

5 HARRIS COURT, BLDG. G
POST OFFICE BOX 85
MONTEREY, CA 93942-0085 • (831) 658-5600
FAX (831) 644-9560 • http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us

TRANSMITAL

TO:	MPWMD Board of Directors		DATE: March 14, 2007
RE:	March 19, 2007 Board Meeting Agenda, Item 15 ~ Consider Appeal of District General Manager's Decision to Deny a Water Permit for a Third Bathroom Addition to 905 Ocean View Blvd., Pacific Grove (APN 006-031-004) – Continued from February 22, 200's Board Meeting		
WF A	ARE SENDING YOU:		
	DOCUMENTS	П	AGREEMENT OR CONTRACT
	DOCUMENTS YOU REQUESTED		OTHER
	COPY OF LETTER		
THE	ABOVE ITEMS ARE SUBMITTED:		
	At your request		Please review and comment
	For your information and files		For your action
	For your approval		Please sign and return
	Please telephone me		
REM	ARKS: Attached is a letter dated March	14, 2007, f	rom Derinda Messenger, who represents
the ar	oplicant in the appeal described under iten	n 15 of the	March 19, 2007 Board meeting agenda.
	BY:	Ulene	M. Tavani, Executive Assistant

Anthony L. Lombordo Jeffery R. Gilles Derinda L. Messenger

Dennis C. Beougher
Patrick S.M. Casey
Sheri L. Darnon
E. Soren Dlaz
J. Kenneth Gorman
Virginia A. Hines
Steven D. Pentose*
Paul Rovella
Miriam Schakar
Bradley W. Sullivan
James W. Sullivan
Kelly McCarthy Sutherland

LORBORDO ATTORNATION ATTORNEYS AT LOW

318 Cayuga Street P. O. Box 2119 Sallnas, CA 93902-2119 831-754-2444 (SALMAS) 888-757-2444 (MONTEREY) 831-754-2011 (FAX)

225 Sixth Street Hollster, CA 95023 831-630-9444

File No.: 03793.000

Jacqueline M. Zischke of counsel

"Certified by the State Boy of California Board of Legal Specialization as a Specialist in Estate Planning, Trust and Robbert But. March 14, 2007

VIA FACSIMILE & U.S. MAIL



David Pendergrass, Chair Members of the MPWMD Board of Directors P. O. Box 85 Monterey, CA 93942

MPWMD

Re: McDannold Appeal

Dear Chair Pendergrass and Members of the Board:

This firm represents Steven McDannold in matters related to his property at 905 Ocean View Boulevard, in Pacific Grove. The McDannolds have filed an appeal to the Water Management District Board of Directors regarding the staff decision to deny issuance of retrofit credits for the McDannold home.

Shortly after the McDannolds received approval to construct a second bathroom for their home in June of 2003, they began designing a renovation of the entire home. The second bath added pursuant to District Ordinance was completed in advance of the overall renovation project because of its immediate need as well as the likelihood of a lengthy design process for total renovation given the constraints of this very small parcel.

When the architect began the design for the renovation, he encountered numerous obstacles related to the existing home. For example, the existing structure on this site was originally constructed within what are now the rear and side yard setbacks. In order to maximize the use of this site for a newly renovated 2,300 square foot home, the architect had to design a structure that incorporated those portions of the old building located within the setback. As you may well imagine, this took considerable time on the part of the architect as well as numerous meetings with the City to ensure development of a project that could be approved by the City of Pacific Grove. During this lengthy design and approval process, the McDannolds recorded the Deed Restriction for their second bath addition pursuant to District Ordinance No. 98.

As you know, Ordinance No. 98 did not preclude addition of a third bathroom to the McDannold home based on retro-fit of existing fixtures within the residence. Accordingly, my client proceeded to spend a considerable amount of time and money to develop plans for the renovation

David Pendergrass, Chair Members of the MPWMD Board of Directors March 14, 2007 Page 2

of their home. Prior to receiving approval from the City of Pacific Grove for the renovation, the District adopted Ordinance No. 114 which added a provision limiting the total number of bathrooms to two where the second bathroom was added under the second bath rule (Ordinance No. 98). When the McDannolds received their final approval of the renovation and attempted to obtain a building permit, Mr. McDannold was advised that Ordinance No. 114 had been adopted which amended Ordinance No. 98 to prevent addition of a third bath.

Unfortunately, had my client been directed by the City to obtain his Water Release Form at the onset of this process, as is done in the City of Carmel and other jurisdictions, he would not be in a position requiring this appeal. It is understood that the District has no control over how or when each jurisdiction implements the requirements for a Water Release Form, however given the unique circumstances in this case, fairness dictates that the Board should grant the requested appeal and allow the McDannolds to proceed with renovation of their home.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Lombardo & Gilles, LLP

Derinda L. Messenger

DLM:rp

cc:

Client

Eric Miller, Architect