

PC 3/27/14
#2
3 pages



Green Valley Nursery Application

Stan Iverson <siverson@tait.com>
To: "tom.dougherty@edcgov.us" <tom.dougherty@edcgov.us>
Cc: Stan Iverson <siverson@tait.com>

Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 3:45 PM

Tom- thanks for taking the time to return my call this morning. I am attaching a letter that discusses my concern about the exhibits in the application. I am concerned with the site access point on Shadowfax Lane and the type of vehicles that access that point now due to the bulk landscape material sales and the large delivery truck that deliver product to the site and the number and type of truck that are now using the site due to the added activities for this use that is already operating without the proper permits. I will review further and get to you with more of my concerns but the exhibits being used for this action are not presenting the entire project and it impacts on Shadowfax Lane and the neighborhood. Please feel free to call me at 916-835-0115 to discuss. I would like to discuss my concerns with DOT prior to the hearing if possible. Can you give me the contact information for the member of the Planning Commission that may be most appropriate to make contact with. Feel free to forward my email and contact info as necessary.

Stan Iverson
2593 Shadowfax Lane EDH
915-835-0115

 **El Dorado County Planning Department.pdf**
55K

14 MAR 12 PM 3:59
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

March 12, 2014

El Dorado County Planning Department

Attn: Tom Dougherty

Re: Green Valley Nursery Application going before March 27th Planning Commission

My name is Stanley Iverson and I own the property at 2593 Shadowfax Lane with my wife Tracy.

I have reviewed the proposed staff report for the project and upon doing so, I have a few items that I feel need clarification of so we can fully understand the impact of the proposed application on our neighborhood. My wife attended the previous hearing on this matter. As I mentioned in our phone conversation, I do not feel that the project description and exhibits contained in the staff report package fully represent what activities are taking place on the parcel. There has been a large increase in the amount of bulk landscape materials that are being processed at the west end of the site since the application was submitted and the exhibits prepared. The site plan that is included in the application is not representative of the current site configuration. The exhibits that are submitted are not sufficient for the commenting departments to fully understand the project and identify the impacts on the neighborhood. The intersection of Shadowfax Lane is along the immediate westerly boundary and is our only access to our neighborhood. The interaction of the site with the Shadowfax Lane entry is not shown accurately or at all on the exhibits. This access point now serves as the main entry for the bulk landscape materials that are delivered in WB-67 type trucks that are not able to make the corner with anyone exiting our neighborhood. This site entry point on Shadowfax Lane needs to be shown and its close proximity to Green Valley Road needs to be analyzed further by DOT as it does create safety concerns due to the large number of high speed vehicles using Green Valley Road. Proper deceleration lanes and road widening need to be conditioned as appropriate. The current DOT conditions regarding the porkchop island will only push more activity to Shadowfax Lane. The applicant should identify the access to the site from the Shadowfax Lane area with the proper to scale truck turn exhibits so they can indicate the actual access to the site, the stockpile areas, the turnaround areas, the loading areas and how all of this interacts with the retail sales, the existing strawberry stand operations and the proposed site improvements including parking and proper two way drive lanes. If these activities cannot be shown to operate safely and within code on the site, then a condition regarding limiting the bulk landscape materials from the site need to be considered due to the safety factors involved.

I have witnessed the illegal grading activities in the creek and am aware that Fish and Wildlife has inspected the site. Has that Department commented on the application? They have filled in the stream bed to provide themselves more space at the expense of the channel. It seems that the condition addressing the prior activities need to be more definitive about the permit required for the future and

past work. The applicant does not seem to appreciate the significant impacts on this work on the upstream neighbors or the sensitive wetlands just across Shadowfax.

I will provide additional comments once I review the application and environmental documents further but wanted to touch base regarding the exhibits versus the actual site activities that are currently taking place, all without the proper permit or approvals. This needs to be addressed for the Commission to take action on proper information.

Thank you, Stan Iverson 916-835-0115