

ATTACHMENT D

PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Gina Montecallo](#)
Subject: FW: Notice of Objection to Unauthorized Use of Exclusive Access Easement — Parcel 2 (56 Mono St)
Date: Tuesday, August 19, 2025 11:48:33 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Kimberly Erickson <kimberlyerickson232@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 2:32 PM
To: Planning <planning@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov>
Cc: keith erickson <teleskeith@gmail.com>
Subject: Notice of Objection to Unauthorized Use of Exclusive Access Easement — Parcel 2 (56 Mono St)

You don't often get email from kimberlyerickson232@gmail.com. Learn why this is important
<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Keith & Kimberly Erickson
56 Mono Street
P.O. Box 1192
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
Phone: (760) 914-1301
Email: teleskeith@gmail.com <<mailto:teleskeith@gmail.com>> , kimberlyerickson232@gmail.com
<<mailto:kimberlyerickson232@gmail.com>>

Date: August 12, 2025

To:
Planning Department
Town of Mammoth Lakes
P.O. Box 1609
437 Old Mammoth Road, Suite R
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Subject: Notice of Objection to Unauthorized Use of Exclusive Access Easement — Parcel 2 (56 Mono St)

Dear Planning Staff,

We are the owners of Parcel 2 of Parcel Map 36-158, located at 56 Mono Street in Mammoth Lakes. This parcel includes an exclusive access easement over the northerly 30 feet of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map 36-158 (54 Mono Street), as recorded in the Mono County Recorder's Office (Book 4, Page 73 of Parcel Maps).

We are writing to formally notify the Planning Department that Parcel 1 (54 Mono Street) has no legal right to use this easement for access or any other purpose. This easement is exclusive, meaning only we, the owners of Parcel 2, have the legal right to access and use it.

It has come to our attention that the owner or applicant of Parcel 1 has submitted plans to the Town that propose utilizing this easement. Please be advised that we do not consent and will never approve of sharing or relinquishing

our exclusive easement rights. Any plan or proposal that relies on access via this easement is unauthorized and contrary to the recorded deed.

We respectfully request that the Planning Department disregard or deny any application or design that includes use of this easement by Parcel 1.

We are happy to provide easement documents, maps or utility records upon request. We also welcome the opportunity to meet with the planning staff and look forward to participating in the Planning Departments Public Hearing scheduled for August 13, 2025, 9:00 am.

Sincerely,
Keith & Kimberly Erickson
Owners, 56 Mono Street (Parcel 2)

From: [Planning](#)
To: [Gina Montecallo](#)
Subject: FW: Objection to Project Pla54 Mono Street – Exclusive Easement, Safety Concerns, and Density Miscalculation
Date: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 3:37:19 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Kimberly Erickson <kimberlyerickson232@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 3:15 PM
To: Planning <planning@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov>
Subject: Objection to Project Pla54 Mono Street – Exclusive Easement, Safety Concerns, and Density Miscalculation

You don't often get email from kimberlyerickson232@gmail.com. Learn why this is important
<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Keith & Kimberly Erickson
56 Mono Street
P.O. Box 1192
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
Phone: (760) 914-1301
Email: teleskeith@gmail.com <<mailto:teleskeith@gmail.com>>

September 17, 2025

Town of Mammoth Lakes Planning Department
437 Old Mammoth Road, Suite R
P.O. Box 1609
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

RE: Objection to Project Plans for 54 Mono Street – Exclusive Easement, Safety Concerns, and Density Miscalculation

Dear Planning Staff and Commissioners,

We are the owners of 56 Mono Street. We are writing to formally object to the pending application submitted by the owners of 54 Mono Street, which proposes to use our easement as a shared driveway. As the owners of 56 Mono, we hold a recorded exclusive 30-foot access easement over the northerly 30 feet of 554 Mono St. The current project plans mischaracterize this easement as shared, obstruct it with site improvements, and rely on inflated lot size figures that are inconsistent with the parcels net buildable area.

Please see the attached list of our detailed objections.

In summary we respectfully request that the Planning Staff and Commissioners:

1. Reject any reliance on our exclusive easement for shared use and site plans that encroach on our easement.
2. Correct the record to reflect the TRUE NET Buildable area of 54 Mono, removing the square footage of our exclusive easement to prevent future disputes and liability.
3. Recalculate Density Bonus based on the net buildable area.
4. Correct the record to reflect that 56 Mono St is a Multi-Family Residence, not a single family home.
5. Require 54 Mono to have their own independent driveway.
6. Require including buried Utility lines in the project plans to ensure costs of relocation and service disruption

are properly accounted for.

7. Enter our previous August 12, 2025 letter of objection, this letter dated September 17, 2025, along with the attached detailed objections, into public record.

We want to be clear: We do not object to lawful development of 54 Mono St. provided that our easement is respected and accurately reflected in the review process.

Thank you for your attention and commitment to responsible planning. We look forward to the September 23, 2025 site visit and working constructively with the Town to resolve these issues.

Sincerely,
Keith & Kimberly Erickson

From: [Pete Minor](#)
To: [Gina Montecallo](#)
Subject: My Comments at the Onsite Meeting
Date: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 11:16:45 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi Gina

I'll try to recount my brief comments concerning the shared access 30 foot easement adjacent to 28 Mono Street's southern boundary. We are opposed to this easement as configured due to probable significantly increased traffic, noise, and associated nuisances such as dust, light, and air pollution.

I did not mention that increased traffic and noise are among the exceptions in the CEQA Guidelines since I doubt that there are any relevant Municipal Codes on easements addressing probable impacts on 28 Mono St. and no credible estimates of probable impacts are available. I did state that the revision of the covered parking entrance to the Northwestern corner of the building increases the adverse impact exposure along 28 Mono's boundary. The preceding paragraphs are my embellished recollection of my comments, but also I had an interesting discussion with the future onsite manager of 54 Mono St. I believe she stated that tenants would sign very definitive leases/ rental agreements regarding number of occupants, cars, guests, and other behavioral attributes which would be rigorously enforced and she would likely be their manager at their place of employment. It would be ideal if 54 Mono St. had these restrictions in perpetuity no matter who owned or managed the property. A unique rental land use definition might be appropriate for all Workforce Housing Developments. It is my understanding that California State legislation created most of the Workforce Housing provisions so I'm not optimistic.

I have briefly examined the large revised Site Plans you generously provided. Unfortunately, I have a question about the shared 28 and 54 Mono properties boundary. Triad Engineering in a circa 1982 survey specified S89deg.08min.01sec. E as the 28 Mono 165.04ft. Southern boundary. The 54 Mono 86 ft. segment is shown as N89deg.13min.07sec.W. Shouldn't 2 overlapping coincident straight line segments have the same bearing? The 28 Mono description was Lot 32, Sierra Valley Sites I Mammoth Lakes, CA. Is there a new source of lot boundaries in this area?

Thank you,
Pete Minor