

HUMBOLDT COUNTY STAFF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF THE REQUIRED FINDINGS
Record Number PLN-2021-17105
Assessor's Parcel Number: 511-061-009

Resolution by the Zoning Administrator of the County of Humboldt certifying compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and conditionally approving the Hone Coastal Development Permit.

WHEREAS, Brendan Reilly submitted an application and evidence in support of approving a Coastal Development Permit for the construction of a 9,800 square foot single family residence, 876 square feet of covered porch area, 1,700 square foot garage, 728 square foot port au cochere, 1,340 square foot pool, and 5,000 square foot recreation area on an approximately five acre parcel in the McKinleyville area (APN 511-061-009); and

WHEREAS, the County Planning Division has reviewed the submitted application and evidence and has referred the application and evidence to involved reviewing agencies for site inspections, comments and recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15303 (a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Humboldt County Zoning Administrator reviewed, considered, and discussed the application for a Coastal Development Permit on September 16, 2021.

Now, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Administrator makes all the following findings:

- 1. FINDING:** **Project Description:** The application is a Coastal Development Permit to authorize the construction of a 9,800 square foot single family residence, 876 square feet of covered porch area, 1,700 square foot garage, 728 square foot port au cochere, 1,340 square foot pool, and 5,000 square foot recreation area on an approximately five-acre parcel.

EVIDENCE: a) Project File: PLN-2021-17105
- 2. FINDING:** **CEQA.** The requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act have been complied with.

EVIDENCE: a) Project is exempt from environmental review per Section 15303(a) – New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures, of the CEQA Guidelines

FINDINGS FOR THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

- 3. FINDING** The proposed development is in conformance with the County General Plan.

EVIDENCE a) The proposed development is consistent with the Residential Estates (RE) land use designation. The RE designation provides for single family units and residential accessory uses. The RE designation is commonly used in water-only service areas. This proposed project parcel is currently developed. The proposed development will not increase the amount of single-family housing in the area. Therefore, the project is in conformance with the County General Plan.

- 4. FINDING** The proposed development is consistent with McKinleyville Area Plan (MAP)
- EVIDENCE**
- a) The land use designation for the parcel within the MAP conforms with the General Plan land use designation.
 - b) MAP Section 2400 Housing is consistent with the General Plan Chapter 8 of the Housing Element. New housing in the Coastal Zone shall be developed in conformity with the goals, policies, standards, and programs of the Humboldt County Housing Element. The proposed development would support the residential use on the site.
- 5. FINDING** The project is compatible with the physical scale and visual resource policies of section 3.42(A)(1)(a) and 3.42(A)(1)(c)(1) of the Local Coastal Plan (MAP).
- EVIDENCE**
- a) The project is within the mapped urban limit line and meets all standards of the principal permitted uses designated in the General Plan, including setbacks, height restrictions, and allowable lot coverage of 35% in the RE zone.
 - b) Existing vegetation bordering the project parcel screen and soften the visual impact of the development from the roadway, public beach, and neighboring parcels in conjunction with an increased setback from the bluff proposed in the Geotechnical Hazard report provided by LACO & Associates (Manhart 2021). No removal of vegetation is proposed.
 - c) The project site is not located within a mapped coastal scenic area and the project is not any greater in height or bulk than is permitted for the principal use, and it is otherwise compatible with the styles and visible materials of existing development in the immediate neighborhood, as the development is not visible from the nearest public road.
- 6. FINDING** The proposed development is consistent with the purposes of the existing Residential Estates (RE), AP (Airport Safety Review), G (Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard), N (Noise Impact) combining zones in which the site is located, or when processed in conjunction with a zone reclassification, is consistent with the purposes of the proposed zone.
- EVIDENCE**
- a) The proposed development is consistent with the minimum required development standards of the RS-5 zone, including height, lot coverage, property line setbacks, density, and residential parking availability. The proposed 33 foot building height is less than the 35 foot height requirement in the AP and RS zones, and all development is proposed within the required property setbacks in the RS zone. Front, Rear, and Interior Side setbacks are 20 feet, 10 feet, and 5 feet respectively. All proposed development is less than the allowed 35% lot coverage at roughly 8%, and complies with the density limit of 1 dwelling unit per lawfully created lot (HCC 313-6.1). An existing driveway and parking area meet the requirements for residential

parking. The design materials are consistent with the zone requirements, including the prohibition of manufactured homes in the Noise Impact (N) combining zone (HCC 313-16.3).

- b) The project is proposed on Lot 133 of the Seffner & Wolf Subdivision. The proposed development of a 9,800 square foot residence, approximately 33 feet in height, a 1,700 square foot garage, 876 square feet of covered porches, 728 square foot port au cochere, 1,340 square foot pool, and 5,000 square foot recreation area, is a principally permitted use in the RS-5 zone with a Residential Estates (RE) land use description (General Plan Chapter 4.8.1)(McKAP Chapter 5.20).
- c) A condition of approval has been included to address the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during construction of the proposed development.

7. FINDING

The construction of a permitted single-family residence will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

EVIDENCE

- a) The property is currently developed, and the proposed development will be consistent with the surrounding existing development. Residential housing will be beneficial to the public health, safety and welfare and will not be materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

8. FINDING

The proposed development does not reduce the residential density for any parcel below that utilized by the Department of Housing and Community Development in determining compliance with housing element law.

EVIDENCE

- a) The parcel's General Plan land use designation (RE) and zoning (RS-5/AP/G/N) allow residential use. The project will not negatively impact compliance with Housing Element law. The project will not impact available housing in the McKinleyville area and will comply with the density range of the RE land use designation, 1-5 acres per unit with a maximum floor area ratio of 0.20. The proposed development is consistent with the McKinleyville Area Local Coastal Plan (Section 3.25 Housing).

DECISION

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the above findings and evidence, the Humboldt County Zoning Administrator does hereby:

- Adopt the findings set forth in this resolution; and
- Conditionally approves the Hone Coastal Development Permit, based upon the Findings and Evidence and subject to the conditions of approval attached hereto as Attachment 1 and incorporated herein by reference; and

Adopted after review and consideration of all the evidence on September 16, 2021

I, John Ford, Zoning Administrator of the County of Humboldt, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct record of the action taken on the above-entitled matter by said Zoning Administrator at a meeting held on the date noted above.

John Ford, Director
Planning and Building Department

ATTACHMENT 1

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

APPROVAL OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT IS CONDITIONED ON THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND REQUIREMENTS WHICH MUST BE SATISFIED BEFORE THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CAN BE FINALIZED.

A. General Conditions

1. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all necessary County and State permits and licenses, and for meeting all requirements set forth by other regulatory agencies.
2. The applicant is required to pay for permit processing on a time and material basis as set forth in the schedule of fees and charges as adopted by ordinance of the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors. The Planning and Building Department will provide a bill to the applicant after the decision. Any and all outstanding planning fees to cover the processing of the application to decision by the Hearing Officer shall be paid to the Humboldt County Planning Division, 3015 "H" Street, Eureka.
3. The Applicant is responsible for costs for post-approval review for determining project conformance with conditions. A deposit is collected to cover this staff review. Permit conformance with conditions must be demonstrated prior to release of building permit or initiation of use and at time of annual inspection. A conformance review deposit as set forth in the schedule of fees and charges as adopted by ordinance of the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors (currently \$750) shall be paid within sixty (60) days of the effective date of the permit or upon filing of the Compliance Agreement (where applicable), whichever occurs first. Payment shall be made to the Humboldt County Planning Division, 3015 "H" Street, Eureka.
4. Conformance of Final Design and Construction Plans to the Geologic Reports.
 - a. *All final design and construction plans, including site preparation, foundation design, and drainage plans, shall be consistent with the recommendations contained in the geologic report of the site (Manhart 2021) prepared by LACO & Associates. This includes the setback from the edge of the bluff identified by the geologic report. Prior to issuance of the building permits the applicant shall submit for review a revised site plan showing the setback as recommended in the geologic report.*
 - b. *The permittee shall undertake development in accordance with the approved final plans. Any proposed changes to the approved final plans shall be reported to the Director. No changes to the approved final plans shall occur without an amendment to this coastal development permit, unless the Director determines that no amendment is legally required.*
5. No future development of shoreline protective devices is permitted on the project parcel.
 - a. *By acceptance of Coastal Development Permit (CDP), the applicant agrees, on behalf of himself/herself and all successors and assigns, that no bluff or shoreline protective device(s) shall ever be constructed to protect the development approved pursuant to CDP PLN-2021-17105, including, but not limited to, the development of a residence, pool, and recreation area, including in the event that the development is threatened with damage or destruction from waves, erosion, storm conditions, liquefaction, bluff retreat,*

landslides, or other coastal hazards in the future, and as may be exacerbated by sea-level rise. By acceptance of this Permit, the applicant hereby waives, on behalf of their self and all successors and assigns, any rights to construct such devices that may exist under applicable law.

- b. *By acceptance of this Permit, the applicant further agrees, on behalf of their self and all successors and assigns, that the landowner shall remove the development authorized by this Permit, if the County or any other government agency with legal jurisdiction has issued a final order, not overturned through any appeal or writ proceedings, determining that the development is currently and permanently unsafe for occupancy or use due to coastal hazards, and that there are no measures that could make the structures suitable for occupancy or use without the use of bluff or shoreline protective devices. If any portion of the development authorized by this permit at any time encroaches onto public property, the permittee shall either remove the encroaching portion of the development or apply to retain it. Any application to retain it must include proof of permission from the owner of the public property. The permittee shall obtain a CDP for removal of approved development, unless the Planning Director provides a written determination that no CDP is legally required.*
 - c. *In the event that the edge of the bluff-top recedes to a point where any portion of the structure becomes threatened, but no government agency has ordered that the structures not be occupied or used, a geotechnical investigation shall be prepared by a licensed coastal engineer and geologist, retained by the permittee, that addresses whether any portions of the authorized development are threatened by coastal hazards. The report shall identify all those immediate or potential future measures that could stabilize the development without bluff or shoreline protective device(s), including, but not limited to, removal or relocation of portions of the development. The report shall be submitted to the Planning Director and the appropriate local government officials. If the geotechnical investigation concludes that any portion of the development is unsafe for operation or use, the permittee shall, within 90 days of submitting the investigation, apply for a coastal development permit amendment to remedy the hazard.*
 - d. *Prior to removal/relocation, the permittee shall submit two copies of a Removal/Relocation Plan to the Planning Director for review and written approval. The Removal/Relocation Plan shall clearly describe the manner in which such development is to be removed/relocated and the affected area restored so as to best protect coastal resources, including the Pacific Ocean. In the event that portions of the development fall to the bluffs or ocean before they are removed/relocated, the landowner shall remove all recoverable debris associated with the development from the bluffs and ocean and lawfully dispose of the material in an approved disposal site. Such removal shall require a CDP.*
5. Prior to the any ground disturbance occurring in association with this permit a qualified botanist shall review the site to determine if Siskiyou checkerbloom is present. If found to be present within the proposed disturbed areas the checkerbloom shall be relocated and an equivalent area of the species shall be created or restored on-site at the direction of a qualified botanist.
 6. No trees larger than 12" diameter at breast height are authorized for removal by this permit.
 7. A Notice of Exemption (NOE) will be prepared and filed with the County Clerk for this project in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines. **Within three days of the effective date of permit**

approval, the Department will file the NOE and will charge this fee to the project.

8. The approved building plans shall meet all applicable fire codes, including fire suppression infrastructure requirements deemed necessary for the project by the Building Inspection Division. Sign-off on the Occupancy Permit by the Building Division shall satisfy this requirement.
9. No lighting of the outdoor recreation area is permitted.

Informational Notes:

1. The subject project lies within airport compatibility zone for the McKinleyville Airport as identified in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).
2. If cultural resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor on-site shall cease all work in the immediate area and within a 50-foot buffer of the discovery location. A qualified archaeologist and the appropriate Tribal Historic Preservation Officer(s) are to be contacted to evaluate the discovery and, in consultation with the applicant and the lead agency, develop a treatment plan in any instance where significant impacts cannot be avoided. Prehistoric materials may include obsidian or chert flakes, tools, locally darkened midden soils, groundstone artifacts, shellfish or faunal remains, and human burials.

If human remains are found, California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 requires that the County Coroner be contacted immediately at 707-445-7242. If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission will then be contacted by the Coroner to determine appropriate treatment of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. Violators shall be prosecuted in accordance with PRC Section 5097.99.

ATTACHMENT 3

REFERRAL AGENCY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project was referred to the following referral agencies for review and comment. Those agencies that provided written comments are checked off.

Referral Agency	Response	Recommendation	Location
Building Inspection Division	✓	Approval	On File
Division Environmental Health		No Response	
Public Works, Land Use Division		No Response	
McKinleyville CSD	✓	Approval	On File
California Department of Fish & Wildlife		No Response	
County Counsel		No Response	
Supervising Planner		No Response	
FPD Arcata	✓	Approval	On File
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board		No Response	
California Coastal Commission	✓	Condition of Approval	On File
NWIC		No Response	
Bear River Band		No Response	
Blue Lake Rancheria		No Response	
Wiyot Tribe		No Response	

From: [Holloway, Catherine@Coastal](mailto:Holloway.Catherine@Coastal)
To: [Johnson, Cliff](mailto:Johnson.Cliff); Logan@landlogistics.com
Cc: [Kraemer, Melissa@Coastal](mailto:Kraemer.Melissa@Coastal)
Subject: Comments on PLN-2021-17105 (Hone, Demolition and CDP)
Date: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 10:21:31 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-a451pfso.png](#)
[17105 Referral Cover Sheet 4.6.2021 CCC \(1\).pdf](#)
[CCC Comments 051821.pdf](#)

Hi Cliff and Logan,

We have reviewed the proposed project (PLN-2021-17105) consisting of a new, two-story, single-family residential structure, swimming pool, and basketball/tennis court on Letz Avenue. We previously provided preliminary comments on May 18, 2021 (see attached). We would appreciate it if the County would correct Attachment 3 of the staff report (Referral Agency Comments and Recommendations) to indicate receipt of our comments.

We have reviewed the staff report and recommended conditions and are concerned that as currently recommended it's unclear whether the project conforms with the policies and standards of the certified LCP (McKinleyville Area Plan and coastal zoning regulations) regarding visual resources and hazards issues. We recommend that the County further evaluate the conformance of the project with the visual resource protection policies of the LCP and add findings and conditions related both to the protection of visual resources as well as enforceable conditions to ensure that the proposed project maintains compliance with the hazard findings of the LCP.

1. Geologic Hazards Setback. The Geologic Hazard Report recommended a minimum setback distance of 181.5 ft from the edge of the bluff. The submitted site plan shows the edge of the new residence 137.5 ft away from the "approximate edge of the stable bank". To comply with the hazards policies of the McKinleyville Area Plan (section 3.28), the applicant should submit, for the Director's approval prior to commencement of the authorized development, final plans that clearly show the delineated edge of the bluff top and that site all proposed new development at least 182 ft away from the bluff edge consistent with the geotechnical report. The report also recommends specific measures for surface drainage, foundation design criteria, and criteria for pool construction. The LACO report recommended a final plan review by LACO's geotechnical department as well as construction observation and testing by LACO staff during earthwork and foundation installation phases of construction. We recommend adding conditions to ensure that the final plans conform with the recommendations included in the geotechnical report.
 - a. In case it's helpful, here is an example condition that the Coastal Commission has imposed on CDPs for conformance of final design and construction plans to geologic reports:

1. Conformance of Final Design and Construction Plans to the Geologic Reports

A. All final design and construction plans, including site preparation, foundation design, and drainage plans, shall be consistent with the recommendations contained in the geologic report of the site prepared by (fill in).

B. The permittee shall undertake development in accordance with the approved final plans. Any proposed changes to the approved final plans shall be reported to the Director. No changes to the approved final plans shall occur without an amendment to this coastal development permit, unless the Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

2. No future shoreline protection. Hazards section 3.28 states that "New Development shall: Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion ... or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs". To comply with the hazard policies of the LCP, we recommend that the County attach a condition prohibiting future construction of protective devices should the residence be threatened by bluff instability in the future. The condition should include a requirement for a deed restriction on the subject property alerting future property owners of the geologic hazards of the site, prohibiting the construction of future shoreline armoring to protect any of the permitted development, and requiring the removal of the house, foundation, and pool when future bluff retreat reaches the point where the structures are threatened.

a. In case it's helpful, here is a sample condition that the Coastal Commission has in many cases imposed on its CDPs for projects in similarly hazardous areas:

A. By acceptance of Coastal Development Permit (CDP) No. 1-18-0035, the applicant agrees, on behalf of himself/herself and all successors and assigns, that no bluff or shoreline protective device(s) shall ever be constructed to protect the development approved pursuant to CDP No. X, including, but not limited to, the XXX [list authorized development], including in the event that the development is threatened with damage or destruction from waves, erosion, storm conditions, liquefaction, bluff retreat, landslides, or other coastal hazards in the future, and as may be exacerbated by sea-level rise. By acceptance of this Permit, the applicant hereby waives, on behalf of herself and all successors and assigns, any rights to construct such devices that may exist under applicable law.

- B. *By acceptance of this Permit, the applicant further agrees, on behalf of himself/herself and all successors and assigns, that the landowner shall remove the development authorized by this Permit, if the County or any other government agency with legal jurisdiction has issued a final order, not overturned through any appeal or writ proceedings, determining that the XXX [structures] are currently and permanently unsafe for occupancy or use due to coastal hazards, and that there are no measures that could make the structures suitable for occupancy or use without the use of bluff or shoreline protective devices. If any portion of the development authorized by this permit at any time encroaches onto public property, the permittee shall either remove the encroaching portion of the development or apply to retain it. Any application to retain it must include proof of permission from the owner of the public property. The permittee shall obtain a CDP for removal of approved development, unless the Executive Director provides a written determination that no CDP is legally required.*
- C. *In the event that the edge of the bluff-top recedes to a point where any portion of the structure becomes threatened, but no government agency has ordered that the structures not be occupied or used, a geotechnical investigation shall be prepared by a licensed coastal engineer and geologist, retained by the permittee, that addresses whether any portions of the authorized development are threatened by coastal hazards. The report shall identify all those immediate or potential future measures that could stabilize the XXX without bluff or shoreline protective device(s), including, but not limited to, removal or relocation of portions of the XXX. The report shall be submitted to the Executive Director and the appropriate local government officials. If the geotechnical investigation concludes that any portion of the XXX is unsafe for operation or use, the permittee shall, within 90 days of submitting the investigation, apply for a coastal development permit amendment to remedy the hazard.*
- D. *Prior to removal/relocation, the permittee shall submit two copies of a Removal/Relocation Plan to the Executive Director for review and written approval. The Removal/Relocation Plan shall clearly describe the manner in which such development is to be removed/relocated and the affected area restored so as to best protect coastal resources, including the Pacific Ocean. In the event that portions of the development fall to the bluffs or ocean before they are removed/relocated, the landowner shall remove all recoverable debris associated with the development from the bluffs and ocean and lawfully dispose of the material in an approved disposal site. Such removal shall require a CDP.*

3. Visual Resources. The proposed project will nearly triple the size of the existing residence and will add a new swimming pool and paved court onto the lot, which is located in between Letz Ave and the ocean. There are minimal to no findings in the staff

report explaining how the project is consistent with the visual resources protection policies of the LCP [section 3.42]. To comply with the visual resource policies in MAP section 3.42, the staff report analysis should consider whether the future residential compound will impact existing views of the ocean and whether it will be visually compatible with and subordinate to the character of surrounding areas. To do this, the analysis could compare the proposed project with existing houses in the surrounding area (which appear to be around the same size as the existing residence and much smaller than the proposed residence) to gauge whether the proposed project is out of character with the surrounding neighborhood.

4. **EHSA.** Our initial comments from 5/18/21 mentioned potential biological resources on the site. Rare Siskiyou checkerbloom plants are known to occur in the project vicinity (plants have been found in surveys around the airport property). We recommend that biological surveys be completed when there is the potential for ESHA to occur on-site in addition to findings related to the project's impacts on sensitive resources and a clear description of the amounts and types of vegetation proposed to be removed as part of the project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss any of our above recommendations further.

Catherine Holloway

Coastal Planner

California Coastal Commission

1385 8th Street, Suite 130

Arcata CA 95521

(707) 826-8950 ext. 3

Catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov



Re: Project Review Request: PLN-2021-17105 Cannabis Related: No

Holloway, Catherine@Coastal <catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov>

Tue 5/18/2021 12:37 PM

To: Suarez, Alyssa <asuarez@co.humboldt.ca.us>

 1 attachments (152 KB)

17105 Referral Cover Sheet 4.6.2021_CCC.pdf;

Hi Alyssa,

Getting you late comments on this project, I hope that's OK. I am clearly catching up on project review this week!

This project proposes a new home, pool, tennis courts, etc. on a blufftop lot. The plot plan shows the approximate edge of stable bank and shows a proposed pool and hot tub within 86 ft. of the bank edge. I'm copying comments that we've sent on other project reviews, and I think they apply here as well. Please let me know if you have any questions or if the applicant is in the process of completing a geologic report already.

Recommendations: The County should require submittal of a site-specific geologic report that includes both (a) an evaluation of bluff erosion/cliff retreat over the projected 75-year design life of the residential development, and (b) a quantitative slope stability analysis. The geologic analyses should factor in the anticipated exacerbating effects of sea-level rise on calculated bluff retreat rate and slope stability/factor of safety setback using the best available science as recommended by the state SLR guidance. The geologic setback recommendation and mapping should reference an accurately delineated "bluff edge" on the site as defined in the Commission's regulations [CCR sec. 13577(h)]:

Bluff line or edge shall be defined as the upper termination of a bluff, cliff, or seacliff. In cases where the top edge of the cliff is rounded away from the face of the cliff as a result of erosional processes related to the presence of the steep cliff face, the bluff line or edge shall be defined as that point nearest the cliff beyond which the downward gradient of the surface increases more or less continuously until it reaches the general gradient of the cliff. In a case where there is a steplike feature at the top of the cliff face, the landward edge of the topmost riser shall be taken to be the cliff edge. The termini of the bluff line, or edge along the seaward face of the bluff, shall be defined as a point reached by bisecting the angle formed by a line coinciding with the general trend of the bluff line along the seaward face of the bluff, and a line coinciding with the general trend of the bluff line along the inland facing portion of the bluff. Five hundred feet shall be the minimum length of bluff line or edge to be used in making these determinations.

The site plan should be updated to show the bluff edge and minimum recommended geologic setback relative to proposed new development.

The construction plans on accelA (dated 3.24.2021) aren't clickable. Do you have copies you could forward over? How is the house designed in terms of height and visual compatibility with the surrounding area? Do you know if there are any ESHA on site or adjacent to the property? It looks like there might be tree removal proposed to move the residence northeast - do you know what the vegetation type is on the property and extent of vegetation removal?

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide preliminary comments.

Cat

From: Humboldt County No Reply <noReply@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Sent: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 10:33 AM

To: Kraemer, Melissa@Coastal <Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov>; Holloway, Catherine@Coastal <catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov>

Subject: Project Review Request: PLN-2021-17105 Cannabis Related: No

Dear Partner Agency, (Cal Coastal Commission)

A permit application has been received for the following project:

Application Number: PLN-2021-17105

Description: Hone CDP & Demolition

Cannabis Related: No

Parcel: 511-061-009-000

Address: 3480 Letz Rd, Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Please access Accela OR your Accela Citizen Access (ACA) account for the County of Humboldt to review this project and submit your response.

ACA: <https://aca.accela.com/humboldt/Default.aspx>

Thank You,

County of Humboldt Planning & Building Department