

**July 18, 2023**

**Regular Meeting**

**Item # 9c. -**

**Updated  
attachment**

P.O. Box 2131  
Olympic Valley, CA 96146  
530-412-3070  
[alisa@tahoedreamteam.com](mailto:alisa@tahoedreamteam.com)

June 10, 2023

Mono Co. Board of Supervisors  
PO Box 715  
Bridgeport, CA 93517

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to request that you waive the bill for my appeal as well as return the original \$500 fee paid to file an appeal. I should not have to pay fees to request that the county follow the law. When Planning Staff lies to the Planning Commission to get them to approve their recommended findings, one should not have to pay for an appeal. There is a basic expectation that point blank lies will not be used in public hearings or anywhere in county operations. I request that the county look into the lies told by the Planning Staff to make sure that this does not happen in the future. Is this how you want to be swayed into accepting recommendations from staff? Is this how you want people to see you running the county? Mistakes, covered up with lies and illegal actions? I appealed the Planning Commissions using a Use Permit to clean up the Planning Department's mistakenly permitting a structure at a height not allowed by the MCGP. My appeal reasons were as follows:

The Planning Commission based their vote on three main items that were lies and/or illegal:

1. Planning Commissioners specifically asked Planning Staff if there were other accessory structures of similar heights. Planning Staff told them there were. This is a flat out lie. The tallest other accessory structure in Swall Meadows is a recently built, beautiful barn on a 2 acre lot and it is 25 feet high at the highest point off grade. Planning staff has this information in their computer. If they don't know the answer, they can say I don't know, but to lie and say that there are other similar buildings is illegal and wrong. A 35 foot high building is not similar to a 25 foot high building. It is 40% higher. Items that have a 40% difference from each other are not similar.
2. Planning Commissioners asked Planning Staff if the main house was higher at its peak in elevation than the height of the accessory structure as they were trying to establish if the peak elevation was higher or lower so that the garage could be considered "subordinate" to the house to comply with MCGP section 04.110.  
*Accessory uses over 20 feet in height shall be architecturally compatible with and be subordinate to the primary residence. Additional design requirements, such as color, building material, landscaping, building articulating and location, may be required to minimize off-site visual impacts and respect neighborhood characteristics.*

The accessory structure is obviously much larger than the house, both in overall height and mass as well as the highest point in elevation but Planning Staff told them that the house was higher. This is a blatant lie. The house is lower. The applicant has open permits on the house and the

planning staff has at their fingertips scaled drawings of the main house that show the height of the house. It is lower than the garage both in height off grade as well as in elevation at the peak of the roof.

At the BOS meeting Planning Staff told the BOS that the garage was subordinate to the house because the house is 2600 sq. ft. and the garage is 1300. The garage is 3-4 stories high and the house is 2. MCGP section 04.110 is clearly discussing visual characteristics of a structure, not internal floor area. Do you want to have deceptive, inaccurate information provided to you by Planning Staff? Are you really ok with being told that a 30 foot high garage is visually subordinate to a 2 story approximately 18-20 foot high house of approximately the same footprint size? Wouldn't you like planning staff to tell you precise facts and accurate information?

3. Design Review approved the building and therefore it is the will of the community. This is not true. The design review met in private, with no agenda posted and no minutes in a person's house. A violation of the Brown Act on many levels. If they did not violate the Brown's Act, the citizens would have known about the permit application and had the opportunity to let the planning staff know that they had a mistake on the height. No credit should be given to a meeting held with these type of gross violations, let alone stretching the facts and calling it the will of the people.

These are not subjective questions that could have many different answers. They are black and white, yes or no questions. Is the house higher than the garage? No, but staff said yes. Are there other accessory structures of similar height? No, but staff said yes. Are you really ok with this? I mentioned all three of these items at the appeal and they were completely ignored. You voted to deny the appeal with the following reasons cited by the 5 supervisors:

Sup. Duggan: I had something built in my view and I got used to it.

Sup. Kreitz: I agree with her

Sup. Peters: I agree with her too

Sup. Salcido: I agree with her too

Sup. Gardner: These people are wasting our time. We have more important issues in our county, like a lack of workforce housing.

Is that really how you decide if something is permitted by the MCGP? You did not provide any factual evidence that the structure complies with the MCGP. Are you really ok with being lied to? Is it ok with you to treat your taxpayers with the complete lack of respect that I was shown in using those reason to determine the outcome of an appeal that I was paying for? If you don't care and you don't want to do your job, step down. Your job, one of its many components, is to follow the MCGP. It is to hold honest and fact based hearings and to expect that your staff give honest and factually accurate information to Planning Commissioners and to yourself.

Planning Staff just re-issued a permit to the applicant using the Design Review findings from the meeting held in private with no notification at someone's house. There seems to be no effort what so ever to follow the rules going forward. The permit expired. Planning Staff could have required that the DR review the application again with proper public notice in compliance with the Brown Act.

I have over \$2,000 in legal bills on top of the \$1,169.75 bill from Mono County. Since no one at the County cared whether or not they were following the law, legal review was a complete waste of money. The applicant designed a building for an illegal commercial use that has subsequently been denied, they lied to Planning Staff on the building's purpose, they bought the structure before they ever had a permit, and they have no legal purpose that requires a 30 foot single story structure. Planning Staff made a mistake that could have been quickly fixed in fairness to all and in the name of the law. The applicants could have used part of the building and replaced part of it for 30-50K, but instead neighbors and the community lost way more than 30-50K in views IN AN UNJUST AND ILLEGAL PROCESS.

I would like this bill waived and my \$500 back. If you feel I should pay, prove to me that no one lied. You can't do it. I should not have to pay to ask the county to follow its own general plan.

DocuSigned by:  
  
378E5F0A67F94A9...  
Alisa Adriani

# COUNTY OF MONO

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



# INVOICE

P.O. Box 347  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
Phone 760 924-1800  
commdev@mono.ca.gov

**DATE:** June 2, 2023  
**INVOICE #** 6223  
**FOR:** Appeal 23-02 Sherer

### Bill To:

Alisa Adriani and Blythe Ousterman  
PO Box 2131  
Olympic Valley, CA 96146  
[alisa@tahoedeamteam.com](mailto:alisa@tahoedeamteam.com)

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
Deposit on 2-27-23	-\$495.00
Staff time - 11.25 hours @ \$99/hr	\$1,113.75
Notice of Public Hearing - Mammoth Times, March 23, 2023 issue	\$51.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$669.75</b>

Make all checks payable to **MONO COUNTY**

To pay online\*, visit: <https://www.monocounty.ca.gov/tax/page/online-payments>. Select "Community Development" under Payment Type. Under "Permit Number / Requested Service", enter the name of project/permit

\*Please be advised, a convenience fee will be applied

**Please email receipt of payment to [wsugimura@mono.ca.gov](mailto:wsugimura@mono.ca.gov)**

If you have any questions concerning this invoice, contact Wendy Sugimura, (760) 924-1814, [wsugimura@mono.ca.gov](mailto:wsugimura@mono.ca.gov).

**PAYMENT DUE UPON RECEIPT**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020, this notice is hereby given that to challenge the imposition of any fee, dedication, reservation, or other exaction, a written protest must be submitted to the Community Development Department within 90-days of the issuance of this permit/license or notice.



# MONO COUNTY

California's Eastern Sierra

[Home](#)   [Mono County CAO](#)

### Payment Receipt

#### Bill Payment

Payment Type	Name	Service Requested	Amount
Misc	Alisa Adriani	Appeal EHO 23-001	\$495.00

Merchant Name    County of Mono CAO  
 First Name        Alisa  
 Middle Initial  
 Last Name         Adriani  
 Address            P.O. Box 2131  
                       City            Olympic Valley  
                       Country        United States  
                       State           California  
 Postal Code        96146  
 Phone              US +1 530-412-3070  
 Email Address     alisa@tahoedreamteam.com

Bill Payment Amount    \$495.00  
 Conv. Fee                 \$11.78  
 Total Payment Amount    \$506.78

Credit Card Number    xxxxxxxxxxxx9898  
 Expiration Date        xx / xxxx  
 Name on Card           Alisa Adriani  
 Card Verification Number    xxx

**Payment successful!**

Amount Charged                \$506.78  
 Transaction ID                 216491023  
 Payment Date / Time         2/27/2023 2:00:47 PM  
    Pacific

Email Address:

Payment email already sent to [alisa@tahoedreamteam.com](mailto:alisa@tahoedreamteam.com)

[Email Additional Receipt](#)

[Print Receipt](#)

[Finish](#)

County of Mono CAO  
[Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Use](#)

Project Name	Employee Name	Month No.	Task Name	Date	Hours	Description
<b>Planning Projects</b>						
	<b>Wendy Sugimura</b>					
		<b>3</b>				
			<b>Appeal 23-02/Sherer</b>			
				3/1/2023	0.25	responding to appellant's questions
				3/20/2023	2.00	staff report
				3/24/2023	1.00	responding to appellant questions: week of 3/20
				3/29/2023	2.00	responding to questions and verifying information was already sent to them
					<b>5.25</b>	
		<b>4</b>				
			<b>Appeal 23-02/Sherer</b>			
				4/3/2023	2.00	prep for BOS meeting, answering appellant questions
				4/4/2023	3.00	appeal at BOS, follow up
				4/7/2023	1.00	responding to appellant
					<b>6</b>	
<b>Full Summary</b>					<b>11.25</b>	

MAMMOTH TIMES  
 PO Box 4050  
 Palmdale, CA 93590-4050

Invoice

1/1

BILLING DATE	TERMS OF PAYMENT
03/31/2023	Net 30 Days

BILLED ACCOUNT
MONO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION PO BOX 347 MAMMOTH LAKES, CA 93546

BILLED ACCOUNT NO.	AGENCY/CLIENT
00008829	00008829
NAME OF AGENCY/CLIENT	
MONO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION	

DATE	TRANS #	DESCRIPTION	INS	SAU	INCHES	COST	EXTRAS	TOTAL
02/28/2023		Balance Forward						0.00
03/23/2023	300307837	Sherer Appeal Notice -	2	1 x 9.89	9.89	51.00	0.00	51.00

0 - 0	AGING			
	1 - 30 DAYS	31 - 60 DAYS	61 - 90 DAYS	91 - 120 DAYS
\$ 51.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

TOTAL NET AMOUNT DUE
\$ 51.00

PLEASE RETURN THIS PORTION  
 WITH YOUR REMITTANCE

If you desire to charge this amount to your credit card, please complete the following information and return to the address below: [ ] Visa [ ] Mastercard [ ] Discover

Acct# \_\_\_\_\_ Exp Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Go paperless with e-invoices. Call 661-441-6373 to give us your email. Thank you for your prompt payment.

BILLED ACCOUNT NO.	BILLED ACCOUNT NAME	AMOUNT REMITTED
00008829	MONO COUNTY PLANNING	

REMIT TO
MAMMOTH TIMES PO Box 4050 Palmdale, CA 93590-4050  Phone: 661-441-6373 Fax: MAMMOTH@AVPRESS.COM

Payment in full is due upon receipt of the statement. A service charge on all balances over 30 days will be computed by a 'Periodic Rate' of 1-1/2% per month, which is an ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF 18%, this applies to the previous balance after deducting current payments and credits appearing on your statement.

Remittance Advice



# Advertising Invoice

## MAMMOTH TIMES

3

Mammoth Times  
PO Box 4050  
Palmdale, CA 93590-4050  
Phone: 760-934-3929  
Fax: 760-934-3951  
URL: [www.mammothtimes.com](http://www.mammothtimes.com)

MONO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
PO BOX 347  
MAMMOTH LAKES CA 93546

**Customer #:** 03100858  
**Phone:** (760)924-1800  
**Date:** 03/23/2023

Ad#	Start	Stop	Publication	Descr	Amount
00043659	03/23/2023	03/23/2023	2M MAMMOTH TIMES	Sherer Appeal Notice	50.00
00043659	03/23/2023	03/23/2023	W CLASS WEB	Sherer Appeal Notice	1.00

Please return a copy with payment

**Total Due**

**51.00**

# Proof of Publication

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MONO

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of the **MAMMOTH TIMES** a newspaper of general circulation, published in

## County of Mono

The Mammoth Times was adjudicated on March 24, 1992, as a newspaper of general circulation for the Town of Mammoth Lakes and Mono County, CA.

The notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to with:

**March 23<sup>rd</sup>,**  
**In the year, 2023**

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Mammoth Lakes, California,  
**23<sup>rd</sup> Day of March, 2023**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

This space is for

Proof

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Mono County Board of Supervisors will conduct a public hearing on **April 4, 2023**, at the Mono County Courthouse, Second Floor Board Chambers, 278 Main Street, Bridgeport, CA, with a teleconference location at the Mono Lake Room of the Mono County Civic Center, First Floor, 1290 Tavern Road, Mammoth Lakes, CA. A remote meeting may be authorized under AB 361, based on Governor Newsom's March 1, 2023, Proclamation of Emergency resulting from severe storms and a finding that in-person participation would result in an imminent risk to the health and safety of meeting attendees. The teleconference and remote meeting can be accessed at <https://monocounty.zoom.us/j/8595789548> and by telephone at: 669-900-6833 (Meeting ID# is 885 9578 9548) and by telephone at 669-900-6833 (Meeting ID# 885 9578 9548) where members of the public shall have the right to observe and offer public comment and to consider the following: **9:30 am – Appeal of Planning Commission Approval of Use Permit 23-001/Sherer.** The project is located at 1273 Swall Meadows Road, Swall Meadows (APN 064-140-014) and approved an accessory structure/garage greater than 20' in height and less than 35' in height. The property is designated Estate Residential and is 0.95 acres. The project qualifies as a Categorical Exemption under CEQA guideline sections 15303 (d). The Planning Commission approved the project and the Board may affirm, affirm in part, or reverse the Commission's decision. Project materials will be available for public review online at <https://monocounty.ca.gov/bos/page/board-supervisors-180> and hard copies are available for the cost of reproduction by calling 760-924-1800. INTERESTED PERSONS are strongly encouraged to attend the livecast meeting by phone or online or to attend in-person; and to submit comments to the Clerk of the Board, c/o Mono County Planning Commission Secretary, PO Box 347, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 or by email at [cddcomments@mono.ca.gov](mailto:cddcomments@mono.ca.gov), by 8 am on Tuesday, April 4, 2023, or via the livecast meeting (technology permitting) at the time of the public hearing. If you challenge the proposed action(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Secretary to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. (MT 03.23, 2023 #19816)