Public Comment -- 1/13/24 PC Mtg., Item No. 6A, DIV 1-23

Jacob Patterson <jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com>

Wed 3/13/2024 11:30 AM

To:cdd <cdd@fortbragg.com>
Cc:Marie Jones <marie@mariejonesconsulting.com>

Planning Commission,

I believe you should approve this subdivision as proposed but I recommend you consider an alteration to the staff recommendation.

First, I think Special Condition # 6 is unnecessary and an overreach by the City. This is a low density residential project involving an existing single family home and two new lots that will accommodate single family homes. Single Family residential projects in the City don't have any design review or landscaping review by the City so it doesn;t make sense to require the future developers of the two lots to have to submit a landscaping plan that isn;t normally required. Why would we generate unnecessary expenses for people looking to develop more housing in town. If I put in new landscaping in my yard, which also involves a single family home, I don't have to submit any landscaping plans for City review, let alone one that includes specific types of plants. I believe that the cited policy is important but not logically applicable to this type of project because it should only have an operative effect when we are dealing with a development project that involves City discretionary review of the landscaping (e.g., commercial, industrial, or multi-family developments). This project is not such a development project and thus this policy doesn't apply to the simple subdivision. Please remove this special condition, which is only "recommended" in the staff report and subject to your interpretation regarding if it is applicable or not. If I were on the Commission, I would find it does not apply here.

Second, I noted the letter from the applicants requesting a waiver of the undergrounding requirements for utilities in subdivisions. I believe this code requirement does not apply to small infill subdivision or lot splits where the utilities are already above-ground (i.e., it only applies to the extension of new utility lines, not the service drops from existing above-ground utilities). Staff didn't address that in the report through a special condition or otherwise (unless I missed it) so I believe that implies they agree it doesn't apply here. If that is not the case, you should direct staff to do what is necessary to waive any applicable undergrounding requirements. I have a feeling that the applicants were told something incorrect at one point (i.e., undergrounding is required) or are mis-interpreting the code language in ILUDC § 18.88.050, subdiv. F.1.

Regards,

--Jacob