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330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
Re: Sundance; Z07-0040; TM07-1454;S09-0012; Hearing: January 24, 2012
Dear Board Members:
The above-referenced project is coming to you following a recommendation for approval from the Planning Commission. On behalf of the applicant, Chris Beauchamp, a summary of the project and the issues relating to such are set forth below.

## 1. The Project.

The property is comprised of 298 acres in the Pilot Hill area with access from Rattlesnake Bar Road. The neighborhood is developed as a rural residential setting with parcels generally of 5 to 10 acres in size. The subject project proposes 20 parcels, each 10 acres or larger.

As originally planned and submitted, the project was in the form of a Planned Development with requisite open-space and a density bonus allowing for 40 lots. This design anticipated the construction of water extension infrastructure from GDPUD. After expending significant sums on engineered plans for the water extension, the plan was dropped due to opposition from the neighborhood and threats of litigation against the infrastructure proposal.

Accordingly, after additional consultations with stakeholders, a new design was submitted that matched the density of the surrounding properties. That is the project that is before you.

## 2. The Issues.

The issues that have been presented for discussion and analysis regarding the project are as
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follows:
a. Traffic. As earlier noted, the project is located in the midst of developed rural parcels. The parcels to the south are generally within the area referred to as Pilot View Subdivision which is served by Pilot View Drive. These neighbors voiced concerns over increased traffic through their neighborhood resulting from this project. The applicant has addressed this concern by designing parcels on the southern end of the project that will contain a gated, emergencyaccess only barrier. The Commission has approved of this design. Accordingly, Pilot View Drive will not be impacted.
b. Trails. The project meets in statutory park dedication requirements. However, the Georgetown Divide Recreation District has made demands in excess of such requirements. Specifically, the District has demanded that the applicant: (i) dedicate a public trail along the main thoroughfare of the project despite the fact that the roadway will be privately owned and maintained, (ii) construct the trail and (iii) maintain the trail in perpetuity.

The applicant has taken the position that the District's demands are unreasonable. First, this is a privately maintained community; the thoroughfares are not public. Accordingly, having a public access trail within a private community is inconsistent and poses significant liability issues for the project. Further, the trail location would not connect to any County recognized trail system. In addition, the District's own policy manual notes the challenges of locating a trail immediately adjacent to a roadway, again, because of liability issues.

The applicant has sought to negotiate with the District by offering an additional fee over and above the statutory park fees. The District has refused to discuss our proposal and has reiterated its demand for dedication, construction and maintenance of a public trail through private property.

The Planning Commission conducted a thorough discussion on the issue and voted to deny the District's demands as being unreasonable.
c. Water. The parcels to be created will be served by wells. Objection has been made based upon the input of some of the neighbors that the area is a dry-well area. The data suggests otherwise.

The Applicant submitted a professionally prepared hydrogeologic report by Holdrege \& Kull. The report concluded that, "...the long term annual groundwater safe yield of the Sundance Subdivison site is substantial enough to preclude any significant impacts on adjacent properties...".

The Planning Commission sought independent verification of the submitted data from the
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County's Environmental Health Department. Mr. Sanford testified that in the opinion of his office the project satisfied requisite criteria. After the project was forwarded to the Board for hearing, the Applicant took the matter off calendar to allow for further examination of the well issue. At the request of Supervisor Briggs, Environmental Health conducted a more detailed analysis of well production in the area. That data is attached hereto for your information. Mr. Sanford's additional analysis concludes that the area of the project is not considered by the County to be a dry well area.

In light of the above, it must be suggested that if it is found that this subject area should be precluded from the utilization of wells, then such prohibition should be extended to every portion of El Dorado County that is composed of fractured rock. In addition, if the well situation in this particular area is so severe as to jeopardize health and safety then a moratorium should issue not only barring new parcels but also barring any new residential construction that would be served by wells. However, the facts are that the subject area is not categorized as a dry-well area and the test wells that have been dug have proven to be adequate.
d. Grazing. The Agricultural Commission has recommended that the property be retained for in large parcels for grazing purposes. The Applicant has submitted data and the Planning Commission found that the land is not suitable for sustaining commercial grazing which is the standard required under the General Plan.
e. General Plan and Zoning. The General Plan for the project area provides for the residential development of 10 acre parcels. The project application does seek a rezone from AE to RE-10. It should be noted that the AE zoning was the result of an earlier Williamson Act contract from which the property rolled out in 1995. The AE Zone was retained as a "holding zone" per County practice. In all aspects therefore, the project is consistent with the General Plan.
3. Conclusion. It is recognized that the neighbors have voiced objection to the project. Yet the facts in the record clearly reflect that the project is consistent with the County's General Plan and all impacts have been mitigated. The Applicant has done everything that has been required. The project should be approved.

Very truly yours,

| DATE DRILLED | PARCEL NUMBER | Well Number | DEPTH | STATIC LVL | GPM | NEWIDEEPEN | DATE DEEPENED | Now Prodution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8/23/78 | 104-110-09 |  |  |  | 8 | Production |  | Now Prodution |
| 6/20/80 | 104-110-10 |  |  |  | 60 | Production |  |  |
| 1/5/83 | 104-110-11 |  |  |  | 8 | Production |  |  |
| 718/03 | 104-110-12 |  | 300 | 30 | 6 | New |  |  |
| 3/14/90 | 104-110-05 |  | 120 | 5 | 5 | Production |  |  |
| 3/15/90 | 104-110-06 |  | 185 | 45 | 15 | Production |  |  |
| 12/16/99 | 104-110-07 |  | 175 | 45 | 50 | New |  |  |
| 6/14/84 | 104-110-08 |  | 125 | 32 | 100 | New |  |  |
| 8/16/90 | 104-110-15 |  | 300 | 40 | 6 | New |  |  |
| 1/31/92 | 104-110-19 |  | 145 | 32 | 20 | New |  |  |
| 4/16/98 | 104-110-16 |  | 150 | 20 | 60 | New |  |  |
| 719/02 | 104-110-41 |  | 300 | 25 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 4/19/91 | 104-110-37 |  | 205 | 80 | 6 | New |  |  |
| 5/15/05 | 104-110-38 |  | 550 | 70 | 7 | New |  |  |
| 4/2/87 | 104-110-40 |  | 250 | 123 | 50 | New |  |  |
| 8/20/90 | 104-110-39 | Well \#1 | 425 | 250 | 2 | New |  |  |
| 10/6/90 | 104-110-39 | Well \#2 | 300 | 90 | 10 | New |  |  |
| 7/7/94 | 104-110-35 | Well \#1 | 450 | 75 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 9/4/03 | 104-110-35 | Well \#2 | 420 | 95 | 12 | New |  |  |
| 3/1/89 | 104-110-36 |  | 225 | 75 | 12 | New |  |  |
| 1994 | 104-110-21 |  | 480 | 82 | 70 | New |  |  |
| 5/16/84 | 104-110-22 |  |  |  | 12 | Production |  |  |
| 5/16/85 | 104-110-27 |  |  |  | 12 | Production |  |  |
| 11/7/08 | 104-110-26 |  | 650 | 250 | 19 | Deepen |  |  |
| 8/14/98 | 104-110-33 |  | 300 | 75 | 40 | New |  |  |
| 9/10/98 | 104-110-34 |  | 300 | 75 | 40 | New |  |  |
| 4/27/82 | 104-110-30 |  |  |  | 6 | Production |  |  |
| 11/23/91 8/9/85 | 104-110-31 |  | 403 | 49 | 19 | New |  |  |
| 8/9/85 | 104-110-28 |  |  |  | 25 | Production |  |  |
| 5/8/86 | 104-110-29 |  |  |  | 15 | Production |  |  |
| 4/28/78 | 071-291-04 | Well \# 1 |  |  | 7 | Production |  |  |
| 11/1/01 | 071-291-04 | Well \#2 ? | 450 | 8 | 15 | New |  |  |
| 8/25/76 | 071-291-01 | Well \#1 |  |  | 5 | Production |  |  |
| 5/25/05 | 071-291-01 | Well \#2 | 375 | 100 | 100 | New |  |  |
| 8/5/77 | 071-291-02 |  |  |  | 10 | Production |  |  |
| 6/3/91 | 071-291-03 |  | 340 | 40 | 100 | New |  |  |
| 11/23/10 | 071-291-05 |  | 375 |  | 100 | Deepen |  |  |
| 6/13/02 | 104-520-02 |  | 460 | 50 | 10 | New |  |  |
| 7/14/11 | 104-520-04 |  | 575 | 80 | 12.7 | New |  |  |
| 2/23/06 | 104-520-05 |  | 300 | 120 | 45 | New |  |  |
| 4/18/84 | 104-130-01 |  |  |  | 15 | Production |  |  |
| 5/19/90 | 104-130-02 |  | 225 | 76 | 12 | New |  |  |
| 2/5/93 | 104-130-03 |  | 400 | 95 | 50 | New |  |  |
| 4/16/96 | 104-130-04 |  |  |  | 2 | New |  |  |
| 2123/82 | 104-130-05 |  |  |  | 8.5 | Production |  |  |
| 6/21/04 | 104-130-06 |  |  |  | 50 | Production |  |  |
| 6/3/96 | 104-130-28 |  | 300 | 40 | 25 | New |  |  |
| 3/5/98 | 104-130-26 | WELL \#1 | 375 | 60 | 15 | New |  |  |
| 9/15/08 | 104-130-26 |  | 575 | 150 | 5 | Deepen |  |  |
| 7/18/02 | 104-130-25 |  | 500 | 90 | 8 | New |  |  |
| 2/12/88 | 104-130-29 |  | 450 | 200 | 4 | Naw |  |  |
| $11 / 1 / 77$ <br> $7 / 24 / 94$ | 104-130-23 |  |  |  | 3.5 | Production |  |  |
| 7/24/94 $7 / 10 / 00$ | 104-130-17 |  | 425 | 205 | 9 | New |  |  |
| 7/10/00 | 104-130-13 |  | 400 | 250 | 10 | New |  |  |
| 1/11/05 | 104-130-42 |  | 800 | 275 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 2/26/81 | 104-130-08 |  |  |  | 3.5 | Production |  |  |
| 11/16/79 | 104-130-07 |  |  |  | 5 | Production |  |  |
| 1/3/84 | 104-130-09 |  | 205 | 45 | 12 | New |  |  |
| 8/10/01 | 104-130-12 |  | 450 | 175 | 6 | Deepen |  |  |
| 3/10/88 | 104-130-11 |  | $\frac{225}{150}$ | 79 | 20 | Production |  |  |
| 1/10/78 | 104-130-15 |  | 150 <br> 95 | 45 | 20 | New |  |  |
| 4/3/78 | 104-130-35 |  |  |  | 12 | Production |  |  |
| 12/29/75 | 104-250-02 |  |  |  | 7 | Production |  |  |
| 3/31/75 | 104-250-03 |  |  |  | 5 | Production |  |  |
| 5/8/78 | 104-250-04 |  |  |  | 3 | Production |  |  |
| 3/28/80 | 104-250-05 |  |  |  | 12 | Production |  |  |
| 4/30/84 | 104-250-20 |  |  |  | 5 | Production |  |  |


| DATE DRILLED | PARCEL NUMBER | Well Number | DEPTH | STATIC LVL | GPM | NEW/DEEPEN | DATE DEEPENED | Now Prodution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11/16/77 | 104-250-21 |  |  |  | 30 | Production |  | Now Prodution |
| 3/8/00 | 104-250-22 |  | 150 |  | 0.5 | Reconstruction |  |  |
| 11/15/04 | 104-250-23 |  |  |  | 10.15 | Production |  |  |
| 7/15/87 | 104-250-24 |  | 160 | 65 | 15 | Production |  |  |
| 1/5/04 | 104-250-25 |  | 500 | 65 | 7 | New |  |  |
| 6/30/82 | 104-250-26 |  |  |  | 25 | Production |  |  |
| 8/23/89 | 104-250-27 |  | 125 | 20 | 30 | Production |  |  |
| 9/8/87 | 104-250-28 |  | 245 | 20 | 20 | Production |  |  |
| 5/15/76 | 104-250-29 |  |  |  | 5 | Production |  |  |
| 9/30/02 | 104-250-30 |  | 580 | 80 | 50 | New |  |  |
| 9/6/79 | 104-250-46 |  |  |  | 12 | Production |  |  |
| 2/14/84 | 104-250-59 |  |  |  | 14 | Production |  |  |
| 7/18/88 | 104-250-60 | well 1 | 300 | 55 | 20 | Production |  |  |
| 8/10/88 | 104-250-60 | well 2 | 245 | 140 | 5 | Production |  |  |
| 1/8/02 | 104-250-61 |  | 150 | 50 | 30 | Now |  |  |
| 7/21/03 | 104-250-63 | well 1 | 550 | 150 | 1.5 | Deepen |  |  |
| 2/27/08 | 104-250-63 | well 2 | 200 | 20 | 4 | New |  |  |
| 8/31/94 | 104-250-64 |  | 245 | 50 | 4 | New |  |  |
| 5/21/87 | 104-250-65 |  |  |  | 14 | Production |  |  |
| 1/14/98 | 104-250-75 |  | 175 | 60 | 60 | New |  |  |
| 11/16/95 | 104-250-76 |  | 150 | 30 | 20 | New |  |  |
| 5/28/92 | 104-100-41 |  | 325 | 150 | 4 | Production |  |  |
| 3/1/00 | 104-100-68 |  | 690 | 210 | 60 | New |  |  |
| 7/29/98 | 104-100-29 |  | 350 | 50 | 8 | New |  |  |
| 6/5/07 | 104-100-53 |  | 550 | 100 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 4/15/97 | 104-100-44 |  | 650 | 115 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 3/6/02 | 104-100-02 |  | 450 | 100 | 12 | New |  |  |
| 2/13/94 9/5/00 | 104-100-21 |  | 300 | 80 | 15 | New |  |  |
| 9/5/00 $9 / 27 / 05$ | 104-100-08 |  | 445 | 51 | 8 | New |  |  |
| 9/27/05 | 104-100-58 |  |  |  | 9.2 | Production |  |  |
| 7/28/99 | 104-100-64 | well 1 | 500 | 80 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 3/5/01 | 104-100-64 | well 2 | 450 | 60 | 10 | New |  |  |
| 9/22/99 | 104-100-65 |  |  |  | 12 | Production |  |  |
| 10/15/03 | 104-100-60 |  | 325 | 70 | 60 | New |  |  |
| 12/15/03 | 104-100-61 |  | 600 | 20 | 12 | New |  |  |
| 9/5/00 | 104-100-69 |  | 300 | 20 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 6/15/77 | 104-100-36 |  |  |  | 100 | Production |  |  |
| 5/16/90 | 104-100-43 |  | 400 | 159 | 20 | Production |  |  |
| 4/15/86 7/22/91 | 104-100-25 |  |  |  | 20 | Production |  |  |
| 7/22/91 $7 / 16 / 86$ | 104-100-26 |  | 400 | 340 | 2 | New |  |  |
| $7 / 16 / 86$ $6 / 15 / 89$ | 104-100-32 |  |  |  | 6 | Production |  |  |
| 6/15/89 | 104-100-24 |  | 285 | 150 | 7 | Production |  |  |
| 4/23/82 | 104-100-23 |  | 285 | 125 | 8 | Production |  |  |
| 27/90 | 104-100-16 |  | 120 |  | 25 | Production |  |  |
| 1/14/81 | 104-100-07 | well 1 | 300 | 80 160 | 5 | New |  |  |
| 9/17/93 | 104-100-07 | well 2 | 375 | 160 100 | 2 | New |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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