| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Lynn or Mark |
| **To:** | CDD Comments; April Sall |
| **Cc:** | John Peters |
| **Subject:** | Comment on Conditional Use Permit 21-001/Hemminger |
| **Date:** | Friday, March 12, 2021 10:11:06 AM |

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Dear Planning Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the UP 21-001/Hemminger application.

I believe in the importance of fair and impartial deliberations that take into account public input and opinion. I would like to address some issues that were raised at the last meeting.

The claim that the utility poles would have been approved by the Commission (had the owner had applied for a variance prior to construction) is presumptuous and dishonors both community input and the general plan. While the utilities poles are installed, the situation is correctable: the poles can be removed - and we do not need to just move on. The developers agreed, as indicated by the approved building plans, that they would underground the utilities - fairness calls for them to be held to this agreement. Developers should not be able to disregard approved plans without facing the consequences of their actions.

The fire danger posed by these lines might be small but it is higher than if they weren't there.

These poles create a negative visual impact; their harm is esthetic and possibly economic. Three poles are visible from my house; one sticks out like a well drilling derrick and all are annoying.

Insuring the accuracy of the submitted bids - especially considering that the cost of ungrounding seems to be at the heart of the matter - should be basic procedure.

The cost of under grounding utilities isn't cheap, but it isn't excessive. Utilities are a recognized cost of building a house; the cost of doing this work *would have been known at the start* of construction. The estimate for under grounding that was submitted is much higher than prices that I have seen in internet searches for similar work. Has the owner looked at cost reduction methods including doing the trenching work himself or with the help of neighbors? If Liberty was responsible for the un-permitted work the developer needs to diligently pursue getting them to correct the violations. The Commission should be interested in the communication between the developer and Liberty; an oral statement from the developer saying that Liberty is not cooperative should not be enough evidence of a financial hardship or of a reasonable attempt at having them correct the problem. Liberty's website reads "our goal is to ensure we comply with all environmental regulations, which is an extension of our local, responsive and caring culture" - they need to be held to that standard.

That the county repeatedly inspected the site without correcting the violation (or turned a blind eye to them because the public hadn't yet reported it) is indicative of a flawed inspection and complaint process. It is disheartening that the County seems unwilling to take any responsibility for allowing this situation to occur. A complaint process that pits neighbor against neighbor is bad for the community. The county and Liberty need to get on the same page and insure that our approved County plans and regulations are followed.

I urge the Commission to insure that approved building plan is followed. The utility lines on the property, and all lines that break the ridge line or skyline, need to be placed underground.

Sincerely,

Mark Langner
109939 Hwy 395

Coleville, CA