

PC 3/26/09
#11

Robert and Susan DeBruin
1430 Salmon Falls Rd.
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
916-933-1573
klrbiker@sbcglobal.net

March 22, 2009

Mr. Michael Baron,
El Dorado County Planning Commission

Re:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Agenda of March 26, 2009 Page 4

11. REZONE/TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

Z06-0005/TM06-1408/PD06-0006 submitted by ALTO, LLC/GARY SPARKS to rezone from Exclusive Agriculture (AE) to Estate Residential Five-Acre, with a Planned Development Overlay (RE-5-PD); and a tentative subdivision map to create 23 singlefamily lots ranging in size from 78,147 square feet to 120,291 square feet (1.79 to 2.76 acres) and three open space lots totaling 25.40 acres. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 126-100-19, consisting of 81.61 acres, is located approximately 3,000 feet northeast of the intersection of Malcolm Dixon Road and Salmon Falls Road, in the El Dorado Hills area, Supervisorial District IV. (Mitigated negative declaration prepared)*

Staff: Michael Baron Recommendation: Recommend approval

Dear Mr. Baron,

I am a long time resident on Salmon Falls Road. Having just become aware of the above proposed Rezone I am writing to oppose this rezoning. I oppose because of concerns regarding the impacts of additional traffic on Salmon Fall Rd. and the environmental impacts of the multiple new septic systems abutting the New York Creek which shortly downstream becomes Folsom Lake a major source of local water supplies along with lack of county adhearance to policy set down to protect public health and safety.

Salmon Falls Road has sustained huge increases in traffic in the last several years without much mitigation to insure safety; ie increased signage, turn lanes, adjusted and posted speed limits etc. The intersection at Salmon Falls and Lake Hills drive is awkward and has become dangerous with the greatly increased traffic that uses this intersection resulting in increasing numbers of accidents and even resulting in several fatalities. What studies have been done/completed that demonstrate the impacts of the additional traffic from this development on the roads and intersections involved? A cumulative traffic study for the effects and mitigation of such on Lake Hills, Malcom Dixon, and Salmon Falls Road and those intersections should be completed

before even considering further impacting this very busy and complex section of road(s). What studies have been completed that show the traffic impacts of this development along with the other both concurrently proposed and approved developments in the immediate vicinity that will be utilizing these same complex roads and intersections?

What studies have been done to show the environmental impacts of the new septic systems in this particularly environmentally sensitive watershed to water supply area? In Oct. 08 waiver allowed development to include 22 new septic systems on Lomita Way (in the same vicinity) while earlier development and developers have respected and had to adhere to the very policies set up to protect us and this area preserving both the area and lifestyle of humans and the animals which reside in the vast State Park with Folsom Lake that borders this area. Not holding developers to policy endangers this environmentally sensitive area and could have ramification on untold numbers downstream. What studies have been done to show the environmental impacts of the cumulative numbers of new septic systems of this and development along with the other both concurrently proposed and approved developments in the immediate vicinity meeting only minimum capacity requirements in this particularly environmentally sensitive watershed to water supply area?

Please re-evaluate your recommendation to approve this sub-policy rezone which needs to be looking out for everyone's interest and not just the developers. This is not right, they need to follow Policy.

Sincerely,
Robert and Susan DeBruin

PC 3/26/09
#11


G.C. WALLACE COMPANIES
ENGINEERS | PLANNERS | SURVEYORS
G.C. WALLACE OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

MEMORANDUM

To: Michael Baron

From: Kaycie Edwards, Andrea Mayer & Wes Hughes, PE

Date: March 17, 2009

Re: **Alto Exhibit X Comments**

Mike,

Based on Exhibit X that you provided to me today, we have the following additional comments to help with clarity and proposed road connections:

- Add APNs and street names to the exhibit for further clarity. We are calling the western road on Diamante Estates "Diamante Road" and the eastern road "Chartraw Road."
- Clarify the "Area of Benefit" hatching on the map and make sure that all Area of Benefit locations shown on the map correspond with Table 1 in the Conditions of Approval. Currently there is an "Area of Benefit" shown at Salmon Falls Road, but not listed in Table 1.
- Remove the T-stub from La Canada B Drive south to Diamante Estates. There has been no agreement to provide access from the Diamante property to the La Canada property. La Canada B Drive should "T" into Alto A Drive, and the connection from Alto A Drive and Diamante Road is shown correctly.
- It is unclear why the Diamante roads are shown as dashed lines and La Canada roads are shown as continuous lines.

We also noticed as we went through each listed improvement as described in Table 1 of the Conditions of Approval, there is no requirement for Alto to construct the required second point of connection with an existing, improved public street. Based on our understanding, the connection between the cul-de-sac terminus of Diamante Road north to Alto's A Drive is the required second access point. It is clear that the alternative second access connection will be through La Canada to Salmon Falls Road. As representative for the Diamante Estates project, we feel it is very important to clearly identify both required points of connection with existing, improved public streets.

Again, if you should have any questions or concerns relating to our comments, please contact us immediately so that we may address all of your questions.

PC 3/26/09

#11



G. C. WALLACE COMPANIES
ENGINEERS | PLANNERS | SURVEYORS

G.C. WALLACE OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
G.C. WALLACE BUILDING, INC.
G.C. WALLACE, INC.

MEMORANDUM

To: Michael Baron

From: Kaycie Edwards, Andrea Mayer & Wes Hughes, PE

Date: March 16, 2009

Re: **Alto Staff Report Comments**

Mike,

We have downloaded the current staff report, accompanying memo and have a few concerns about both items. We would like to convey our concerns to you in writing.

Circulation issues have been very important to the neighbors and residents around these projects, and based on our review of the staff report, we believe it is very important to clearly identify the planned circulation routes and access points for the Alto project.

First, we believe the staff report should provide additional clarification on page 12 under the heading **Other Issues, Access and Circulation**. Specifically, this description should clearly describe the two points of access Alto has been conditioned to provide. Currently, we understand that the two points of access will be south through the Diamante and Chartraw projects. If that is the case, the access points should be identified and described using APNS. Alternatively, it is our understanding that if the La Canada project moves forward, the second point of access through Diamante Road may not be necessary. We would encourage the staff report clearly identify the proposed circulation access points as well as the alternative access points utilizing APNs and project names. This same comment applies to item #36 in the memo.

Our comments are as follows for **Attachment 1/Conditions of approval, Table 1**: The off-site improvement for the connection between Alto and Diamante should to be listed on the Conditions of Approval. Understandably, based on the settlement agreement between the property owners, Alto is required to construct the connection from the cul-de-sac terminus of Diamante Drive to the southwestern property boundary, and we believe for clarity and consistency, this off-site improvement should also be included in Table 1.

This memo is written without having seen Exhibit X as described in the staff report. Future review of Exhibit X may help to clarify theses comments. If you should have any questions or concerns relating to our comments, please contact us immediately so that we may address all of you questions. Also, please note we will be following up directly with Eileen Crawford of DOT to clarify and comment on item #34 in the memo.

Robert Hablitzel
1500 Lake Vista Lane
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

PC 3/26/09
#11

March 16, 2009

Mr. Michael Baron, Senior Planner
El Dorado County Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Re Rezone Z06-005/Planned Development PD06-0006
Tentative Subdivision Map TM06-1408
Sparks/ALTO
North of Malcom Dixon Road in the EDH/Salmon Falls area

Dear Mr. Baron,

Please consider and pass these written comments onto the Planning Commission for its meeting to be held on March 26, 2009 for the above referenced project. My comments are based on my review of the project file posted on the County's web site.

In regards to the environmental check list:

VIII Hydrology & Water Quality

b. wells-the project is being serviced by EID. However there should be a condition that the property owners cannot dig wells in the proposed project for their use.

IV Biological Resources

e. lots are not to be pre graded. How will the County preserve intent of the approved removal plan for potentially 23 different permits plus road construction and insure mitigation?

There is no mention of preservation of existing oaks in Open Space parcels A & B.
There is no mention of how the open space parcels will be maintained.

What legal entity will own Open Space Parcels A & B? Is there an open space management plan to insure long term maintenance guidelines? I am sure it is the county's intent to leave "as is," however that is not addressed. Will there be recreational

uses appropriate to the terrain, such as hiking trails? The other extreme would be, "can all vegetation be removed for fire control?"

VI Transportation/Traffic

d. Substantially increase hazards-

Malcom Dixon Road is in poor condition. In the heavy rains of 2006/2007 it was heavily damaged due to just a fairly heavy rain event. DOT spent many hours repairing. It is clear the road base is in sub standard condition.

The traffic reports included for this one project does not address two bridges near New York Creek, which are substandard in width. They are treated as one way bridges by daily users. This should be addressed in the traffic analysis for all three projects collectively and/or individually. In addition, residents completed their own traffic study, which indicate significant different findings than presented.

The applicant, along with the other Malcom Dixon applicants, should be responsible for full improvements to current El Dorado DOT standards.

VII Hazards and Hazardous Materials

h. Expose people to significant loss.

The project setbacks are 30 feet. However the environmental document recognizes that setbacks should be from 30-100 feet for fire safety in vegetative cover that exists in the area. It is imperative that all setbacks be changed to 100 feet for rear yard setbacks. This will insure that the proposed development will be responsible to meet CalFire Standards.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the environmental check list and this project.

Sincerely,

Bob Hablitzel