



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

5 pages

Fwd: Feb. 26 meeting item 14-1617

Susan McClurg <smcc6286@icloud.com>
To: charlene.tim@edcgov.us, lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

Fri, Feb 20, 2015 at 12:37 PM

For some reason this email was undeliverable to the individual commissioners. Please include it in materials for feb. 26 meeting. Please confirm receipt.

-Susan McClurg

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan McClurg <smcc6286@icloud.com>
Date: February 20, 2015 at 12:24:42 PM PST
To: "Rich Stewart - rich.stewart@edcgov.us" <Rich Stewart - rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, "Gary Miller - gary.miller@edcgov.us" <Gary Miller - gary.miller@edcgov.us>, "Tom Heflin - tom.heflin@edcgov.us" <Tom Heflin - tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, "Dave Pratt - dave.pratt@edcgov.us" <Dave Pratt - dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, "Brian Shinault - brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <Brian Shinault - brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, planning@edcgov.us
Subject: Feb. 26 meeting item 14-1617

To members of the Planning Commission,

I cannot attend the Feb. 26 information-only workshop on the Dixon Ranch project because it is occurring during my normal work hours. I would like to go on record to express my disappointment that you would schedule a public hearing on a project of this scale during normal business hours when many of us need to be at our jobs. I respectfully request that any subsequent meetings be held during the evening hours.

I also want to go on record as being opposed to this high-density project. I was disappointed to learn that letters submitted on the draft EIR would not be made available to you at this workshop. I attached my letter so that it can be included in your packet of materials.

To summarize my comments:

I am opposed to the Dixon Ranch project. This proposal to construct 605 homes on 280 acres is not in character with the rural setting of the surrounding area. The area is not zoned for high-density housing and should not be rezoned. The land should remain as currently zoned in the General Plan – low-density residential – and should be developed as such to remain in character with the majority of the land east, west and north of this project.

The Green Valley Road corridor cannot handle the projected increase in traffic from this high-density proposed project. As proposed, the Dixon Ranch project would double the amount of traffic on Green Valley Road. The current level of traffic is 4,682 daily trips on Green Valley Road at Deer Valley Road; this project would add 4,931 daily trips. This is unacceptable. Green Valley Road already is congested during morning and evening rush hours. It is already difficult to access private driveways along Green Valley Road and as identified in the Green Valley Corridor Report **commissioned by the county** identified numerous safety issues for cross traffic and private driveways because of limited sight distance, including Malcom Dixon Road and Rocky Springs Road. The addition of this many cars will increase safety hazards at these and other intersections.

-

I urge the Planning Commission to reject the proposed project and the requested general plan amendment. This is not a good location for high-density residential development given the rural nature of the surrounding properties and the traffic impacts on Green Valley Road.

Susan McClurg

Carl Road

2/20/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Feb. 26 meeting item 14-1617

Green Springs Ranch

Rescue

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=b8659658af&view=pt&search=inbox&msg=14ba8b6693b3c03f&siml=14ba8b6693b3c03f



DixonRanchLetter.doc

37K

Feb. 6, 2015

Susan M. McClurg
1871 Carl Road
Rescue, CA 95672
Green Springs Ranch

Sue M. Lillian MacLeod, Principal Planner
Community Development Agency, El Dorado County
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
Email: Lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

RE: Dixon Ranch Draft EIR (A11-0006, Z11-0008, PD11-0006, & TM11-1505)

Dear Ms. MacLeod,

I live in Green Springs Ranch and have reviewed the Draft EIR for the proposed Dixon Ranch development on Green Valley Road. **I am opposed to the density of this project and urge the planning department to recommend denial of this general plan amendment.**

The Draft EIR has not adequately addressed the major impacts of this project:

Project Density: The property for the proposed project is now zoned agricultural with a low-density land use designation. Green Springs Ranch, which lies east and north of this project, is zoned for 5-acre parcels. It is a tranquil, country environment, which is the reason I moved here four years ago. The land on the north side of Green Valley Road between Malcom Dixon Road and Deer Valley Road is primarily zoned for low-density housing. Even the higher density areas near Green Springs Ranch such as Highland View and Sterlingshire are on larger lots – at least half-an-acre in size. This project would allow for an 8:1 density at the shared border of the 5-acre zoned Green Springs Ranch. The proposal for 605 parcels on 280 acres is a greater than tenfold increase above and beyond what would be allowed adjacent to us under the current General Plan. And the map in the Draft EIR indicates that the highest density lots in the proposed Dixon Ranch development would be adjacent to our boundary – this high density does not fit with the current zoning and development of the area.

The project objectives on page 40 of the Draft EIR contain inaccurate information. The Draft EIR includes these objectives:

- Implement the County's General Plan by directing growth within those areas with moderate topography, located amongst already developed lands, with access to services, schools and transportation systems.

This proposed project is not located among already developed lands and does not contain the needed infrastructure, service access, schools or transportation systems.

- Implement the County's General Plan by providing urban/suburban type development within lands designated as Community Region in order to ensure the preservation of large expanses of open space and agricultural lands within the County.

This proposed project would not preserve large expanses of open space or agricultural lands. Approval of this project would convert 280 acres of farmland to high-density housing.

Traffic: The project would double the amount of traffic on Green Valley Road. The current level of traffic is 4,682 daily trips on Green Valley Road at Deer Valley Road; this project would add 4,931 daily trips. This is unacceptable. Green Valley Road already is congested during morning and evening rush hours (including traffic to and from Pleasant Grove Middle School.) Already there is great difficulty for people with private driveways and for people on side roads (such as Deer Valley) to access Green Valley Road. The Final Corridor Analysis Report, Green Valley Road, prepared by Kittelson & Assoc., Inc, Oct 2014; identified numerous safety issues for cross traffic and private driveways because of limited sight distance, including Malcom Dixon Road and Rocky Springs Road. The addition of this many cars will increase safety hazards at these and other intersections.

On page 126 of the Draft EIR, the traffic study found that most of the intersections on Green Valley Road would see their level of service worsen if the Dixon Ranch project is built as proposed – even at intersections where there is some form of traffic mitigation factor proposed, such as a stop sign. Given the fact that Green Springs Ranch had to wait 20 years for its left and right turn “pockets,” the Draft EIR’s assumption that these improvements will be made seems inadequate. Even if some of these improvements were to eventually be constructed, what happens in the meantime as the level of service declines at the many rural intersections along Green Valley Road?

In conclusion I urge the county to reject the proposed project and the requested general plan amendment. This is not a good location for high-density residential development given the rural nature of the surrounding properties and the traffic impacts on Green Valley Road.

Sincerely,

Susan M. McClurg

2/20/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Public Comment_Dixon Ranch PC 2/26/15, file no. 14-1617

PC 2-26-15

#5

Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

3 pages



Public Comment_Dixon Ranch PC 2/26/15, file no. 14-1617

Green Valley Alliance <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Fri, Feb 20, 2015 at 3:52 PM

To: Brian Shinault <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, Dave Pratt <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, Gary Miller <colcapt@hotmail.com>, Rich Stewart <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, Tom Heflin <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>, Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Please include the attached comments into the public record in opposition to the proposed Dixon Ranch project.

Green Valley Alliance
www.GreenValleyAlliance.org



GVA 2.20.15 PubComment to PC_Dixon .pdf
442K

Feb 20, 2015

Re: **Dixon Ranch Public Comment - Planning Commission 2/26/15, file no. 14-1617**

Dear Commissioners:

The Green Valley Alliance (GVA) strongly opposes the high density Dixon Ranch project. As the lead agency for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County staff should be asking all the hard questions to protect county residents from negative project impacts. Yet GVA sees significant health & safety as well as visual impacts from this project that have NOT been called out as significant. The County's position appears to be one of facilitating the project for the developer, leaving corridor residents without an advocate in this discussion.

GVA members have spent years attending the County's Regulatory Reform meetings, workshops, Board and Commission hearings, and met with various members of County staff, in an effort to convey that the Dixon Ranch site should not be included within the Community Region (CR). This high density development project now before the Commission is dependent upon the project site retaining its CR designation and County staff is seemingly in support of the proposal. We have obviously not been heard.

It is important that you, our Commissioners, know there is no obligation to approve this project, even though you may feel pressured when you see 1500+ pages of DEIR documentation. Please know that County residents volunteered their time to sift through that very same 1500+ pages, and unlike the developer, they were not being paid. Remember that our General Plan includes policies for protection which are every bit as important as the right to develop.

Please consider the following comments:

- The recently completed (Oct 2014) Green Valley corridor traffic study enumerated safety issues at multiple direct access driveways along Green Valley Road that will be greatly exacerbated by Dixon Ranch traffic.
- The project will bring many new students to local schools who presumably might bike to Pleasant Grove Middle School or Oakridge, but the project is not being required to provide the necessary bike lanes on Green Valley Rd.
- The project will cause a substantial change and loss of visual character to the Rural Region of the corridor.
 - DEIR impacts table II-1 lists multiple sound walls, but there is no sound wall plan or height limitations. This could have a huge visual impact on this rural section of the corridor. Additionally, the 22' high wall at the access drive should be included on any sound wall plan.
 - The conversion of rolling hills into a high density subdivision is not even listed as an impact
 - Oak tree retention policies have been entirely disregarded.
- The construction for such a project could last many years, and construction is to be allowed 7 days a week. Should the project be approved in any form, it should be conditioned to exclude weekend and holiday construction.

- Numerous public comments from County residents were not included in the DEIR. The El Dorado Hills APAC (Area Planning Advisory Committee) requested that all comments submitted by the public for the 705-unit design (July 2012) be included as part of the Dec 2012 Notice of Preparation for the 605-unit redesign, and they are not.¹
- The lot sizes proposed are as small as 9 units per acre, while the project is bordered on three of four sides by minimum 5 acre lots. This density is incompatible and is a huge impact on those surrounding rural properties.
- State air quality standards for carbon emissions are clearly not being met according to the draft EIR.
- El Dorado County has mapped areas of known Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA), and in fact asbestos was found in the testing samples under Access Dr A. Yet very little information has been provided regarding the extent, further testing, or what the mitigations will be.
- Our schools are already at capacity, and the designated area schools cannot accept the students expected from this project. Where will they go, and what will be the cost to existing county residents?
- The project proposes to remove 44% of the oak canopy rather than the allowed 10%. There are many impacts associated with this in regards to aesthetics, biological preservation, wildlife habitat conservation, and air quality, to name just a few. Projects on the Green Valley corridor should be held to a higher standard for scenic corridor preservation, rather than being granted exceptions for increased abuse of our protective policies.
- The mitigations themselves for the traffic impacts will hugely effect residents along Green Valley Rd near Salmon Falls and EDH Blvd, and yet it does not appear that these people were notified of any impending changes for road widening, etc.
- Is there a cost associated with gaining right of way in the areas where traffic mitigations call for additional lanes, and what portion of that will be borne by County residents? Will eminent domain be considered?
- Approving this subdivision during a time of drought is not only contrary to General Plan policy 5.2.1.7, but is of concern to surrounding residents with failing wells who may need to purchase water. The Water Supply Assessment for the project indicates there is no research to show how many households may be at risk. It is irresponsible to move forward contrary to General Plan policy without having full understanding of the facts.
- The project would require additional police services (DEIR p338), but there is no data to say how much of an increase, and what costs County residents might be expected to bear.

Corridor residents, and County residents in general, have the reasonable expectation that our County staff is advocating for GOOD development that will improve our quality of life, or at least not degrade it. This project does not promote that confidence. Please do not support this project as proposed.

Green Valley Alliance
www.GreenValleyAlliance.org

¹ Example: GSRLA letter dated June 2012 and submitted for the first NOP release is not included in public comment Appendices Vol 1