

To the Board of Supervisors

Re.: Maxwell

MHRB Permit #2016-0018

July 7, 2020

To the Board of Supervisors,

I would like to go on record as the permit was written up with different terms than were approved by the MHRB Board on Feb. 14, 2020. This has caused me concern, and I would like to set the record straight.

I am not sure how the Planning and Building Department wrote up this permit. Then, as we have not had a meeting since March, the minutes have not been approved, so there is no proof on paper regarding the facts. Seems unfair for the Board of Supervisors to make a decision without seeing the minutes, especially as the Chair of the Board, is disputing the facts of the permit.

Please refer to the MHRB Permit:

1) FINDINGS, (a) The exterior appearance and design of the proposed work is NOT in harmony with the exterior appearance and design of the existing structures within the District. The design was found by the MHRB board to NOT be harmonious with the other homes in the neighborhood. (b) The appearance of the proposed work WILL detract from the appearance of other property within the District.

2) The MHRB Board never saw a demolition permit request.

3) The MHRB Board did not approved a 5'9" fence in the front yard. The fences that are approved in front of homes in Mendocino are 3' tall. Planning approved the fence as it is set back from the road out of County right-of-way. The fence is not in character with the town.

4) Item 29. This is an important one. The applicant was asked multiple times to provide proof there was at least 50% of usable materials in the Ferro House. Former head Planner Bill Kinser explained to the MHRB board that if there is not 50% of material left in the house, it is considered a demolition and requires a permit for demolition. Then, the house that is built would be considered a new structure.

5) The Ferro House is in such decrepit condition, the applicant was not able to find a licensed contractor to say there was at least 50% of usable materials left in the house. We on the Board requested this multiple times, if the applicant was able to produce proof, we would consider it a remodel and certain items would be grandfathered in. Being there is not 50% of materials left of the Ferro house, this equates the house being considered a brand new house. As a new house, everything changes. As such, the set backs from the property line need to be up to code, and the lot coverage is 25% not 45% as the applicant is proposing to use. At this time, the structures are not to code on the setbacks, they are about 2' from the property line. A Mendocino volunteer fire man testified his concern if there was a fire, there would not be enough room to put it out, and it has a greater risk to the neighbors next door that the existing structure is near.

6) The Board did not find the design of the long and rambling house to be harmonious with the environment. It appears the applicant is reaching to use as much of the lot as possible, over what is deemed legal and necessary in the town of Mendocino.

It is my hope that the Board of Supervisors upholds the decisions that were made regarding this application.

Respectfully yours,

Deirdre Lamb

Chairman of the Mendocino Historical Review Board