



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Dixon Ranch Draft EIR public comment.

Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>
 To: Charlene M Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Thu, Mar 10, 2016 at 3:01 PM

Public comment on Dixon Ranch.

Lillian MacLeod
 Principal Planner

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

(530) 621-6583 / FAX (530) 642-0508
 lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Markus** <eldoradovineyard@yahoo.com>
 Date: Thu, Mar 10, 2016 at 6:41 AM
 Subject: Re: Dixon Ranch Draft EIR public comment.
 To: Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>
 Cc: "mark.millard@edcgov.us" <mark.millard@edcgov.us>, "shawna.purvines@edcgov.us" <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Lillian Macleod,
 Principal Planner
 El Dorado County
 Placerville, CA

Ms, Macleod,

I'm revisiting APN 126-020-04 Louie - Helm / Dixon Ranch Right of Way. AKA APN 067-051-11 AKA APN 067-050-20-100. A triangular shaped parcel of approximately 1.8 acres in the Southeastern section of 24 10 8 adjacent and directly next door to our parcel APN 126-231-28.

Yesterday, I was contacted by Mark Millard, Senior planner; (mark.millard@edcgov.us 530-621-5697). He informed me about the parcel is no longer available for horticulture purposes (AS OF DEC 2015) and that you being his supervisor mentioned that you had contacted me about the findings and resolution after my public comment was submitted (FEB 10, 2015). I recall talking to you at the time of submitting my comments to the planning commissioners, but nothing about the findings of my concerns or any resolution was ever discussed with me. Where can i find the information Mr Millard is referring to? Was it published, possibly buried somewhere within other documentation? No one contacted me personally however. He could not help me further and referred me to the individual who handled the zone change and usage if I wanted further explanation why or how that occurred; Shawna

Purvines (Principal planner / long range planning shawna.purvines@edcgov.us 530-621-5362.

I've been reviewing records and still believe SMUD is the rightful property owner and as a citizen am challenging Louie-Helm as owners of that parcel. The Grant of Right of Way dated 03/07/1960, Doc # 2631, Bk 500 Page 333 was mistakenly entitled and actually is a Right of Way 'IN FEE' ownership to SMUD. And was clarified by Resolution #3281 recorded June 16, 1958 #4604, Bk 435, Pg 130, It was also recorded in Sacramento and Placer county's having some significance without stating. The property was considered a separate parcel ever since and IMO is to this day. Further, SMUD has paid assessed taxes for 56 years and is recognized as legal owners by the recorder's office, assessor's office and tax collector of El Dorado County. Under California law the right of entitlement and acquisition of property by continuous possession, acknowledgement of by payment of taxation for and usage of, ownership is claimed. SMUD would automatically take title similar to "adverse possession of ownership" by decree and by being a public utility would constitute this parcel public property and should be excluded from the Dixon proposed project entirely.

The property can never be developed being within and under the SMUD power lines, by changing it's usage to RF-L from AE / OS actually means it can be used for nothing by right, simply because it doesn't even meet the minimum lot size under the zoning criteria. Only open space has a minimum lot size that this parcel can utilize for any usage. A special use permit would have to applied for any application with the exception for underground utilities approval by SMUD not the county. SMUD has so many of its own regulations overriding the county all together. SMUD would be the ultimate deciding factor for its usage no matter what in any scenario.

Why do I care? I'm resident an immediate neighbor and have been for over 35 years. It has come to my attention, "the powers that be", driving this conspicuously monstrous development is the Planning and Development Dept of El Dorado County who unwittingly partnered with this project use of the Dixon name and it's rich family history blemishing our county's heritage and culture to further in-power the Hon Fay Louie dynasty of China. it's laughably shameful, when the developer's dictate our public servants bow down. Wake up country men.

Regards

Mark Kleinhans, Resident of Green Springs Ranch a Planned Rural Development, Lot 73, Rescue.

On Tuesday, February 10, 2015 11:20 AM, Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us> wrote:

Dear Mr. Kleinhans:

Thank you for your comments on the Dixon Ranch Residential Project public DEIR. They will be included in the administrative record.

Lillian MacLeod

Principal Planner

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

(530) 621-6583 / FAX (530) 642-0508
lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

On Mon, Feb 9, 2015 at 12:50 PM, Markus <eldoradovineyard@yahoo.com> wrote:
*Please submit the attached letter as public comment on the Dixon Ranch draft EIR.
Thank you, Mark Kleinhans, 2400 Clarksville Rd, Rescue, CA 95672*

Mark Kleinhans
2400 Clarksville Rd
Rescue, CA 95672
530-344-2900

Lillian Macleod, Principal Planner
Community Development Agency, El Dorado County
258 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Dixon Ranch Draft EIR Public Comment;

Ms. Macleod,

The EIR states that their development will have insignificant visual impact to neighbors. In actuality it will have an extreme visual impact from our vantage point.

Our property of 7.3 acres within Green Springs Ranch is directly next door to the proposed development sharing approximately 540 feet of property line on the South Eastern side of the proposed development where we have enjoyed the view of the foothills and a knoll of heritage oaks since building our home in 1993 (we have owned the property since 1981). The view of the knoll (hill) on Dixon Ranch from our house will have approximately 20-30 homes in direct eyesight off our porch and rooms from inside our home. We consider this change to be significant and doesn't reflect the statements in the EIR regarding visual impact being insignificant and does not blend with neighboring properties like it says it does. (Page 350 c.) . We feel the severity of this visually will be an eyesore and will adversely affect our property's value. The glare of lighting that will flood the front of our house at night is significant as well (they state that lighting will have less than significant impact pages 349 & 350) Their building lots in around Lot 2A designated on their Preservation of Oak Trees map should be redesigned. We feel that the lots on top of the knoll (hill) that we have a view of should be estate size lots of 5 acres each in addition to a buffer bordering Green Springs Ranch in order to reflect our rural developments zoning R5 and to blend with its neighbor as the

EIR states it does, but doesn't. We are against the zone change request because of it's negative impact and the misinformation in their EIR.

The county's current oak woodland management ordinance which needs to be rewritten because of a court decision presently allows the removal of 10% of trees for developments such as this but they will be removing 45% (page 349) total to be removed by their 2nd phase. They want the county to approve their development before the oak tree ordinance is written. I feel this is unacceptable; the county will be in a position of being manipulated in order to satisfy this developer's approval in-hand.

The county doesn't have an ordinance to protect and preserve heritage (larger and older) oak trees, but neighboring counties and communities in the state do. When the county rewrites the oak tree woodland management ordinance I feel they should consider adding the preservation and protection of heritage oaks.

The developer has included a parcel that they don't own; APN # 126-020-04 which is owned by Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) who has continuously paid the property taxes there since 1960. It is zoned open space. It is located in around their Lot F open space (on their map) and is land locked and accessible from our property and the Dixon Ranch. In the EIR appendices where the property deeds are exhibited this parcel is excluded and there is no arrangement made for its use or purchase. Regardless of whether arrangements have or haven't been made it should be excluded and remain open space as it always has been. Nothing can be built there because of the power line easement and this parcel is included with their zone change request, go figure. They've designed a portion of lot 249 (From their map) within this parcel. Lot 249 I believe should be removed entirely leaving all of Lot F open space as it was originally planned.

The intersection at Green Valley Rd and Deer Valley Rd (West) is Green Springs Ranch's only access point and will be impacted greatly by extra traffic. I believe we need a traffic signal now and this development in my opinion will increase the traffic over the top. I feel the developer needs to become a partner with the county on this improvement. Deer Valley Rd crosses Green Valley Rd twice, East end and West end. The county DOT only provides figures on their website for the East end, an intersection 7 miles away and not the West end where we are located. There needs to be a traffic study just for our intersection alone for analysis. I made the mistake when reviewing the Deer Valley Rd intersection off the counties website as being our own intersection, I hope others haven't done the same thing.

And if it's not too late and however this proposal pans out I personally feel Dixon Ranch should remain inside the Rescue Fire District, the district will loose money by making a change in districts, there is a need for extra tax revenue here. IMO, historically it should remain in Rescue and El Dorado Hills doesn't need it as much as Rescue does.

We are against the rezoning change in the draft EIR as written.

Thank you,

3/14/2016

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Dixon Ranch Draft EIR public comment.

Mark Kleinhans

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.