

**From:** [Johnson, Cliff](#)  
**To:** [Lippre, Suzanne](#); [McClenagan, Laura](#)  
**Subject:** FW: PLN-9633-CDP  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 12:39:25 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Can you forward to the Commissioners? Item E-1 on the agenda

---

**From:** Johnson, Cliff  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 2:37 PM  
**To:** [catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** [Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov); Kathleen <[kathleen@landlogistics.com](mailto:kathleen@landlogistics.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: PLN-9633-CDP

Hi Catherine,

Below in red are some responses to your questions and concerns. In reading back through the staff report I think we could have been more clear about what we are proposing to permit here, but it is simply to permit the restoration work that has already taken place (mostly through natural regeneration) and a new sign. The references to the private trail would have better been defined as "former unpermitted private trail" or "unpermitted private trail being remediated and abandoned". To be completely clear, we agree a private trail would be difficult to justify under the LCP and this permit is not intended to authorize that in any way. It is to close out the violation and permit the remediation work.

Cliff

---

**From:** Holloway, Catherine@Coastal <[catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 9:42 AM  
**To:** Johnson, Cliff <[CJohnson@co.humboldt.ca.us](mailto:CJohnson@co.humboldt.ca.us)>  
**Cc:** Kraemer, Melissa@Coastal <[Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** PLN-9633-CDP

Hi Cliff,

Commission staff has reviewed the staff report for PLN-9633-CDP (Seaside Ranch) and we have a few questions regarding potential issues raised by the project. I was unable to find the email address for Kathleen Franklin, the listed planner. Please forward these comments to Kathleen if possible. It's unclear to us how the County can make the findings that the proposed project is consistent with the public access and resource protection policies of the SCAP. Below are a few questions and brief comments. We recommend postponing the item till further evaluation has been completed.

1. Can you please clarify why a CUP is required for this project? Is it related to the private trail use through NR lands, which is not allowed under the LCP? The County's findings do not discuss the purpose of the use permit or Special Permit. **Sorry that it is not clear, it is for restoration purposes. Restoration is not a specified use so is conditionally permitted.**
2. What is the existing access situation? Is there evidence that public rights may have accrued across the disturbed landscape that may result in the new "no public access" signage interfering with existing public access rights? The staff report has no substantive findings related to access and it's unclear why the "no public access" sign is required as a condition of CDP approval other than, potentially, to curtail existing public access use of an existing trail through NR lands that the County through this action would privatize. **We have no evidence that public access has been happening or accrued. Our understanding is that it has been revegetating and not in use.**
3. It appears that the existing private trail will remain in place, signage will be added stating "Private property, no public access allowed", and the site would be left in its current state. There are no specifications on what that sign will look like, where it will be placed, and other sign parameters that would demonstrate the trails consistency with the LCP. **This is not intended to be a trail, just a signage that it is private property. The language of that condition is confusing. It should be referring to at the start of the former private trail. The private trail is not to be used at all but allowed to continue to revegetate.**
4. The staff report includes an alternative to actively restore the trail. As proposed, a private trail constructed across NR lands will be allowed to remain. We recommend at a minimum requiring further revegetation of the residual trail with native vegetation and monitoring to ensure success. Restoration could include light regrading with smaller equipment and planting to effectively decommission the trail, better restore the NR landscape, and in that way perhaps prevent the need for the "no public access" signage at the top of the trail. **We will provide these comments to the commission.**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. I will be out of the office for the remainder of the week and Melissa Kraemer, copied on this email, is available if you have any questions or would like to discuss the above questions.

**Catherine Holloway**

Coastal Planner

California Coastal Commission

1385 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 130

Arcata CA 95521

(707) 826-8950 ext. 3

[Catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Catherine.holloway@coastal.ca.gov)

