that the The project met the intent of the general plan and allowable uses the council approved the project basically the same as the planning commission it was appealed because it does not meet the intent and did not follow all of the required and reasonable CEQA inspections and processes. Low and behold the coastal commission agreed and rather than go to a full hearing we were told that the applicant desired to resubmit their plan. at the city Council meeting last night the above information was read suggesting that the coastal commission was requesting this change maybe it's time for the planning commission and ultimately the city Council to develop some backbone in the city does not work for the coastal commission the City of Fort Bragg has its own approved general plan and we don't need to ask the Coastal commission whether or not we're doing a good job that's what the appellant process is for and if that doesn't follow the plan right or follow all of the regulations then the court system is the next step please don't take this lightly the concerns that many of us have that the process is being trampled on just to get housing that supposedly we have a crisis I have formally requested a copy of the studies that the city used to

determine that they needed 200 new units by the end of 2026 have not seen it yet I do not believe it exists but I'll be pleased if something can be produced The impression that the coastal commission is requesting this implies to you decision makers that it is right don't be fooled you've all heard the story about the wolf in sheep's clothing have you not? and sadly it brings into question who is actually pushing this project we were told the applicant but it sounds like the applicant has indirectly the coastal commission on their side that's not the way it's supposed to work I thought a long time about this process and you cannot just stick a hot dog stand outside of a residential building and call it a commercial use no matter how much you want it to be. once again this is a predominantly residential project trying to be placed into a commercially zoned property. the proper path to have taken would be to request the property be rezoned and now that we see the state mandates that are being jammed down our throats the council and planning commission should make sure that the maximum building heights that are desired cannot be overcome by a state mandated bonus of any kind. dictated so it might not come across very well but I think you get the idea thank you

sorry for the multiple emails everyone is busy so it's difficult to block out the time none of us are paid for this as it was pointed out it's a volunteer job to protect our community and keep the rural character of Fort Bragg as alive as we can keep it according to all the plans it is anyway. that's what I'm trying to do and I know most of the community feels the same way they're just not vocal and people are afraid to speak out against housing because you are convinced and have convinced yourselves that there's a crisis it's a concern what's not happening is the ability for homes that people can purchase and build equity that the city Council as I've mentioned for 20 years has gone out of its way to restrict that in the state with all of their rent controls and prop 19 have made it virtually impossible for the private sector to be in the rental business if they choose to go into the rental business they should follow the same plans and same processes that anyone else has to do including view shed protections whether you like it or say it's not on the map or not doesn't make it right Paul Clark

Paoli, Diana

From: cdd
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 10:17 AM
To: Paoli, Diana
Subject: FW: 1151 S Main Planning Commission 06252025

Please see public comment below.
Thank you,

Sarah Peters

Assistant Planner | City of Fort Bragg
speters@fortbraggca.gov

From: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 7:39 AM
To: cdd <cdd@fortbraggca.gov>
Cc: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>; Colin Morrow <colinmorrow@protonmail.com>
Subject: 1151 S Main Planning Commission 06252025

Planning commissioners, one last email for the meeting tonight. You are the first filter for the City of Fort Bragg to ensure that anything that is constructed meets all the necessary codes and plans, and legal processes required. We depend on you. The Coastal Commission appeal process is the public's way to correct things when you make a mistake. As just happened with the first application. There seems to be some collusion to get this project through no matter the consequences and cost to the integrity of Fort Bragg. This is not a good look for our city.

As the appellants, we have so far been denied the full rehearing of the application by the full coastal commission. So far, this process has been, much like the local process been "shaped" to use a kind word by coastal commission staff. Much like our staff, in my opinion they have been wrong on my biggest concern, the mixed-use intent, *and the poor process and I believe wrong application of the density bonus incentives before any real public hearing was done that would have given the area property owner a chance to speak. You can't legally use them to avoid CLUDC requirements, but so far you have allowed it.

You have been informed by the community how in many ways this project has not met the CEQA requirements that must be made for such a large

project. You have heard it all, traffic, noise, views, coastal access, miss application of the allowed zone uses. I agree with all the other comments on this process, or lack thereof.

It will be up to you to correct this, and I hope you do. Appeals are very time consuming, and lawsuits as well. I believe legal fees can be part of a CEQA suit if it is successful. No one wants to go there, and * unless the application is modified to at least 50% plus being commercial, it will be appealed. If the density bonus incentives are not adjusted to a modified project with at the majority being commercial, it will be appealed. If the project does not meet all the CEQA requirements that have been commented on, it will be appealed. This is not a idle, threat, we have shown that I believe. Had you listened to us the first time all this time and energy would not be wasted. We have proven to you we were correct on the intent of the zone, but we have not had the full coastal commission rehearing that we asked for. This is an end run around the proper process, it wont work.

This project as submitted and revised can not be approved. It has been a while, but I was a city of Fort Bragg planning commissioner and have worked in the real estate industry right here on the coast since 1978, so I think I have some working knowledge of the process, and how it should work. I own what I believe is the largest property management company as well, so again I have some knowledge of the alleged “housing crisis” and discount that claim.

As before, with only three minutes to present, I am available for questions about this project and why I object, but no one so far has asked me. I believe another concerned citizen will be pointing out the lack of original notice to the neighboring property owners for density bonus incentive treatment hearing by the city council. The need for a traffic study, the nearby with Pollywog playschool traffic and other concerns, the list is long. All serious concerns.

There is so much wrong with this from the start. I hope you can stand strong and make sound decisions without fear.

Thank you

Paul Clark

Paoli, Diana

From: Jacob Patterson <jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:12 PM
To: cdd
Cc: Whippy, Isaac; City Clerk
Subject: Public Comment 2 -- 6/25/25 PC Mtg., Item No. 6B, Continued Hearing

Planning Commission,

Now that I have read the traffic letter Marie mentioned in her revised (and now effectively meaningless) Special Condition # 44, I feel compelled to reiterate my objections to the smoke and mirrors that are being presented. Yet again, the real issues of concern related to traffic and transportation safety are not being addressed at all, instead we have a letter from traffic engineers telling us the conditions do not merit a traditional traffic study focusing on LOS to Highway One intersections or VMT analysis. That is not the point. It doesn't really matter if Marie, traffic engineers at CA Traffic Solution, or even you planning commissioners think a traditional traffic study would be useful because they **are required and are not discretionary** even if not particularly illuminating. (Sometimes planning requirements are somewhat illogical but that doesn't defeat the fact that they might be legally required.) Our CGP policies don't provide any discretion on this requirement for major development projects like this one.

That said, I agree that studying LOS along Highway One intersections isn't a useful exercise and something else makes more sense. In this case, we need a traffic engineer to study the existing conditions at the Harbor Avenue and Ocean View Drive intersection focusing on safety concerns (not traffic delays and greenhouse gas emissions, which is what LOS is about) related to potential vehicle/vehicle and vehicle/pedestrian collisions due to visibility concerns. (CA Traffic Solution didn't do any of that, all they did was try to justify Marie's call of not having a traditional LOS traffic study prepared, which is quite similar to Marie's financial feasibility analysis that only looks at commercial retail rather than the real commercial alternative of short-term lodging, which is actually proposed for this project.) Then the traffic engineer needs to suggest and evaluate different solutions like the ones discussed at your meeting (e.g., a four-way or three-way stop that wouldn't create traffic backup issues back onto Highway One). You can then draft Special Condition #44 to actually do something like install a four-way stop--right now it has them implement all recommendations from the letter but the letter doesn't actually have any recommendations to implement because it didn't look at this issue at all.

A focused analysis of this project-specific concern is well within the scope of what the required, non-discretionary, traffic and transportation analysis could encompass. As a result, you really need to require that analysis or (as a shortcut that probably doesn't pass legal muster but would have a relatively low risk of enforcement) just impose as a special condition installing the improvements like a stop signs on Ocean View Drive or one of those flashing pedestrian crosswalks that light up when in use by someone crossing the street so cars are altered to slow down and stop. There should also be a pedestrian crossing warning sign between Highway one and Harbor Avenue.

As Dave Jensen pointed out, none of the prior studies looked into anything related to that intersection, including the AutoZone project which didn't direct new traffic to that intersection, its traffic was directed toward the unnamed Frontage road that doesn't have the same concerns because visibility is not impacted there. This political theater masquerading as principled planning is getting tiresome. There is

no scenario where we can let this project proceed without actually and effectively addressing the very real safety concerns at this intersection that has not been analyzed by anyone for this project or for the prior nearby projects that had traditional LOS-focused traffic studies.

One of the main failings of traditional traffic studies is their scope is often too narrow and doesn't always address other transportation-related issues like pedestrian safety concerns and odd street layouts like we have in the area of this project. (Dave touched on this in his comments.) In fact, deficient traffic and transportation analysis, including omitting the specific issues of pedestrian crossing safety concerns, has been one of the most frequently litigated issues in CEQA- and planning-related legal challenges. Instead of pretending this isn't something we need to address, we should properly address it. Moreover, the applicant even said he was fine with having such an analysis prepared and would implement the roadway improvements. Why would we not take him up on that offer? I am sure they don't want avoidable accidents happening next to their properties, particularly for their hotel guests. (It isn't good business to have your customers run over.)

In short, if you want this project to work, you need to require a targeted analysis of this intersection and ways to address the pedestrian and vehicular safety concerns that nearly everyone acknowledges exist. As Marie pointed out, that kind of thing normally has to happen prior to the approval not as a condition for something to happen afterward, but there are ways to structure such requirements to apply after-the-fact by establishing the quantitative and qualitative review criteria up front that would trigger different requirements. We actually defer these kinds of things all the time, by delegating further reviews to the Director's discretion to determine if the requirements are met. I don't think that is the best way to handle this for the current situation but it is an option. The better approach is to require this analysis before you recommend anything for approval, which shouldn't be that involved or difficult based on how quickly they were able to get the letter from CA Traffic Solution for this meeting. Yes, that would involve another continuance but isn't that better than having a potential approval just get appealed and challenged. The delay and expense are much higher going that (stubborn) route rather than addressing this issue adequately up front.

Best,

--Jacob

Stump, Valerie

From: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 9:05 AM
To: cdd
Cc: Paul Clark; Colin Morrow
Subject: FW: 1151 S Main. 0652025 PC meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

A further thought on this How would you planning commissioner react if this was the direction you got from City Council on an item you were to decide? I am assuming I am not the only one that sees the problem with this. Coastal Commission Staff should not put themselves in this process, and you should not allow it. Just makes the appeal again more likely. They did that before when you were told the original application was fine. It was not as you now know. This should in my mind put the brakes on this entire project. The density bonuses were poorly handled, the project again should be commercial, but the bonuses were applied as if it were only residential. Open to an appeal and of course court actions. I was shocked when this was read last night, and the mayor just brushed it off as if it were of course correct. The modified application should be at the request of the applicant and no one else.

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

From: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 6:21 AM
To: Paul Clark <pclark@fortbraggrealty.co>; Commission Fort <cdd@fortbragg.com>
Subject: 1151 S Main. 0652025 PC meeting

The Public Hearing for the Following Item has Been Continued to July 14, 2025: "Coastal Development Permit Amendment, Use Permit and Design Review Amendments to Modify an Approved Mixed-Use Multifamily Project at 1151 S Main Street to Respond to Coastal Commission Staff Requests to: 1) Change 3 units of Multifamily Housing into 2,450 SF of Hotel Units on the Ground Floor of Building 3; and 2) add a Signed Public Access Sidewalk through the Parcel

this should be the icing on the cake to just about anyone that believes in due process the applicant put in a design opposition was expressed. we were told by Staff that the The project met the intent of the general plan and allowable uses the council approved the project basically the same as the planning commission it was appealed because it does not meet the intent and did not follow all of the required and reasonable CEQA inspections and processes. Low and behold the coastal commission agreed and rather than go to a full hearing we were told that the applicant desired to resubmit their plan. at the city Council meeting last night the above information was read suggesting that the coastal commission was requesting this change maybe it's time for the planning commission and ultimately the city Council to develop some backbone in the city does not work for the coastal commission the City of Fort Bragg has its own approved general plan and we don't need to ask the Coastal commission whether or not we're doing a good job that's what the appellant process is for and if that doesn't follow the plan right or follow all of the regulations then the court system is the next step please don't take this lightly the concerns that many of us have that the process is being trampled on just to get housing that supposedly we have a crisis I have formally requested a copy of the studies that the city used to

determine that they needed 200 new units by the end of 2026 have not seen it yet I do not believe it exists but I'll be pleased if something can be produced The impression that the coastal commission is requesting this implies to you decision makers that it is right don't be fooled you've all heard the story about the wolf in sheep's clothing have you not? and sadly it brings into question who is actually pushing this project we were told the applicant but it sounds like the applicant has indirectly the coastal commission on their side that's not the way it's supposed to work I thought a long time about this process and you cannot just stick a hot dog stand outside of a residential building and call it a commercial use no matter how much you want it to be. once again this is a predominantly residential project trying to be placed into a commercially zoned property. the proper path to have taken would be to request the property be rezoned and now that we see the state mandates that are being jammed down our throats the council and planning commission should make sure that the maximum building heights that are desired cannot be overcome by a state mandated bonus of any kind. dictated so it might not come across very well but I think you get the idea thank you

sorry for the multiple emails everyone is busy so it's difficult to block out the time none of us are paid for this as it was pointed out it's a volunteer job to protect our community and keep the rural character of Fort Bragg as alive as we can keep it according to all the plans it is anyway. that's what I'm trying to do and I know most of the community feels the same way they're just not vocal and people are afraid to speak out against housing because you are convinced and have convinced yourselves that there's a crisis it's a concern what's not happening is the ability for homes that people can purchase and build equity that the city Council as I've mentioned for 20 years has gone out of its way to restrict that in the state with all of their rent controls and prop 19 have made it virtually impossible for the private sector to be in the rental business if they choose to go into the rental business they should follow the same plans and same processes that anyone else has to do including view shed protections whether you like it or say it's not on the map or not doesn't make it right Paul Clark

Stump, Valerie

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:53 PM
To: cdd
Subject: public comment 6-25-25 PC meeting, item 6B, 1151 S. Main Street

Dear Commissioners,

According to the City this development is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 15332 - Class 32 Infill Development Projects and 15195 Infill Housing Development. The Class 32 Exemption, exempts infill development within urbanized areas if it meets certain criteria. "The class consists of environmentally benign infill projects that are consistent with the General Plan and Zoning requirements. This class is not intended for projects that would result in any significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality impacts. This exemption is not limited to any use type and may apply to residential, commercial, industrial, public facility, and/or mixed-use projects." See City of Los Angeles Infill Development Projects - Class 32 Categorical Exemption Special Requirement Criteria.

The above significant issues with traffic, noise, air quality, and/or water quality impacts have not been addressed in this proposal. These issues are not benign; they require a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and can therefore not be exempt from CEQA. Even with 15 "whereas" clauses, 46 special conditions, and 8 standard conditions these above issues cannot to minimized.

Additionally, the City's failure to study cumulative impacts need to be addressed in an MND or EIR.

Annemarie Weibel

Stump, Valerie

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:57 PM
To: cdd
Subject: public comment 6-25-25 PC meeting, item 6B, 1151 S. Main Street
Attachments: Ca brome1.JPG; Ca Brome2.JPG; Ca brome3.JPG; ca brome4.JPG

Dear Commissioners,

This illustrates the botanical survey by Alison Gardner.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: photos, Calif. brome
Date: Wed, 25 Jun 2025 13:42:28 -0700
From: Alison Gardner <garaway58@gmail.com>
To: Weibel Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>

California brome (*Bromus sitchensis* var. *carinatus*)

Paoli, Diana

From: cdd
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:51 PM
To: Paoli, Diana
Subject: FW: public comment 6-25-25 PC meeting, item 6B, 1151 S. Main Street

Please see public comment below. I have not forwarded her preceding comment, as this one supercedes it.

Thank you,

Sarah Peters

Assistant Planner | City of Fort Bragg
speters@fortbraggca.gov

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:47 PM
To: cdd <cdd@fortbraggca.gov>
Subject: public comment 6-25-25 PC meeting, item 6B, 1151 S. Main Street

Please disregard the previous e-mail as it was sent by accident. Subject was not correct, Annemarie

To Planning Commissioners,

I am submitting for the records this Botanical Survey by Alison Gardner, local botanist. Alison Gardner has done botanical surveys for use permits on the Mendocino Coast since the 1980's.

This is a partial list as it is only based on one observation that took place on 6-24-2025. With more time a vegetation map will also be added.

The trees include several bishop pines, a shore pine, a doug fir, and some monterey pines. Several of these trees, including the shore pine and the doug fir, have the sea fog lichen in them (*Niebla cephalota*), which has been declared rare in Oregon, and will likely be added to the rare list in California in the near future, but is not on it yet. There are several large areas of broom.

The meadow is mostly introduced grasses: sweet vernal grass and velvet grass, with a number of other non-native grasses, also, but does have a significant percentage of native grasses incorporated. There is California brome (*Bromus carinatus*, AKA *Bromus sitchensis* var. *carinatus*) through out much of it, I'd estimate at about 5 to 10% of the total cover. There are many patches of blue wild rye (*Elymus glaucus*, and *Elymus glaucus* ssp. *virescens*) which is also a native grass. I'd say that as a component of the whole, maybe 3%? There is also a number of areas with bracken fern. The bracken is not over the whole field, but in patches. There are a lot under the doug fir and shore pine, and in the southwestern portion of the parcel. There is a vegetation classification California Brome-Blue Wild Rye Prairie (<https://vegetation.cnps.org/alliance/499>) which this is close to fitting into. I don't think that the percentage of the native grasses is quite high enough, though. Membership rules include "*Bromus carinatus* characteristically present with native plants > 10% relative cover in the herbaceous layer

(Buck-Diaz et al. 2013)." and "*Bromus carinatus*, *Elymus glaucus*, and *Pteridium aquilinum* > 30% relative cover in the herbaceous layer (Sikes et al. 2025)." It's close, but I'm not sure it qualifies. The state and global rarity ranks are S3,G3.

An S3 ranking is considered "vulnerable" and it doesn't prohibit construction, but it would require more hoops to be hopped through, and likely some mitigation.

Table 1. Global and state ranking system for natural communities per NatureServe (2009) and Sawyer et al. (2009).

Rank—Title Definition Abundance

G1 or S1— Critically Imperiled	At very high risk of extinction due to extreme rarity, very steep declines, or other factors	Fewer than six viable occurrences and/or 2000 acres (worldwide or statewide)
G2 or S2— Imperiled	At high risk of extinction or elimination due to very restricted range, very few populations, steep declines, or other factors	6-20 viable occurrences and/or 2000-10,000 acres (worldwide or statewide)
G3 or S3— Vulnerable	At moderate risk of extinction or elimination due to a restricted range, relatively few populations, recent and widespread declines, or other factors	21-100 viable occurrences and/or 10,000-50,000 acres (worldwide or statewide)
G4 or S4— Apparently Secure	Uncommon but not rare; some cause for long-term concern due to declines or other factors	Greater than 100 viable occurrences and/or greater than 50,000 acres (worldwide or statewide)
G5 or S5— Secure	Community demonstrably secure due to common and widespread abundance	
	Widespread and abundant (worldwide and statewide)	

There are also some areas with California oat grass (*Danthonia californica*), which can be a component of the California brome/blue wildrye/bracken meadows. If the California oatgrass were added in, it should take the native grasses above the level where it would classify as that habitat. However, it's not listed in the "membership rules".

I would be curious as to whether these native grasses are on the botanical survey, and if they gave an argument as to why they shouldn't be considered.

There are a few, but not many, remnant coastal wildflowers--gum plant (*Grindelia stricta* var. *platyphylla*), lupine (*Lupinus littoralis*), yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*). There is the native wild blackberry. There is red elderberry and pink flowering currant.

If the native grasses aren't addressed in the previous botanical surveys for this property, a new survey should be done, or the former surveys should be amended. Photos of the native grasses will follow.

Alison Gardner

Stump, Valerie

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 1:59 PM
To: cdd
Subject: public comment 6-25-25 PC meeting, item 6B, 1151 S. Main Street
Attachments: blue wildrye1.JPG; blue wildrye2.JPG; blue wildrye3.JPG; blue wildrye4.JPG

Dear Commissioners,

This illustrates the botanical survey by Alison Gardner.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: blue wildrye photos
Date: Wed, 25 Jun 2025 13:45:00 -0700
From: Alison Gardner <garaway58@gmail.com>
To: Weibel Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>

Blue wildrye (*Elymus glaucus* var. *glaucus*)

Stump, Valerie

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 2:01 PM
To: cdd
Subject: public comment 6-25-25 PC meeting, item 6B, 1151 S. Main Street
Attachments: ca oatgrass1.JPG; ca oatgrass2.JPG; ca oatgrass3.JPG; ca oatgrass4.JPG; ca oatgrass5.JPG

Dear Commissioners,

This illustrates the botanical survey by Alison Gardner.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: ca oatgrass photos
Date: Wed, 25 Jun 2025 13:47:37 -0700
From: Alison Gardner <garaway58@gmail.com>
To: Weibel Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>

California oatgrass (*Danthonia californica*)