

#### **PLANNING APPLICATION FORM**

Humboldt County Planning Department
Current Planning Division 3015 H Street Eureka, CA 95501-4484
Phone (707) 445-7541 Fax (707) 268-3792

RECEIVED
FEB 1 8 2021
Humboldt County
Plefning Division

#### INSTRUCTIONS:

- 1. Applicant/Agent complete Sections I, II and III below.
- 2. It is recommended that the Applicant/Agent schedule an Application Assistance meeting with the Assigned Planner. Meeting with the Assigned Planner will answer questions regarding application submittal requirements and help avoid processing delays. A small fee is required for this meeting.
- 3. Applicant/Agent needs to submit <u>all</u> items marked on the reverse side of this form.

SECT	FION I
APPLICANT (Project will be processed under Business name, if applicable.)	AGENT (Communications from Department will be directed to agent)
Business Name: Mr. M'bivire Alicense Emineer	Rusinass Nama
Contact Person: Inevala Musice	Business Name:
Mailing Address: PC Box 322 95337	Contact Person: Mailing Address:
City, St, Zip: Fields Landing CA	City, St, Zip:
Telephone: 107 362-5906 Alt. Tel: 107 502 6156	Telephone: Alt. Tel:
Email: Jerrymigoire 788jmc@gmailicom	Email:
OWNER(S) OF RECORD (If different from applicant)	
Owner's Name:	Owner's Name:
Mailing Address:	Mailing Address:
City, St, Zip:	City, St, Zip:
elephone: Alt. Tel:	Telephone: Alt. Tel:
OCATION OF PROJECT	THE TOT
Site Address: 6766 West Avenue	Assessor's Parcel No(s): 306-024-004
Community Area: Fields Landina	Parcel Size (acres or sq. ft.): 4,791 34ft
s the proposed building or structure designed to be used for	designing producing launching maintaining or storing
uclear weapons or the components of nuclear weapons?	YES ZNO
SECT	ION II
To finish the construction of a spreviously approved and permitted previously approved and permitted prea in fields Landing. When finish imilar to others in sorrounding and	lans, in a low density residential led this personal home would be ea.
SECT	ON III
OWNER'S AUTHORIZATION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	
hereby authorize the County of Humboldt to process this ap County of Humboldt and employees of the California Departr lescribed above as reasonably necessary to evaluate the property that are not complete or do not contain truthful and accurate evocation of approvals.	nent of Fish and Wildlife to enter upon the property oject. I also acknowledge that processing of applications information will be delayed and may result in denial or
DAN Melanco	2/10/21
Applicant Signature	2/18/2   Date
Applicant digitature	
the applicant is not the owner of record: I authorize the armit and to represent me in all matters concerning the applicant is a second or the concerning the applicant is a second or the concerning the applicant is a second or the concerning the applicant is not the owner of record:	applicant/agent to file this application for a development lication.
the applicant is not the owner of record: I authorize the ermit and to represent me in all matters concerning the applicant of Passad Standards.	lication.
the applicant is not the owner of record: I authorize the ermit and to represent me in all matters concerning the application of Record Signature	applicant/agent to file this application for a development lication.  Date

PLN-2021-17025

## This side completed by Planning Staff

Checklist Completed by: TŚ Date: 01/20/2021

# THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION

Iton	0/	Received	lter	n		Received	
Iten	Filing Fee of \$			Architectural Ele	evations		
	Fee Schedule (see attached, please return			☐ Design Review Committee Approval			
ш	completed fee schedule with application)						
	Plot Plan 12 copies (folded if > 8½" x 14")			Exception Requ	Exception Request Justification		
	☐ Tentative Map 12 folded copies (Minor Subd)				nt Timber Management Plan		
	☐ Tentative Map 18 folded copies (Major Subd)				Size Modification Request Justification		
	[Note: Additional plot plans/maps may be required]				aining Route (see County GIS)		
	☐ Tentative Map/Plot Plan Checklist (complete & return with application)			Parking Plan	minimus en (2)		
	☐ Floor Plan			Plan of Operation			
ш	☐ Division of Environmental Health Questionnaire ☐			CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE	draulic & Drainage Plan		
						ies	
	On-site sewage testing (if applicable)		with original signatures)				
	On-site water information (if applical			Reclamation Pl	an, including engineered cost		
	Solar design information		30		mpleting reclamation	빌	
	Chain of Title			0.0000000	Illing Unit Fact Sheet	ARIUS TAX	
	Grant Deed			Variance Requ			
٦	☐ Current ☐ Creation	Steam blud in a		Vested Right D	ocumentation/Evidence	dia C	
	Preliminary Title Report (two copies	, prepared		Other			
	within the last six months prior to ap	plication)		0.00			
				Other			
		sea legale pri		Other			
						11.00	
	Ag. Preserve Contract Certificate of Compliance Coastal Development Permit Administrative Planning Commission  Design Review Inland	General Plan Amendment General Plan Petition Information Request Modification to Lot Line Adjustment Preliminary Project Review		ion st 	<ul> <li>□ Reclamation Plan</li> <li>□ Surface Mining Permit</li> <li>□ Surface Mining Vested Right Determination</li> <li>□ Timber Harvest Plan Information Request</li> <li>□ Use Permit H.C.C. §</li> </ul>		
	Coastal						
	Determination of Legal Status  Determination of Substantial	Special Permit Administrative Planning Commission			☐ Variance H.C.C. §		
-	Conformance	H.C.C. §_			Zone Reclassification		
-	Extension of	Subdivision			Other		
-	Fire Safe Exception Request	Parcel Ma					
1000	File Sale Exception Request	Exception to		ubdivision	Other	We state	
	property and the second of the			II E II E			
			D	ote:	Receipt Number		
A	pplication Received By:eneral Plan Designation:	VIV.	. Da	ate:	Treceipt (validor:		
	lan Document:						
L	and Use Density:				IN the extent for 35% 3 order	The Section	
Z	one Designation:Status:	∏ An	peal	able [	Not Appealable	minds n	
	Coastal Jurisdiction Appeal Status:  Appealable  Preliminary CEQA Status:						
	☐ Environmental Review Required ☐ Categorically Exempt From Environmental Review: Class Section						
	Statutory Exemption:  Not a Project		Jida	·	a the Im. 1		
	1 Other			and the second			

### Intention:

To finish building a single dwelling home in which I (owner & builder) can live in and to complete the project in a timely manner under compliance with the county. This home would not be for sale or profit, it would be a continuation of existing structures, follow the previously permitted and approved plans, does not require any habitat removal or alteration, would be similar to other community structures and is located in a low-density residential area.

### Main Argument points:

- Unjustly/Unfairly treated at Public Hearing: 'Abuse of discretion of the Hearing Officer/Planning Commission'
  - Last item on agenda 9pm commissioners already strained and ready to be done
  - Commissioners hastily moved from comments to vote unlike previously heard topics
  - Wasn't allowed to respond nor have a closing statement, unlike all other representatives from previously heard topics who were asked several times if they had anything else they would like to say before going to a vote
  - No time allowance, nor proper notification of meeting or informed of importance of meeting
  - Now being charged \$339.87 for hearing

4 main reasons (stated by Tricia Shortridge) to deny permit:

1. It's a after the fact permit

Response: No work was done until Code Enforcer told me 'just want to see you finish' which was a verbal go ahead and all demolition was micro managed by Code Enforcer. Many 'after the fact' permits granted in Humboldt County

2. Long history of code violations

**Response:** Admit some fault; going through hard times without support. However now focused on and committed to moving forward and the intention to complete project in timely manner upon approval and with support network behind me.

3. Existing violations which are still there

**Response:** Been under direct supervision by Code Enforcement, told conflicting things and have been given different direction from different agencies. Although there's still work to be done, I have already done multiple things asked, currently much cleaner than represented by presentation and **currently in compliance** with Code Enforcement (see attached)

4. No variance

**Response:** Trisha agreed to start application for variance by end of 2020 however never did. Time it has taken from first getting permit to now there has been new zoning laws/code.



- Previously approved and permitted plans. Work was done under fully approved permit
- Under direct supervision by Code Enforcement during whole process was told to take down building, all work was inspected.
- Foundation permit approved (see attached)
- Work done up to approved permit standards, foundation permit accepted by Building Department and Planning Department Coastal permit should not be required
- Not large intersection or traffic area, not necessarily blocking any view point, majority of intersections uncontrolled in Fields Landing and other residences have structures right along edge of property line.
- Fields Landing Community in support- petition (see attached)
  - o If allowed to build home the surrounding properties increase in value
  - Other examples of "nuisances" around fields Landing
  - Allegations of continual reports can be misleading, is it one individual or multiple people supposedly making reports?
- Specialized permits/allowances in Ca- Home owner and builder, current pandemic situation
- Unprofessional, unfair and discriminatory treatment from Tricia Shortridge
  - Not communicating in timely fashion about public hearing
  - Overstepping job description, bypassing other agencies and requiring unrealistic demands-invoices (see attached)
  - Not properly completing or attempting job- email string, nothing checked on appeal application (see attached)
  - Not communicating in person-refusal to answer questions which is why Brian got involved
  - Hand written notes are wrong, invoice # to disregard is nonexistent (see attached)
  - Shows disregard for the project and issuing wrong/incorrect information
  - Setting prices to try and cause economic hardship and confusion. \$2000 in one week compared to \$2000 in year? (see attached)

## Please Consider:

I live on limited budget, the estimated cost of completing project vs estimated cost of tear down and rebuild would cause economic strain on top of the decreased property value from changing plans. I'm a retired A license Engineer and a long existing member of our community for over 60 years. I have built and help build several public and private structures throughout Humboldt and would like to complete this last one in the means possible for myself. Thank you for your time and consideration.