

Randall Adams

From: David Bernstein <davidrbernstein@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 10:38 AM
To: Randall Adams
Subject: Re: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — request for appeal jurisdiction basis and parcel area clarification

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Good Morning Mr. Adams

Thanks for trying to get the questions below answered before the Friday meeting. In particular answers on the NV25236 status and whether a Stipulation and Order was executed are of particular interest.

Thank you again for your help.

David Bernstein
145 18th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
408 857 9872

=====

On Saturday, August 15, 2026 at 01:14:32 PM PDT, David Bernstein <davidrbernstein@yahoo.com> wrote:

Subject: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — follow-up: Nielsen survey and roof position at the property lines

Dear Mr. Adams,

Following up on my earlier email with one further item, which I think is narrower and more easily answered.

The site plan sheet in Exhibit D includes a detail bearing the stamp of Jeff B. Nielsen, Licensed Land Surveyor No. 6832, of Mid Coast Engineers, Job No. 25085. It annotates the shed at 13.00 by 18.00 feet with offsets from the property line of 0.5 feet on one line and 0.2 feet on the other, and it distinguishes a "foundation line" from an "eave line."

The eave line appears to be drawn only on the two sides of the structure facing the existing residence and rear yard. On the two sides facing the property lines, I do not see an eave line shown. Since the staff report states at page 2 that the applicant is proposing to remove eaves and other extensions that extend beyond the walls along the side and rear property lines, I would like to understand what the survey does and does not establish about the roof.

Could you provide or confirm the following:

1. The complete, full-size Nielsen survey and the surveyor's field notes, rather than the reduced detail printed on the plan sheet.

2. Whether the eaves along the side and rear property lines had already been removed at the time the survey was performed, or whether they were present and simply not measured.
3. The dimension from each property line to the outermost edge of the roof assembly, including any drip edge, flashing or trim.
4. Whether the existing fence was located by the survey, and if so, its offset from the property line.
5. Whether a Record of Survey or corner record has been filed with the County Surveyor for this work pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 8762, and if not, the basis on which one was not required.

My interest is straightforward: the annotated wall offsets are two tenths and five tenths of a foot, so a roof edge projecting further than that would cross onto my parcel, and I cannot tell from the record whether it does. If the answer is that the roof does not cross, I would like that confirmed in the record before the hearing.

Thank you again for your help.

David Bernstein
145 18th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
408 857 9872

=====

On Saturday, August 15, 2026 at 12:18:49 PM PDT, David Bernstein <davidrbernstein@yahoo.com> wrote:

Subject: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — request for appeal jurisdiction basis and parcel area clarification

Dear Mr. Adams,

I am the owner of 145 18th Avenue, the parcel immediately adjoining 154 Sunny Cove Drive, and I will be commenting on Application 251357 at the hearing. Ahead of that, I would appreciate clarification on three items in the staff report so that my comments are accurate.

1. Appeal jurisdiction. Exhibit F states that the project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Could you confirm the basis for that determination under Public Resources Code section 30603(a)(1) — whether the parcel is treated as lying between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea, or within 300 feet of the inland extent of the beach, or both? If the County has a post-LCP-certification appeal jurisdiction map covering APN 028-221-16, I would appreciate a copy or a link.
2. Parcel area. The record contains three different figures. The staff report and Exhibit F state 3,833 square feet (GIS). The applicant's written variance findings state 3,883 square feet. The Project Data block on the plan set, Exhibit D, states 4,000 square feet. Since the sole special circumstance identified in Variance Finding 1 is that the parcel is less than the 4,000 square foot minimum for the R-1-4 district, could you confirm which figure the Planning Division is relying on?
3. Lot coverage. The lot coverage calculation on Exhibit D reports 1,745 square feet as 43.6 percent against a 45 percent maximum, which appears to be derived from a 4,000 square foot parcel. The same sheet's Project Data

block separately states 1,651 square feet, or 41 percent. Could you confirm which calculation the Division has reviewed, and what the coverage percentage is when computed against the parcel area identified in item 2?

Separately, please add me to the notice list for all further actions on this application and this parcel, and please serve me with the Final Local Action Notice if the application is approved in any form.

Thank you for your time. I am happy to pick any of this up by phone if that is easier.

David Bernstein
145 18th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
408 857 9872

Randall Adams

From: David Bernstein <davidrbernstein@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 1:15 PM
To: Randall Adams
Subject: Re: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — request for appeal jurisdiction basis and parcel area clarification

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Subject: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — follow-up: Nielsen survey and roof position at the property lines

Dear Mr. Adams,

Following up on my earlier email with one further item, which I think is narrower and more easily answered.

The site plan sheet in Exhibit D includes a detail bearing the stamp of Jeff B. Nielsen, Licensed Land Surveyor No. 6832, of Mid Coast Engineers, Job No. 25085. It annotates the shed at 13.00 by 18.00 feet with offsets from the property line of 0.5 feet on one line and 0.2 feet on the other, and it distinguishes a "foundation line" from an "eave line."

The eave line appears to be drawn only on the two sides of the structure facing the existing residence and rear yard. On the two sides facing the property lines, I do not see an eave line shown. Since the staff report states at page 2 that the applicant is proposing to remove eaves and other extensions that extend beyond the walls along the side and rear property lines, I would like to understand what the survey does and does not establish about the roof.

Could you provide or confirm the following:

1. The complete, full-size Nielsen survey and the surveyor's field notes, rather than the reduced detail printed on the plan sheet.
2. Whether the eaves along the side and rear property lines had already been removed at the time the survey was performed, or whether they were present and simply not measured.
3. The dimension from each property line to the outermost edge of the roof assembly, including any drip edge, flashing or trim.
4. Whether the existing fence was located by the survey, and if so, its offset from the property line.
5. Whether a Record of Survey or corner record has been filed with the County Surveyor for this work pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 8762, and if not, the basis on which one was not required.

My interest is straightforward: the annotated wall offsets are two tenths and five tenths of a foot, so a roof edge projecting further than that would cross onto my parcel, and I cannot tell from the record whether it does. If the answer is that the roof does not cross, I would like that confirmed in the record before the hearing.

Thank you again for your help.

David Bernstein
145 18th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
408 857 9872

On Saturday, August 15, 2026 at 12:18:49 PM PDT, David Bernstein <davidrbernstein@yahoo.com> wrote:

Subject: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — request for appeal jurisdiction basis and parcel area clarification

Dear Mr. Adams,

I am the owner of 145 18th Avenue, the parcel immediately adjoining 154 Sunny Cove Drive, and I will be commenting on Application 251357 at the hearing. Ahead of that, I would appreciate clarification on three items in the staff report so that my comments are accurate.

1. Appeal jurisdiction. Exhibit F states that the project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Could you confirm the basis for that determination under Public Resources Code section 30603(a)(1) — whether the parcel is treated as lying between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea, or within 300 feet of the inland extent of the beach, or both? If the County has a post-LCP-certification appeal jurisdiction map covering APN 028-221-16, I would appreciate a copy or a link.
2. Parcel area. The record contains three different figures. The staff report and Exhibit F state 3,833 square feet (GIS). The applicant's written variance findings state 3,883 square feet. The Project Data block on the plan set, Exhibit D, states 4,000 square feet. Since the sole special circumstance identified in Variance Finding 1 is that the parcel is less than the 4,000 square foot minimum for the R-1-4 district, could you confirm which figure the Planning Division is relying on?
3. Lot coverage. The lot coverage calculation on Exhibit D reports 1,745 square feet as 43.6 percent against a 45 percent maximum, which appears to be derived from a 4,000 square foot parcel. The same sheet's Project Data block separately states 1,651 square feet, or 41 percent. Could you confirm which calculation the Division has reviewed, and what the coverage percentage is when computed against the parcel area identified in item 2?

Separately, please add me to the notice list for all further actions on this application and this parcel, and please serve me with the Final Local Action Notice if the application is approved in any form.

Thank you for your time. I am happy to pick any of this up by phone if that is easier.

David Bernstein
145 18th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
408 857 9872

Randall Adams

From: David Bernstein <davidrbernstein@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 12:19 PM
To: Randall Adams
Subject: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — request for appeal jurisdiction basis and parcel area clarification

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Subject: Application 251357 (APN 028-221-16) — request for appeal jurisdiction basis and parcel area clarification

Dear Mr. Adams,

I am the owner of 145 18th Avenue, the parcel immediately adjoining 154 Sunny Cove Drive, and I will be commenting on Application 251357 at the hearing. Ahead of that, I would appreciate clarification on three items in the staff report so that my comments are accurate.

1. Appeal jurisdiction. Exhibit F states that the project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Could you confirm the basis for that determination under Public Resources Code section 30603(a)(1) — whether the parcel is treated as lying between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea, or within 300 feet of the inland extent of the beach, or both? If the County has a post-LCP-certification appeal jurisdiction map covering APN 028-221-16, I would appreciate a copy or a link.
2. Parcel area. The record contains three different figures. The staff report and Exhibit F state 3,833 square feet (GIS). The applicant's written variance findings state 3,883 square feet. The Project Data block on the plan set, Exhibit D, states 4,000 square feet. Since the sole special circumstance identified in Variance Finding 1 is that the parcel is less than the 4,000 square foot minimum for the R-1-4 district, could you confirm which figure the Planning Division is relying on?
3. Lot coverage. The lot coverage calculation on Exhibit D reports 1,745 square feet as 43.6 percent against a 45 percent maximum, which appears to be derived from a 4,000 square foot parcel. The same sheet's Project Data block separately states 1,651 square feet, or 41 percent. Could you confirm which calculation the Division has reviewed, and what the coverage percentage is when computed against the parcel area identified in item 2?

Separately, please add me to the notice list for all further actions on this application and this parcel, and please serve me with the Final Local Action Notice if the application is approved in any form.

Thank you for your time. I am happy to pick any of this up by phone if that is easier.

David Bernstein
145 18th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
408 857 9872