

Wilson Estates required mitigation

Minimum 15 year development agreement locking in this plan this map that goes with the sale of the property with the following mitigations:

- If the map is allowed to expire or a request to alter or dissolve the development agreement is approved, the land use and zoning reverts to MDR and R1A.
- Deny the design waiver requests for reductions in road width and right of way radii. Must allow for visitor parking on both sides of the street, which encourages slower speeds through the development protecting the community.
- .70 mile of damage to Malcolm Dixon Road must be fully re-paved at owners expense NOT patched for the health and safety of bikers, skateboarders, vehicle traffic and aesthetics.
- Developer cannot remove themselves or their successors from the Malcolm Dixon Road Area of benefit.
- In an effort to prevent urban sprawl. Future limitations will be placed on sewer connections. Sewer shall not be annexed across the street (North of Malcolm Dixon Road.). Water may only be annexed with documentation of dry wells North of Malcolm Dixon Road to service Arroyo Vista and surrounding only as needed.
- Additionally in an effort to make the neighborhoods consistent: Wilson Estates will revise their sewer plan to bring services to Alta Vista Court and the Mormon Church as a community benefit of the project.
- Exhibit F – In the spirit of retaining the visual character of the area and minimizing fire risk remove all wood fencing from the development. Replace all fencing with a 4-rail Ranch style vinyl white fence along Malcolm Dixon Road Frontage like surrounding residents. Pool enclosures may be ornamental iron.
- In addition to regular fees, they shall contribute no less than 30% of the cost for the improvements needed for the Sterlingshire turn pocket and light signalization. They do not get a pass because the community added their impacts to the CIP. They must share the cost of their impacts.
- Open space must be locked in so that it cannot be re-designated at a later date (i.e serrano golf course). Open space should be available to the public. Bike trail, sitting area, horseshoe pits, bocce ball and maintained by the homeowners association. This land has beautiful valley views that should be available to the community for use with safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Phasing of the project 12 homes at a time. We do not want a visually displeasing construction zone unattended for prolonged periods of time.
- Secondary EVA exit cannot be re-purposed at a later date or for the duration of the Development Agreement.
- No granny flats because of PD clustering.
- Non- gated community (except for EVA gate)
- No track homes builders (Elliot, KB, Warmington, etc)
- Must be custom home sites – promoting local builders. Discounts for using local builders
- Must include annual reports to code enforcement including pictures for monitoring, enforcement, and fines for un-kept open space. Specifically, but not limited to the area along Green Valley Road. (It should never look like Rolling Hills Estates that backs to Green Valley Road)
- If this development has school-aged children they will share the same schools as their neighborhoods. No dividing communities like what happened in Serrano.
- All lots that touch Malcolm Dixon Road will be conditioned with no vehicular access to Malcolm Dixon Rd
- Construction hours will be limited to M- Sat 9 am to 5 pm. No Construction on Sunday.
- Lots 1 and 28 (the most Western lots) will be limited to:
 1. 50 foot set back from existing residents on Alta Vista Ct of all structures, sports courts, rv parking.
 2. No sports court lighting.
 3. Pool and pool equipment must be set back 20 feet from any property line.
 4. Construction will be limited to one (single) story construction.
 5. The residents of Alta Vista Court have first right of refusal to purchase lots 1 and 28 at fair market value.
 6. Building envelope must not be rotated. The rear of these lots must match the rear of Alta Vista. (For example no rear to side)

In the absence of a development agreement, the afore mentioned mitigations are applied to the project as conditions of approval.

November 4, 2014

Ron Mikulaco, Supervisor District 1
Shiva Frentzen, Supervisor District 2
Brian Veerkamp, Supervisor District III
Ron Briggs, Supervisor District IV
Norma Santiago, Supervisor District V
Jim Mitrisin, Clerk of the Board

PLEASE DENY REZONE

Madams and Sirs of the Board:

I'm here today to request a denial of the REZONE for the following 3 reasons:

Incompatibility
Public Safety
Disruption of Community Living

This proposal is not complete and not ready for approval. Although numerous revisions have been made, the proposal is still
28 units on 16 acres. Gross Density is a facade.

A lengthy 6-foot fence or wall would be constructed to hide this incompatibility. This long fencing is not similar to the surrounding areas on Malcolm Dixon Road. The compatibility exhibit CTA Engineering submitted on 10-9-14, File 14-1331, Attachment #22, shows higher density developments built on Silva Valley and El Dorado Hills Blvd. This is not a good example. None of the higher density developments are on Malcolm Dixon Road. Do not be fooled. No matter how it is worded, this proposal is not similar to existing surroundings. I question the integrity of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Attachment #18. This report is written as if the REZONE was approved. The residents disagree with the opinions of the aesthetics on page 6. Why are the opinions of the planning commission and developer more important than the residents? The other parties do not live on this road, we do.

The REZONE would require a Right Only Turn onto Malcolm Dixon Rd. Current Zoning would not require ANY ACCESS to Malcolm Dixon Road except Fire Access. There is no enforcement to stop the proposed residents from making a U-Turn to head West on Malcolm Dixon Road to access a Traffic Light instead of a stop and turn lane. Per the Mitigated Negative Declaration, page 38, no improvements will be made to Malcolm Dixon Road. Therefore, there should be NO access to Malcolm Dixon Rd except fire access only. Malcolm Dixon Road is not safe. Our family and friends work in Public Safety and agree the road is not safe. There are blind intersections, narrow bridges, excessive speeds due to lack of stop signs, and no bike lanes or pedestrian lanes. Vehicles have to stop for wildlife to cross, have to move into the opposite lane to avoid groups of cyclists, or residents walking children or dogs. Vehicles have to wait for groups of skateboarders to pass before the cars can proceed.

The proposal shows new access for sewer to the proposed development from the El Dorado Irrigation Building that is adjacent to our property. My concern is that .70 mile of Malcolm Dixon Road will be destructed to bring sewer to the proposed development. We have lost trees on our property due to old construction of housing and road improvements. That .70 mile is lined with the same type of trees on our property and other residents' property that could be disrupted from the destruction of the road to bring sewer to this proposed development. The result could be future downed trees causing potential harm to residents and citizens using Malcolm Dixon Road. We have lost 2 more trees this year right next to the irrigation building.

The destruction of the road for piping of new sewer lines will disrupt traffic on an already limited-access road due to narrow bridges and roads and existing trees, and will deter wildlife access, and deter numerous recreational access to the residents and citizens of El Dorado County.

Malcolm Dixon Road is unique. Consider the proposed fencing hiding the incompatibility of the project, the increase of unsafe access, and the disruption of trees, wildlife, and community-use of Malcolm Dixon Road.

Please DENY this REZONE request due to incompatibility, public safety, and disruption of community living.

Sincerely,
Shereen, Sierra, and Forrest Baker

2 of 3



3 of 3