

09-0351 #65

RECEIVED 12-10-09
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

Tim and Carol Cary
3164 Sierrama Drive
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

2009 DEC 10 PM 2:34

County of El Dorado Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Rezone 08-0026 for Vista Grande Estates

We are writing to object to the proposed parcel split and rezone Z08-0026/Tentative Subdivision Map TM08-1476/Vista Grande Estates, and to the proposed conditions for the rezone. We have previously consistently objected to other parcel splits in this area.

We believe that the County Planning Department is approving an illegal rolling rezone of our area, which is zoned R5 in the General Plan. The County is slowly but surely converting our street to 1 acre lots, which is inconsistent with the County's General Plan. The continuing addition of additional lots and additional houses that feed additional traffic onto Sierrama Drive creates an ever-increasing burden on our private road, which is not maintained by the County. The County gains additional tax revenues, but then shifts the burden of providing roads for the increased traffic to the private landowners on Sierrama Drive. Sierrama Drive is not engineered to accommodate the traffic loads being proposed, nor do we want it to be.


We also object to the County changing our neighborhood into a different environment. We chose to buy in a semi-rural area, but the County, through these rolling rezones, is converting it increasingly into a suburban community. The zone is R-5, not R-1, and the surrounding area does not support an R-1 density. We believe that you should retain and enforce the zoning that is required by the General Plan; if you want to change the General Plan overlay to R1 from R5, you should carry out the environmental and traffic studies that would be required for such a change. As it is, by the "rolling rezone," we believe the County is illegally proceeding with changes to the General Plan that do have significant impacts, and that require EIRs and other mitigation studies. If the County continues to allow this pattern of creeping rezones, then we may be left with no choice but to file legal action to halt this practice, which we believe illegally evades the requirements of a change to the General Plan.

In addition, the traffic access onto Meder Road from Sierrama Drive is not acceptable for a larger traffic load, nor is Sierrama Drive itself. Having said that, we like the road as it is; widening and straightening the road would only increase the existing problems with speeding motorists on the road. By the County continuously allowing additional lots, houses, and traffic to Sierrama Drive, you are also continuously increasing the cost for the private landowners to maintain the road. We believe that the owners of the additional lots should have to pay all additional ongoing costs that will be created by the rezones they seek.

Carol Cary
#65

We strongly urge you to deny the proposed rezone. If you do approve the rezone, we urge you to leave Sierrama Drive in its current condition.

Very truly yours,



Tim and Carol Cary