

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

1385 8TH STREET, SUITE 130
ARCATA, CA 95521
PH (707) 826-8950
FAX (707) 826-8960



W10a

LCP-1-PTA-20-0040-1

**(CITY OF POINT ARENA – FARM STAYS AND AG EXCLUSIVE USE
CHANGES) – TIME EXTENSION**

JANUARY 13, 2021

CORRESPONDENCE

From: [Mitch McFarland](#)
To: NorthCoast@Coastal
Subject: Public Comment on January 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 10a - City of Point Arena LCP Amendment No. LCP-1-PTA-20-0040-1 (Farm Stays and Ag Exclusive Use Changes). Time Extension
Date: Thursday, December 24, 2020 12:52:27 PM

Hello,

I support anything that the Commission can do to encourage and facilitate increased housing opportunities in Point Arena. It appears this measure may assist in that effort. Please grant their request.

Mitch McFarland
Point Arena

From: [Arassy](#)
To: NorthCoast@Coastal
Subject: Comment LCP-1-PTA-20-0040-1
Date: Friday, January 8, 2021 3:11:34 PM

Arabella Akossy
220 Port Rd., Point Arena, CA 95468

January 8, 2020

RE: In Favor of LCP Amendment No. LCP-1-PTA-20-0040-1 (Farm Stays and Ag Exclusive Use Changes). Time Extension / Agenda Item W10a

Dear Commissioners:

I strongly support Commission staff's request for a time extension to take action on the above referenced LCP Amendment.

Due to my extremely negative experience when dealing with Point Arena city staff and council members in regard to Council Member Richard Wasserman's proposed building project, CDPA 2020-02 (01), I have lost all confidence that these local government representatives possess the required competence and basic ethical standards to handle any LCP matters without the most scrutinizing oversight by the California Coastal Commission. Consequently, please consider it both necessary and prudent for Commission staff to be allowed extra time to evaluate the proposed changes.

The questionable conduct by city staff concerning the Wasserman CDPA for a supposed agricultural barn/workshop – against which I have filed a second appeal on December 9, 2020 (A-1-PTA-20-0074) – includes but is not limited to the following:

- Despite being incomplete and full of inaccuracies, which I pointed out in detail with a letter of concern before the first public hearing, the Council approved the application, ignoring all the clearly demonstrable problems, such as an incomplete Point Arena Mountain Beaver (PAMB) report and illegal grading (corroborated with photographs). In addition, the application was approved without requiring even some of the most basic mitigation measures for PAMB, noise issues from the workshop, or addressing visual screening, fire hazards, water quality, correct setbacks, etc.
- Only after I filed my initial appeal, did the city planner admit that unpermitted grading had indeed occurred (whereas she is on record, in writing, to claim that she could “find no evidence of any grading”) and another public hearing amending the first application was held. Now the planner's behavior gets even more questionable: she downplays the

amount of grading to 38 cubic yards (in reality close to 80 cubic yards) and misrepresents the location of said grading far away from the applicant's existing septic field, when in fact it was done in very close proximity to it. In addition, she and the applicant claim that the illegally graded area is not part of the proposed project when clearly it is.

- The PAMB report remains incomplete and city staff is trying to take away ESHA status where required (the proposed building site is within the Mountain Beaver Buffer Area). They have also applied an ESHA exemption where it is clearly not allowed under CEQA guidelines.

- Furthermore, all agencies were given an incorrect description of the project, passing it off as an 800SQFT barn only, when the actual application notes a 1404SQFT building with a workshop (the applicant is a working finish carpenter), which the second staff report notes could become commercial in nature. The RA-2 zoning, however, says differently. Moreover, even after the first appeal none of the agencies were updated, which is yet another indication that staff is deliberately shirking applicable rules and regulations effectively allowing Mr. Wasserman to build a project under false pretenses, when it should not have been approved in the first place.

There are many more deliberate falsehoods within the application and staff reports but this is obviously not the time to bring this up in more detail. My intention is to make you aware that staff for the City of Point Arena, in my experience, has no qualms blatantly ignoring and/or misinterpreting the code to benefit of one of their own. It follows that there need to be fewer "loopholes" for them to be able to do so in the future.

That would also include making sure the zoning map that was included with the amendments request is correct, as I can already see that Mr. Wasserman's parcel is identified as AE, when in fact it is zoned RA-2. It would not be surprising if more inconsistencies are to be found, which is yet another reason why Commission staff should to be granted the time extension.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Arabella Akossy