

Proposal MHRB 2016-0018  
Collin Maxwell

JUN 26 2019

Planning & Building Services

Dear Julia Acker,

My husband, Michael Hopper, and I own 45260 Albion Street on the east side of Mr. Maxwell's property. We have several concerns about his current proposal to demolish, reconstruct, and or construct the Ferro House, garage, tower, fencing, driveway and other structures.

Our concerns are as follows:

From our conversation with Mike Kelly from the Water District the well on Mr. Maxwell's property supports a one to two bedroom residence. We would like to see the floor plan of each of the structures. We would also like to know what is the planned usage for the space.

We have read the historic notes in the proposal and see that it is noted that there were historically short-term rentals on this property. This has no bearing on the current laws today, as at this time there are no short term rental permits available. The property is in a residential zone, not commercial

It was our understanding from Bill Kinser, who was at the last meeting on Mr. Maxwell's proposal, that there would not be 50% left of the buildings currently on the property. We would like to see a third party verify this. If this is indeed the case, then we would like to have the setbacks adjusted to the standards that are used today.

Is there going to be a hazardous material report? It is possible that there is asbestos in several of the buildings.

With regards to the trailer, it is our understanding that trailers are not allowed in Mendocino Historic district. If this is correct, we do not see how this trailer can remain.

Thank you,

Virginia Pier and Michael Hopper



January 20, 2020

Mendocino County

JAN 30 2020

Mendocino Historical Review Board  
C/O Planning & Building Dept.  
Franklin Street  
Fort Bragg CA 95437

Planning & Building Services

MHRB members,

I am speaking as a concern citizens and as a past member of MHRB.

I am requesting you deny the Colin Maxwell project for the following reasons;

The so-all reconstruction of a priority 1 building is not in keeping with the State and Federal guidelines for historic structures, one has to ask why this applicant is not required see a professional organization that can do a feasibility report on what can be realistically saved and how it should be approached?

Carey and Associated did this exact procedure before the Temple of Kwan began it restoration of the building back in 1998. Why is it that this applicant gets to decide what is salvable and not an expert in this field? What is his credentials on preservation of historic structures?

Why do all of the additions have separate front entrances. Looking at the plans gives it the look of separate units that are attached. Is this a guise and that they will be become separate rentals? The overall project is not "in keeping with the character" of the its surrounding block. There is no project on this block of this size. This project in not in "character with the west side of Albion Street." In the last meeting one board member stated he had no objection to dormers on the rebuild because the board has allowed dormers in the district. Where in the surrounding area are there dormers? As I have said in the past when I served on MHRB that people come and go but the buildings stay. It is the community that has to live and look at what is left for generations to come.

MHRB has the right to deny this project because it is not in character with the surrounding neighborhood or the town a s a whole. I support a smaller footprint of this project that is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your service.

Lorraine Hee-Chorley  
PO Box 506  
Fort Bragg CA 95437



Mendocino Historical Review Board  
Case # MHRB\_2016-0018  
February 3<sup>rd</sup> 2020

Mendocino County

JAN 31 2020

Planning & Building Services

To the MHRB,

We own 45260 Albion Street, which is immediately east of Mr. Maxwell's property.

We have several concerns about the plans that have been submitted for this hearing.

The drawing on page 10 provides five colored blocks. The notes at the bottom indicate that they represent a cabin, rooms, additions, a tower and a garage. There are no dimensions on this drawing. Their placement only provides a relative understanding of where they are located on the property. This makes it difficult to understand how the placement of the structures esthetically fit into the confined area of 6,080 square feet, in addition to any set backs or easements that might be required by local building codes.

A new survey that provides exact locations of the proposed new layout would help to provide this understanding.

In addition, we would like to know what the easement will be between our property and Mr. Maxwell's. On the Northeast corner of his property the distance between the current buildings and ours is approximately 10 to 18 inches.

It is not entirely clear in the proposal whether the indicated tower height of 26 feet includes the water tank. Or, is the water tank going to add to the overall height of the structure? In any event, we would like to propose that the overall height not exceed the maximum allowed.

Thank you,

Virginia Pier  
Michael Hopper

**Caitlin Schafer - Fwd: MHRB\_2016-0018 Application**

---

**From:** Julia Acker <ackerj@mendocinocounty.org>  
**To:** Caitlin Schafer  
**Date:** 2/3/2020 4:02 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: MHRB\_2016-0018 Application  
**Cc:** Adrienne Thompson; James Feenan

---

Please post for MHRB tonight under MHRB 2016-0018

Thanks,

Julia

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** MCN <arlo@mcn.org>  
**Date:** February 3, 2020 at 3:32:32 PM PST  
**To:** Julia Acker <ackerj@mendocinocounty.org>  
**Subject:** MHRB\_2016-0018 Application

Dear MHRB

I'm writing to voice my concern about the Maxwell application before the board, MHRB\_2016-0018.

On architectural details alone, sprawling from one edge of the property to the other with multiple units and entrances, this development is out of place in its neighborhood on west Albion St. It maximizes square footage by preserving existing setbacks. But keeping those setbacks requires preserving 50% of the existing building materials, and I don't see this being met when a) the new structure is twice the size of the old one and b) most of that existing structure can't be salvaged for anything built to code.

There's plenty of room on the lot to build a new single family home that is in keeping with local architecture and has nominal setbacks.

Finally, the updated proposal still left me wanting to see all proposed structures - the home, water tower and garage, in a single rendering that includes neighboring structures so that one can compare the existing and proposed developments in context.

Thank you,

Arlo Reeves  
511 Ukiah St.  
Mendocino