

Shallow, Kinarik

From: Kat Fiorentino <kat@loansbykat.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 9, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Shallow, Kinarik
Cc: Alejandro & Susan Garcia; angela Oneill; angela Oneill; Cheryl Hammond; Dave & Muneca Sutherland; Derrick Leeks; Don & Fran Van Skike; Glenda Atwood; Hannah Siviglia; Jeremiah Herrera; Jill & Robert Maccione; June & Robert Maccione; Kathy Wilkey; Raquel Terrazas; Tommy & Julie Thomas; Zach Siviglia
Subject: PL21-0162
Attachments: 360 Diamond Oaks Rd Public Hearing Notice.pdf

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings Kinarik,

I received my public hearing notice on the matter of 360 Diamond Oaks Road. I understand there is a Tree Permit to remove native oaks on this proposed development site. I am writing to petition for a copy of the Tree Permit, parcel map or other illustration showing which oak trees will be removed.

I am sure all the owners copied on this request would like to see the projected impact of the removal of these native oak trees allowing an opportunity to provide feedback. I am sure I am not the only one who has knowledge about endangered species using those oaks as a habitat.

I am primarily concerned with the 2 huge trees behind my property that serve as wildlife habitat for the Red-Tailed Hawks. I even thought I saw a Red-shouldered hawk but couldn't get a picture of it. I am concerned about the adverse impact of removing habitat for these endangered species of raptors. There are so many varieties of birds using these trees as a place to call home. I would appreciate it if the city could share with us their environmentally friendly position on which trees will be protected to avoid further loss of endangered species.

I understand we need to address the housing shortage. I also know the city of Roseville is an amazing, desirable place because we have wetlands, greenbelts and park initiatives to maintain space for the preservation of wildlife. Protecting open areas, so we can all enjoy our property, live in harmony with the neighborhood, neighbors and wildlife is fundamental to keeping Roseville Great!

This greenbelt at Sierra View has been home to so many migratory birds, endangered species and threatened wildlife for over 60 years. We are very concerned about removal of the Native oaks, some may even be over 100 years old.



Kat Fiorentino

Mortgage Broker, Financial Solutions Management
Branch Manager

Phone: 916-300-6125 Email: Kat@loansbykat.com Website:
<https://LoansByKat.com/>

Address: 408 Sunrise Ave #7, Roseville, CA 95661
NMLS 230274 DRE 01298989

Follow us



FSM

FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS MANAGEMENT

GTG Financial, Inc dba Financial Solutions Management. 1919 Creekside Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95405. Equal Housing Opportunity. Licensed by the CA Department of Real Estate 02029711 NMLS 1595076. Licensed to do business in the states of CA, CO, TX.

Shallow, Kinarik

From: Shallow, Kinarik
Sent: Thursday, December 9, 2021 12:01 PM
To: 'Kat Fiorentino'
Cc: Alejandro & Susan Garcia; angela Oneill; angela Oneill; Cheryl Hammond; Dave & Muneca Sutherland; Derrick Leeks; Don & Fran Van Skike; Glenda Atwood; Hannah Siviglia; Jeremiah Herrera; Jill & Robert Maccione; June & Robert Maccione; Kathy Wilkey; Raquel Terrazas; Tommy & Julie Thomas; Zach Siviglia
Subject: RE: PL21-0162
Attachments: PL21-0162, 360 Diamond Oaks, Item 6.1a Sierra View Subdivision, 02 Exhibit F Tree Removal Exhibit.pdf

Hi Kat,

Attached is the tree removal exhibit that identifies the trees to remain, to be removed, and/or encroached into. The complete set of project plans are located on the City's Projects of Interest website at www.roseville.ca.us/ProjectsofInterest under "Sierra View Subdivision". Consistent with CEQA, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project which included an evaluation on the project's impacts to biological resources including special-status and migratory bird species and removal of oak trees. Mitigation measures will be required of the project to ensure no special-status species or birds are harmed during tree removal or construction. These measures include the requirement of pre-construction nesting bird surveys done by a qualified biologist prior to the start of construction to determine whether there are any active nests. The CEQA document is located online at www.roseville.ca.us/environmentaldocuments under "Sierra View County Club & Sierra Vista Specific Plan Redesignation and Rezone Project, File # PL21-0161 and File # PL21-0162".

Thank you,
Kinnie

Kinarik Shallow
Associate Planner
Development Services Dept. – Planning Division
o: (916) 746-1309
f: (916) 774-5129

Working together to build a quality community.

Civic Center | 311 Vernon Street | Roseville, CA | 95678



From: Kat Fiorentino <kat@loansbykat.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 9, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Shallow, Kinarik <KShallow@roseville.ca.us>
Cc: Alejandro & Susan Garcia <Scoopie@msn.com>; angela Oneill <Aoneill@hga.com>; angela Oneill <Angela_Oneill@icloud.com>; Cheryl Hammond <J.c.hamandegg@comcast.net>; Dave & Muneca Sutherland

<Daves@jps.net>; Derrick Leeks <Mr.leeks@icloud.com>; Don & Fran Van Skike <donald1578@sbcglobal.net>; Glenda Atwood <hayglenda@gmail.com>; Hannah Siviglia <hsiviglia@gmail.com>; Jeremiah Herrera <Jerherrera@gmail.com>; Jill & Robert Maccione <jmmaccione@gmail.com>; June & Robert Maccione <jmmaccione@hotmail.com>; Kathy Wilkey <Kwilkey1964@gmail.com>; Raquel Terrazas <Rterrazas9196@gmail.com>; Tommy & Julie Thomas <TnJ7@comcast.net>; Zach Siviglia <zhsiviglia@gmail.com>

Subject: PL21-0162

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings Kinarik,

I received my public hearing notice on the matter of 360 Diamond Oaks Road. I understand there is a Tree Permit to remove native oaks on this proposed development site. I am writing to petition for a copy of the Tree Permit, parcel map or other illustration showing which oak trees will be removed.

I am sure all the owners copied on this request would like to see the projected impact of the removal of these native oak trees allowing an opportunity to provide feedback. I am sure I am not the only one who has knowledge about endangered species using those oaks as a habitat.

I am primarily concerned with the 2 huge trees behind my property that serve as wildlife habitat for the Red-Tailed Hawks. I even thought I saw a Red-shouldered hawk but couldn't get a picture of it. I am concerned about the adverse impact of removing habitat for these endangered species of raptors. There are so many varieties of birds using these trees as a place to call home. I would appreciate it if the city could share with us their environmentally friendly position on which trees will be protected to avoid further loss of endangered species.

I understand we need to address the housing shortage. I also know the city of Roseville is an amazing, desirable place because we have wetlands, greenbelts and park initiatives to maintain space for the preservation of wildlife. Protecting open areas, so we can all enjoy our property, live in harmony with the neighborhood, neighbors and wildlife is fundamental to keeping Roseville Great!

This greenbelt at Sierra View has been home to so many migratory birds, endangered species and threatened wildlife for over 60 years. We are very concerned about removal of the Native oaks, some may even be over 100 years old.



Kat Fiorentino

Mortgage Broker, Financial Solutions Management
Branch Manager

Phone: 916-300-6125 **Email:** Kat@loansbykat.com **Website:**

<https://LoansByKat.com/>

Address: 408 Sunrise Ave #7, Roseville, CA 95661

NMLS 230274 **DRE** 01298989

Follow us





GTG Financial, Inc dba Financial Solutions Management. 1919 Creekside Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95405. Equal Housing Opportunity. Licensed by the CA Department of Real Estate 02029711 NMLS 1595076. Licensed to do business in the states of CA, CO, TX.

Shallow, Kinarik

From: Kat Fiorentino <kat@loansbykat.com>
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 7:17 PM
To: Shallow, Kinarik
Cc: Alejandro & Susan Garcia; angela Oneill; Cheryl Hammond; Dave & Muneca Sutherland; Derrick Leeks; Don & Fran Van Skike; Glenda Atwood; Hannah Siviglia; Jeremiah Herrera; Jill & Robert Maccione; June & Robert Maccione; Kathy Wilkey; Raquel Terrazas; Tommy & Julie Thomas; Zach Siviglia
Subject: Sierra View Country Club Residential Development
Attachments: Parcel Map - New.jpg; Sierra View Res Dvlpmnt Letr of intent.pdf

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I received a postcard from the city of Roseville Planning division regarding The following project's notice of MND. The problem is that it seems to address multiple projects so it's a bit confusing. I am hoping you can clarify some questions for our neighborhood as I am sure I am not the only one who has questions about his notice.

We are concerned with identifying the project that borders our neighborhood, specifically Diamond Oaks Road and Shasta Street. It appears you have lumped 3 different development projects on this one postcard so again I am confused. Are we just the 75 units on infill Planning Parcel 3 and listed as APN 015-011-029-000 or are we some combination of the other identifies referenced below? Pleasant Grove does not connect to our Diamond Oaks Neighborhood, but I really can't identify exactly which Parcel and APN pertains to us on this Post Card.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that, as Lead Agency, the City of Roseville, Development Services Department, Planning Division has prepared an Initial Study leading to a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project referenced below. This Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review and comment.

Project Title/File#: Sierra View Country Club & Sierra Vista Specific Plan Redesignation and Rezoning Project; File #PL21-0162 and #PL21-0161

Project Location: 360 Diamond Oaks Road, Roseville, CA 95678 (APN 015-011-029-000) & 3301 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville, CA 95661 (APN 496-100-030-000) (Parcel WB-41) / 3250 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville, CA 95661 (APN 496-100-029-000) (Parcel WB-31)

Project Owner: SVLC 23, LLC & Westpark SV 400, LLC

Project Applicant: John Tallman, WP Sierra View, LLC & Westpark SV 400, LLC

Project Planner: Kinarik Shallow, Associate Planner

Project Description: The project will allow the construction of 75 single-family homes on Infill Planning Parcels 3 and 100 and the construction of 63 single-family homes on Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) Parcel WB-41. The project consists of amending the General Plan (GP) land use designation and modifying the zoning for a majority portion of Infill Planning Parcel 100 (northern part) and modifying the zoning for a minor portion of Infill Planning Parcel 3 (southern part), both located immediately east of the Sierra View Country Club, in order to reduce the property's existing planned housing density. The majority of Infill Planning Parcel 100 would be amended from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential and rezoned from R3 (Multi-Family Housing) to RS/DS (Small Lot Residential with Development Standards). A minor portion of Infill Planning Parcel 3 would be rezoned from R1 (Single-Family Residential) to RS/DS. A Tentative Subdivision Map is proposed that would include the redesignated and rezoned portion of Infill Planning Parcel 100 and the rezoned portion of Infill Planning Parcel 3 that will create 75 single-family lots. The Tentative Map would reduce the total number of residential units previously anticipated for Infill Parcel 100 from 223 to 130. The project would increase the density of SVSP Parcel WB-31 from 23.7 units per acre to 26.4 units per acre, as allowable under the GP, and increase its total planned high-density residential units by 30—from 263 to 293. The project also would redesignate Parcel WB-41 from Community Commercial to Medium Density Residential through a GP amendment and rezone it from CC (Community Commercial) to RS/DS (Small Lot with Development Standards) and create a Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map with 63 medium-density residential lots.



Kat Fiorentino

Mortgage Broker, Financial Solutions Management
Branch Manager

Phone: 916-300-6125 Email: Kat@loansbykat.com Website:
<https://LoansByKat.com/>

Address: 408 Sunrise Ave #7, Roseville, CA 95661
NMLS 230274 DRE 01298989

Follow us



GTG Financial, Inc dba Financial Solutions Management. 1919 Creekside Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95405. Equal Housing Opportunity.
Licensed by the CA Department of Real Estate 02029711 NMLS 1595076. Licensed to do business in the states of CA, CO, TX.

Shallow, Kinarik

From: Shallow, Kinarik
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Kat Fiorentino
Cc: Bitter, Greg; Ogden, Derek; Alejandro & Susan Garcia; angela Oneill; Cheryl Hammond; Dave & Muneca Sutherland; Derrick Leeks; Don & Fran Van Skike; Glenda Atwood; Hannah Siviglia; Jeremiah Herrera; Jill & Robert Maccione; June & Robert Maccione; Kathy Wilkey; Raquel Terrazas; Tommy & Julie Thomas; Zach Siviglia
Subject: RE: Sierra View Country Club Residential Development
Attachments: PL21-0162 Sierra View Subdivision Map.pdf

Hi Kat,

Thanks for reaching out. We realize the project description in the MND notice may be confusing, but it is two projects that are linked to each other. Below are descriptions for each project. File #PL21-0162 pertains to the Sierra View Country Club property in your neighborhood, which has an address of 360 Diamond Oaks Rd. (APN# 015-011-029-000). There are currently 168 units allocated to that site, however the project is proposing to build only 75 units (attached is the proposed subdivision map). The remaining 93 units must be transferred elsewhere within the City, and are being transferred to SVSP Parcel WB-41 and WB-31, which is why they are referenced in the project description. I apologize for the confusion but hope this provides clarification. Feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

File #PL21-0162 Request: This project will allow the construction of 75 single-family homes on Infill Planning Parcels 3 and 100, located to the east of the Sierra View Country Club. The entitlements include a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of Parcel 100 from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR) and a Rezone from Multi-Family Housing (R3) to Small Lot Residential (RS). Infill Planning Parcel 3 will be rezoned from Single-Family Residential (R1) to RS. A Tentative Subdivision Map is requested to subdivide the parcels into 75 single-family lots. Lastly, a Tree Permit is requested to remove native oak trees on the site in order to facilitate development of the lots. The remaining 93 units allocated to Infill Parcel 100 will be transferred to Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) Parcels WB-41 (+63 units) and WB-31 (+30 units).

File #PL21-0161 Request: This project will allow the construction of 63 single-family homes on SVSP Parcel WB-41. The project entitlements include a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of Parcel WB-41 from Community Commercial (CC) to MDR and a Rezone from CC to Small Lot Residential/Development Standards (RS/DS). The SVSP will also be amended to reflect the 30 additional units transferred to High Density Residential Parcel WB-31. A Second Amendment to the Westbrook Development Agreement will be made to reflect the proposed land use changes, unit transfers, and to include dedication of a portion of West Roseville Specific Plan Parcel W-60B to the City. Lastly, a Tentative Subdivision Map is included to subdivide Parcel WB-41 into 63 medium density residential lots.

Thank you,
Kinnie

Kinarik Shallow

Associate Planner

Development Services Dept. – Planning Division

o: (916) 746-1309

f: (916) 774-5129

Working together to build a quality community.

Civic Center | 311 Vernon Street | Roseville, CA | 95678



From: Kat Fiorentino <kat@loansbykat.com>
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 7:17 PM
To: Shallow, Kinarik <KShallow@roseville.ca.us>
Cc: Alejandro & Susan Garcia <Scoopie@msn.com>; angela Oneill <Aoneill@hga.com>; Cheryl Hammond <J.c.hamandegg@comcast.net>; Dave & Muneca Sutherland <Daves@jps.net>; Derrick Leeks <Mr.leeks@icloud.com>; Don & Fran Van Skike <donald1578@sbcglobal.net>; Glenda Atwood <hayglenda@gmail.com>; Hannah Siviglia <hsiviglia@gmail.com>; Jeremiah Herrera <Jerherrera@gmail.com>; Jill & Robert Maccione <jmmaccione@gmail.com>; June & Robert Maccione <jmmaccione@hotmail.com>; Kathy Wilkey <Kwilkey1964@gmail.com>; Raquel Terrazas <Rterrazas9196@gmail.com>; Tommy & Julie Thomas <TnJ7@comcast.net>; Zach Siviglia <zhsiviblia@gmail.com>
Subject: Sierra View Country Club Residential Development

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I received a postcard from the city of Roseville Planning division regarding The following project's notice of MND. The problem is that it seems to address multiple projects so it's a bit confusing. I am hoping you can clarify some questions for our neighborhood as I am sure I am not the only one who has questions about his notice.

We are concerned with identifying the project that borders our neighborhood, specifically Diamond Oaks Road and Shasta Street. It appears you have lumped 3 different development projects on this one postcard so again I am confused. Are we just the 75 units on infill Planning Parcel 3 and listed as APN 015-011-029-000 or are we some combination of the other identifies referenced below? Pleasant Grove does not connect to our Diamond Oaks Neighborhood, but I really can't identify exactly which Parcel and APN pertains to us on this Post Card.

Shallow, Kinarik

From: Derek Pell <derek.j.pell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 1:14 AM
To: Shallow, Kinarik
Subject: Sierra View Country Club & Sierra Vista Specific Plan Redesignation and Rezoning Project File #PL21-0162 and #PL21-0161

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Kinnie,

I wanted to reach out with some concerns regarding the proposed rezoning for infill parcels 100 and 3. There was obviously a lot of work that went into the combined CEQA document and I understand there are a couple different sets of rules at play here that have to be navigated (SB 330 and CEQA). While on the surface, downzoning one area of the city by 93 units and redistributing them elsewhere in the area seems rational, I am concerned that the analysis is missing the higher-level interactions.

For example, take VMT. For the SV parcels, VMT analysis is not required since the general plan assessed the impact of VMT for the parcel designated at MDR, and the proposed change from baseline creates fewer units and thus fewer VMT. For the SVSP parcel WB-41, VMT analysis showed a decrease based on a strict change from commercial to residential. The conclusion of page 5 of the Cumulative Considerations that the proposed project will reduce VMT impacts, however, intuitively doesn't seem right.

The city is taking housing (or really potential housing) from a centralized location, and pushing it to the far reaches of town. The SV parcels are just over a mile from commercial areas such as Old Town and Downtown, the Church St. Station, and around a mile and a half from The Fountains, where there are restaurants and shops. Having previously lived just over on Alta Vista Ave, I speak from experience when I say it is a centralized, bikeable, walkable area where VMT could well be below average for the city. Conversely, the parcels in the SVSP will likely be far away from most destinations when they are first constructed, meaning more people in more cars. Looking at the SVSP itself, WB-31 and WB-41 are going to be around a mile from other commercial areas and significantly farther from the main commercial zones along Baseline when SVSP is fully built out. It seems to me that both in the short term (before full SVSP buildout) and in the long-term, the combined effect of the rezoning will be that there will be fewer people close to amenities where it is possible to not drive, and more people in cars travelling longer distances to get the goods and services they need. In fact, re-zoning WB-41 to residential removes the north-west commercial area of the SVSP and, again, will push more people to get in their car and drive, rather than walking or biking down the street.

In conclusion, downzoning infill parcels 3 and 100 is a bad deal for future Roseville residents. It takes one of the city's last opportunities to create denser infill on a greenfield site close to jobs, shops, restaurants and healthcare, and wastes it on a single-family gated subdivision. In addition, pushing more housing out to the edge of the city is a surefire way to force more people into cars.

Thank you for your time,

Derek Pell
530 863 0662

1004 Shasta St.
Roseville, CA 95678
December 5, 2021

Kinark Shallow
Associate Planner
City of Roseville
khallow@roseville.ca.us

Re: Objection to Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration
Sierra View Country Club & Sierra Visit Specific Plan Redesignation and Rezoning Project,
File #PL21-0162 and # PL21-0161

Dear Mr/Ms. Shallow:

We are owners of a property bordering the proposed project, reference above. We object to the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the above-referenced project. It is deficient as follows:

- 1) With respect to Parcels 3 and 100, the proposed MND does not disclose, discuss, nor provide for mitigation of the destruction of nesting and breeding habitat of birds protected by the Migratory Birds Act, including mallards, Canada geese, great horned owls, red shouldered hawks, yellow-billed magpies, northern mockingbirds, and Steller's jays, among others. The Migratory Birds Act prohibits the destruction of the breeding habitats of birds protected thereunder.
- 2) The proposed MND does not disclose that Parcels 3 and 100 serve as forage for river otters, which are protected by the federal Endangered Species Act. There is no provision for mitigation of this loss.
- 3) The proposed MND does not provide for mitigation of the loss of habitat for the native bat population. Currently, Parcels 3 and 100 provide shelter and food for native bats that take advantage of the large oaks and the insect population breeding in the seasonal lakes and vernal pools.
- 4) The proposed MND does not disclose that on or about August 27, 2021, after the development of the Sierra View property was announced and public meetings held, Sierra View Country Club and/or its developer, WestPark, illegally took a backhoe onto Parcel 100 and dug into the area of and/or surrounding the tree-sheltered wetlands, seasonal lakes, seasonal streambeds, and vernal pools, with the intent of destroying them by draining them of all or part of their water supply. They then caused to be erected a low containment fence to prevent the land and water from reverting to its natural state. It is believed that Sierra View/WestPark also altered the sites of the natural seasonal lakes/stream beds/wetlands/vernal pools located behind the bordering homes on

Sierra Oaks Court and Walton Way and altered the drainage of the proposed entryway across from Spanger School. It is believed that neither Sierra View nor WestPark had obtained the required Lake and Stream Alteration permits from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife before digging, or if they did, that they did so without disclosing that the purpose of the alteration was to destroy the protected permanent and seasonal wetlands, stream beds, and lake beds, and vernal pools, as well as Migratory Bird breeding habitat on the property. It is believed that in so doing, Sierra View and WestPark intentionally destroyed perennial breeding habitat of mallard ducks and Canada geese, as well as the river otter forage, in violation of the Migratory Birds Act, CEQA, and other state and federal environmental laws and regulations. Although the MND does disclose that the wetlands and vernal pools on Parcels 3 and 100 will be destroyed, it does not disclose that Sierra View and WestPark took it upon themselves in August 2021 to destroy the existing streambed, seasonal lakes, wetlands, and vernal pools to make the mitigated development they proposed appear to have no significant impact. (Photographs of the backhoe and subsequent damage are available upon request).

4) The MND does not adequately address impact on Water Quality. First, the document basically says that because Placer County has not adopted a master plan, there is no mitigation of water quality required. It also states, essentially, that because the law requires mitigation, there can be no significant impact. This is an insufficient evaluation of the actual impact that the proposed development will have on Water Quality. It is believed that the drainage of the water from Parcels 3 and 100 are into salmon habitat. Currently, Parcels 3 and 100 serve a vital wetlands filtration function in buffering and filtering run-off of chemicals used to operate and maintain the golf course. Although the MND proposes mitigation through bioswales and retention pond, the proposed measures appear to be inadequate to replace the function of the current wetlands and to handle the run-off from the golf course and the increased pollution from the establishment of a residential development in its place of the former wetlands. Nor does it adequately address impact on down-stream salmon habitat. A more detailed environmental study is needed.

5) The Greenhouse Gas Emissions report is flawed in that it addresses only the effects of “construction” and “operations.” It does not address the permanent loss of greenhouse gas filtration and conversion through the loss of canopy provided by the 158 to 168 trees that are proposed to be removed from Parcels 3 and 100. It is unclear that “operations” includes the greenhouse gas effects of furnaces, air conditioners, motor vehicles, and other internal combustion engines that come with the establishment of a residential neighborhood. There appears to be no calculation of the increase of greenhouse gases from the establishment of the residential neighborhood, nor the loss of greenhouse gas reduction capacity of the with the removal of 158 to 168 trees and other currently existing flora. A more detailed environmental study is needed.

6) Density. The MND states that medium density is appropriate for Parcel 100 because it was originally zoned in the 1950s to have greater density. But, at the time the area was so zoned, there was no development of R1 housing and a school completely occupying the eastern and

northern borders of the parcel. The only housing extant at the time the Parcel was zoned was the medium density housing located along the railroad tracks to the south of the parcel. Over the ensuing 70 years, the neighborhood bordering Parcel 100 was developed to be entirely single-family housing, except for the Sierra View property to the south, which more closely matches the 1920's bungalow housing to the south of that property. But, the entire eastern border, which comprises the bulk of the neighboring property, is R1 housing. Moreover, Parcel 3, to the north, is designated and proposed to be developed as R1. The more appropriate zoning for Parcel 100 would be as R1 density to match the surrounding subsequently established neighborhoods.

7) The MND proposed to adopt for Parcels 3 and 100 the EIR performed for the subdivision of which Parcel WB-41 is a part. That existing subdivision is more than 3 miles away and with substantially different environmental and surrounding neighborhood characteristics. Although the concept of moving density from one parcel to another may appeal, the EIR for the subdivision containing WB-41, that appears to have no streambed or wetlands, is not an adequate study of the environmental impacts of the proposed development of Parcels 3 and 100.

We believe that, pursuant to CEQA, a more detailed and independent study of the environmental impacts of the proposed development of Parcels 3 and 100 is necessary and additional mitigation measures beyond those proposed in the MND are required. Consequently, the currently proposed MND should not be approved, pending a more detailed study of multiple aspects of the proposed development.

Sincerely,



Robert Maccione



Jane Maccione