

DATE 11-28-07
Plan Dept.

November 27, 1997

Helen Baumann, Supervisor District 2
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Public Hearing December 4, 2007
General Plan Amendment A07-0007/Rezone Z07-0016/Planned Development PD07
0012/Tentative Subdivision Map TM07-1441/Shinn Ranch

2007 NOV 28 AM 11:46

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

Request for Denial of Rezoning of APN 331-070-01

Request for 200 foot setback/fire break

Dear Ms. Baumann,

My parents' property (APN 331-070-02) is bordered on two sides by the proposed Shinn Ranch development. My parents have owned this property for fifty years and have lived on it for forty years. Although this project has been in the works for years, my parents and the other residents of Slate Creek Road were never once contacted by the owners or developers for any information or input.

Are you aware that at the November 14, 2007 Ag Commission meeting, following my objections to this rezoning, when asked directly by one of the Commissioners, Camille Courtney, Applicant (Rancho Cortina Properties) indicated that the ten acre parcel, APN 331-070-01, was **not part of a conservation easement?** This is in direct conflict with her comments to the Planning Commission on October 11, 2007 when she said this parcel would be part of a conservation easement and would be "open space forever"!

Not only are her words on tape, they also appears on page 32 of the minutes of that Octoberr 11, 2007 Planning Commision meeting. Please check it out for yourself:

"Regarding asbestos, Ms. Courtney said none has been found on the site. If some is found, they must follow Best Management Practices. They have no problem stubbing out on a utility easement. There will be individual postal deliveries on this project. They will not be going to the El Dorado Post Office. The ten-acre lot is permanent open space. It was utilized to meet the County Oak Woodland Management Plan requirements. They meet the requirements of Policy 7.4.4.4. The Open Space is High Density because of the planned development. It will be permanent open space with a conservation easement. Slate Creek is an intermittent stream. The initial study has been out for quite some time. There are many mitigation measures for raptors. Credits are available from the mitigation bank."

When you make decisions on behalf of the people in this county, your reputation is on the line. If someone is not honest on one issue, is it possible that the entire Negative Mitigation Report" is full of inconsistencies and half-truths?

Objection To Rezoning Of Parcel APN 331-070-01

This parcel was NOT an original part of the Shinn Ranch development. It was acquired by the Shinn Ranch only a few months ago on or about February 9, 2007. It may be a very lucrative investment for this property to be rezoned, but it has little or nothing to do with the proposed project. High density housing on this parcel would be inappropriate and irresponsible.

This 10 acre parcel borders APN 331-070-02 owned by my parents, George R. and Kathryn E. Morris. Although the Mitigated Negative Declaration submitted for this project indicates that most of Shinn Ranch is currently zoned for pasture and rural residential use, this parcel is untouched and unimproved. The terrain is hilly, and is densely populated with trees, primarily oaks. And this parcel is not shown on the map they submitted.

This parcel provides a habitat for countless species of plant and animal life including but not limited to: oak trees, pines (including Ponderosa), deer, racoons, possum, quail, turkey, squirrels, rabbits, and numerous hawks who come back to nest each year.

The dense trees provide a sound buffer for the families on Slate Creek Road as well as Sierra Oaks Drive, helping to absorb the traffic sounds from Pleasant Valley Road as well as the US Forestry (we can currently hear their phone ring even at this distance). This ten acre parcel (APN 331-070-01) would continue to absorb some sound from the proposed animal control and other new construction proposed in that area. In addition to the noise reduction, the trees absorb some of the pollution from the ever increasing traffic on that road. This property is currently zoned 5 acre RE, MDR and we are respectfully requesting that this zoning be left alone and not changed.

My parents came here 40 years ago to get away from the city and suburbs. For forty years they have enjoyed a country life and contributed to this community through their time and their taxes. They owned and operated a sheep ranch for many years before retiring and contributed to many 4H blue ribbons. Imagine them now in their "golden years" being told they are about to be surrounded with High Density low income housing. If APN 331-070-01 is rezoned, my parents' property will become an island through which the wildlife can no longer gain entry.

Objection To Mapping Of Parcel APN 331-620-30

The back of our property borders the Shinn Ranch and has had a view of the rolling hills and trees all these years. The proposed map butts six houses up against our property line all the way across. Not only is our view gone, but more importantly, we have been advised by our lawyer that these six homes, placed up against our untouched back property, create a fire liability for my parents since their property is not cleared. After fifty years, should they have to be the ones to deal with this? We are respectfully requesting a two hundred foot setback with a 25 foot firebreak between our fenceline and the back fences of these six homes.

Both the Planning Commission and the Ag Commission ignored my concerns and my requests, as well as those of many other respondents. We were not aware of the appeal process for the Planning Commission. The Ag Commission chose to "make no comment"! I also met a number of people who received notices for the Ag Commission meeting but not for the Planning Commission!

I have enclosed my letters to the Planning Commission and to the Ag Commission outlining all my concerns for this project. I have also included a map highlighting the parcels involved.

It is not our intention to stand in the way of progress, but isn't it your job to represent the people, the environment and the wildlife that is here **NOW**. Please help us!

Respectfully,

Mardi Morris

Mardi Morris
P.O. Box 416
El Dorado, CA 95623
622-7517

mm/mw

CC: Rusty Dupray, Supervisor District 1
CC: James R. (Jack) Sweeney, Supervisor District 3
CC: Ron Briggs, Supervisor District 4
CC: Norma Santiago, Supervisor District 5



PLEASE
DO NOT
REZONE
THIS
PARCEL

BACK
PROPERTY
LINE
FIRE
LIABILITY

Source: TSD Engineering, Inc., August 2007.



Michael Brandman Associates

32480001 • 08/2007 | 4_site_plan.cdr

Exhibit 4
Site Plan

COUNTY OF EL DORADO • SHINN RANCH PROPERTY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

October 3, 2007

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

RE: Public Hearing October 11, 2007
General Plan Amendment A07-0007/Rezone Z07-0016/Planned Development PD07-0012/Tentative Subdivision Map TM07-1441/Shinn Ranch

Enclosed: Letter of objection to the project, three photos

To all members of the El Dorado County Planning Commission:

This letter is intended to convey objection to the rezoning of all parcels of the Shinn Ranch Planned Development Community, at this time.

The first part of this objection will refer to the project as a whole.

The second part of this objection will refer specifically to APN 331-070-01.

Part 1:
Objection to this project going forward at this time

Traffic

The stretch of road between the El Dorado Y (junction Mother Lode Drive/Pleasant Valley Road) and the town of El Dorado is a dangerous one. Many accidents and resulting deaths have occurred over the years. I challenge any of you to visit the El Dorado Post office at different times during the day. Pulling out of Slate Creek Road onto Pleasant Valley Road can be harrowing. Pulling out of the post office to get back onto Pleasant Valley Road can be life threatening! If you place hundreds of new people on the Shinn Ranch development (or anywhere else on this corridor), you are jeopardizing the lives of all of the citizens of this county.

While the Planning Commission may have plans in place for the future to expand the roads and other measures which would provide increased safety for our citizens, according to recent newspaper articles and recent elections, the county does not have the money necessary to implement these plans at this time.

For years, this stretch of Pleasant Valley Road has been minimally maintained. There is NO safe pedestrian shoulder, and few places for a driver to pull over in the event of a breakdown or an illness. Since much of Mother Lode Drive as well as parts of Shingle Springs, have been annexed into Placerville the tax dollars are not returned to these communities. Road maintenance becomes a luxury.

It is essential for the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to recognize that there is an appropriate order. You must have the safety measures in place first BEFORE allowing construction to begin. If not, lives will be lost. The developer will be concerned for the

development but he/she will leave the consequences up to the local government. The people of this county are depending on their government to ensure the health and safety of their environment and to protect their lives. This begins in the planning stages. This begins with you.

Environment

One of the outstanding features of El Dorado County is clean air. But pollution levels are changing. When you concentrate large numbers of people into small areas (subdivisions) no matter how cautious, the air quality suffers. One family may own more than one car. Many families may regularly burn wood or leaves, When the population is appropriately spread out this is not a problem. But when people are concentrated in small areas it is.

Grading of the Shinn Ranch parcels and the necessary roads, as well as digging swimming pools, landscaping etc. may expose the surrounding community to dangerous levels of asbestos and other cancer causing chemicals. The fact is that all the proper testing results for El Dorado Hills seemed to have been in place and on file with the county. This did not prevent the "asbestos disaster" that devastated a large number of people who now face the threat of unanticipated health problems and whose property values have plummeted. *Can the county afford not learn from these mistakes?*

On Slate Creek Road alone, out of six families, there are two women with serious Asthma. Multiply this by the surrounding community.

Water

There are six families residing on Slate Creek Road. Three of these families have wells and two families have livestock. The sheer number of proposed families on the Shinn Ranch Project may jeopardize the water table for current residents in the area. My understanding is that Mr. Shinn's original proposal of a luxury golfcourse community was aborted because of EID water restrictions. *How much more water will 146 families (lots) consume and how will this affect the neighboring communities?*

Wildlife

As the years streak by, we hear more horror stories of wild animals "invading" the territory of civilization. But the truth is, human beings are encroaching on the territory of wildlife, leaving them with no place to go.

The properties on Slate Creek Road have enjoyed decades of watching herds of deer (some returning year after year) and many other animals, including racoons, rabbits, squirrels, possum, fox, coyotes, quail, turkeys, hawks, and a wide variety of creatures slithering closer to the ground. One of the reasons for this bounty is that the Shinn Ranch Property and the George Forni properties have been wide open. High density housing will destroy this natural resource and leave these animals with no place to go.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration submitted for this proposal, insists that these problems would be less than significant WITH mitigation. *It is obvious by their own data that they will be extremely significant without mitigation. We do not currently have the funds to mitigate the effects (consequences) of rezoning these parcels*

Part 2

Objection To Rezoning Of Parcel APN 331-070-01

This parcel was NOT an original part of the Shinn Ranch. It was acquired by the Shinn Ranch only a few months ago on or about February 9, 2007. Please note the enclosed photo of a real estate sign representing this parcel. It indicates that this parcel is up for sale NOW. It may be a very lucrative investment for this property to be rezoned but it has little or nothing to do with the proposed project. High density housing on this parcel would be inappropriate and irresponsible.

This 10 acre parcel borders APN 331-070-02 owned by my parents, George R. and Kathryn E. Morris. Although the Mitigated Negative Declaration submitted for this project indicates that most of Shinn Ranch is currently for pasture and rural residential use, this parcel is untouched and unimproved. The terrain is hilly, and is densely populated with trees.

The land provides a habitat for countless species of plant and animal life including but not limited to: oak trees, pines (including Ponderosa), deer, racoons, possum, quail, turkey, squirrels, rabbits, and numerous hawks.

The dense trees provide a sound buffer for the families on Slate Creek Road as well as Sierra Oaks Drive, helping to absorb the traffic sounds from Pleasant Valley Road as well as the US Forestry (we can currently hear their phone ring even at this distance). This ten acre parcel (APN 331-070-01) would continue to absorb some sound from the proposed animal control and other new construction proposed in that area. In addition to the noise reduction, the trees absorb some of the pollution from the ever increasing traffic on that road. This property is currently zoned 5 acre RE, MDR and I am respectfully requesting that the 5 acre zoning be left alone and not changed.

My parents came here 40 years ago to get away from the city and suburbs. For forty years they have enjoyed a country life and contributed to this community through their time and their taxes. They owned and operated a sheep ranch for many years before retiring and contributed to many 4H blue ribbons. Imagine them now in their "golden years" being told they are about to be surrounded with High Density (and possibly) low income housing.

In Conclusion

I am not against progress. I am not against property development or anyone making a profit. But when that progress and profit come at the expense of the lives, safety, or the quality of life of others, then the price is too high.

El Dorado County does not have the money to advance the provisions necessary to protect its citizens from consequences of this project. Without the safety measures firmly in place, it is not responsible, at this time, to take the first step and rezone these parcels. And High Density Residential is irresponsible in any case in this area.

I am asking in your service to the public, to deny/postpone the current rezoning proposals for this project. Once you push the snowball down the hill, you cannot "take it back" The health and safety of this county begins with you.

With all due respect,

Mardi Morris
P.O. Box 416, El Dorado, CA 95623

November 14, 2007

El Dorado County Department of Agriculture, Weights & Measures
311 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

My name is Mardi Morris. I am here representing my parents, whose property is bordered on two sides by this project.

To the west, this project has six houses bordering our property line. My parents had a sheep ranch for many years, but currently have no livestock. After consulting a lawyer we understand that because we are not in the Williamson Act, we do not qualify for the agricultural setback. However, the attorney pointed out to us that since our back acreage is unimproved and heavily wooded, that we could face a fire liability from these houses. After fifty years of ownership, I hardly think my parents should have to be concerned with some kid tossing a cigarette over the back fence.

We are asking for a setback from our property line and a concrete wall backing these new homes, to protect us, as well as the new residents.

I am also renewing my objection to the rezoning of parcel number 331-070-01, a ten acre parcel that borders our property to the north. The applicant clearly stated to the planning commission that this property was being donated to a federal conservation easement. She stated that this ten acres will be open space forever. If it will be open space forever, then why would they continue to request a rezoning to high density residential? I am asking that you deny the rezoning of this parcel to insure the continued habitat and sanctuary of all the wildlife currently residing there.

I am shocked and appalled that the general plan has rezoned so many smaller parcels (such as my parents 13 1/2 acres) from rural agricultural to Residential estate. Agriculture has been the backbone of this county for decades and now the small ranchers and farmers are disappearing. Will El Dorado County's only claim to fame be high density development? We deserve better.

Sincerely,

Mardi Morris
P.O. Box 416
El Dorado, CA 95623