

Letter 1

March 28, 2017

To: Town of Loomis Planning Commission

From: Steven D. Harris  
5449 Myrtle Dr.  
Loomis, CA 95650

Re: Addendum to prior public comment regarding "The Grove" development

To Whom It May Concern:

I believe the developers of "The Grove," willfully or unwittingly, have attempted to skirt the Loomis General Plan and sideline the local community concerns. They want to double the number of local streetlights, destroy two seasonal wetland watersheds (including extensive frog habitat, a critical link in the rural food chain), build a 13 foot tall retaining wall/fence combo, and grade 10 acres into essentially a stand-alone pad separate from the local neighborhoods - in the middle of an existing neighborhood that transitions from medium density suburban to low density rural.

As far as I know, the only changes to their plans, so far, have been the removal of a gate (so now it is a gated community without a gate) and replacing a segregating brick wall with a segregating wooden wall.

Their initial attempts at environmental approval bypassed local authority, and their initial plans completely ignored the General Plan of the Town.

The mitigation declaration (MND) conspicuously whitewashed all concerns regarding previously documented General Plans and local community concerns.

I do not believe that folks should not build houses, but this development has never wavered from anything more than being a spiritless, slightly modified version of the urban to suburban transitions so common in Rocklin, Roseville, and Lincoln. The Town of Loomis was created specifically to discourage and disallow this sort of industrial style development.

It is not clear to me, and to others with whom I've spoken, that these developers recognize nor respect the Loomis community and brand.

I support the need for changes to this plan to recognize and adopt local character, the intent of the law, and the habitat and environment at a most sensitive and transitional parcel that has been undeveloped for decades.

Best regards,



Steven D. Harris

# Letter 1

January 25, 2017

TO: Robert King, Town Planner  
Town of Loomis Planning Department

RE: The Grove Development --  
"Initial Study/Mitigated Declaration" and Special Considerations for the Town of Loomis

Dear Mr. King:

There are some valid concerns not directly addressed in the context of the Town of Loomis in the "Initial Study/Mitigated Declaration" for The Grove development. These concerns need to be addressed as some of them affect the very character of the community.

It is stated clearly that The Grove project is in a sensitive area, requiring some special considerations. In this context, some of the things I assume we as a Town are intent on preserving include:

- Local rural character. The Town of Loomis garners great property values from older homes existing in the preserved and precious rural landscape, especially at the edges where rural residential transitions to rural. Note: this is not "urban" to "rural" zoning as characterized in the Initial Study.
- Wildlife habitat, not limited to protected species. This would include maintaining the healthy abundance of amphibious and avian. I have seen owls and hawks living and preying on and near the lot, and it is an amazing and beautiful sight.
- Existing property character and values. This area is relatively dark, and much of the year the sounds of frogs and trains pervade. These are the sights and sounds of Loomis: stars, and natural creatures.
- Natural flora, especially trees. There are many different species of trees here, including Eucalyptus. A significant change to drain patterns could greatly affect surface ground water and threaten some, if not all, of the larger trees in the area.

The primary concerns that need to be properly addressed, and may have been side-stepped in the Final IS:

- The "design plan" for the Grove is essentially a "gated community" without a gate. By levelling the new neighborhood, segregating it from the rest of the community by fences (and walls), it is essentially hidden and separate in character. The Final IS does not properly characterize this aspect of the design. This effectively brings "Rocklin style" development to the heart of the most sensitive area of transition in residential zoning in Loomis. It sets a terrible precedent and threatens local property values.
- The design doesn't just "not add additional storm drain flow to existing properties", it completely changes the existing topography and habitat. The design blocks all storm drainage into neighboring lots -- changing the drain patterns dramatically. This destroys frog habitat. Affecting this aspect of the local food chain affects all local bird and mammal populations, which also affect migrating birds and raptors. While many of these species are not "protected", they are a critical aspect of local life in the Town of Loomis -- the very things our general plan is designed to protect.
- The design increases some elevations of contour significantly, culminating in a retaining wall taller than an ordinary person with a fence on top. While on a suburban scale these impacts are "less than significant" when compared to the local neighboring lots and neighborhoods, they are "more than significant". I have been unable to locate any local lots or developments with significant a contrast in elevations. This grading is excessive.

## Letter 1

- Three street lights exist in the plan. The only street lights in neighboring developments are at main intersections. The new lights would result in light pollution for what is essentially a starry sky, yielding what resembles suburban, not rural, residential development.

I am not opposed to local development. That particular 10 acre lot needs some residential development to make it healthy. However "The Grove" as the vesting plan indicates, is not what we need. We do not need what is essentially a fenced-off, gated community (without the gate) that destroys habitat, eliminates drainage, creates industrial sized (urban) retaining walls abutting the rural zone, and profits the developers at the expense of the community. The plan needs to be more creative and abide by those aspects of planning and ordinance that were side-stepped in the Final IS:

- As evidenced in the principles of the Town of Loomis general plan, "The Grove" requires a lot layout that is "open", not completely fenced and walled off. The existing plan contrasts greatly with local character. Also the density of the lot plans should stick more closely to the intent of the general plan with smaller lots to the center and larger lots to the outside. The proposed plan just creates "slightly larger" lots in general, is very homogenous, and very cookie-cutter suburban with a "mock" rural character. It is very much (exactly) like most, or all, of the recent Rocklin and Roseville suburban developments.
- In keeping with local character, "The Grove" needs to rely on residential home lighting with great consideration for light pollution and eliminate the need for "street lights" that are not controlled by residents themselves.
- The grading plan for "The Grove" needs to be more creative and considerate to existing habitat. The plan needs to preserve some degree of existing wetlands and needs to contour more closely to the natural lay of the land. Yes, this is a challenge, but it is not insurmountable. The shed for the southwest corner could be reduced somewhat without being eliminated. The plan should also include grading more to No Name Lane and Humphrey for much of the development, creating drain improvements instead of simply gathering and storing run-off in a closed system, as might be done in suburban developments.

The Town of Loomis must abide by the intent of the General Plan when reviewing these designs and hold the developers to a standard that exceeds "National" and "State" standards, which should be considered the "low bar" (as evidenced in surrounding communities of Roseville and Rocklin). There is no need to create dissent and controversy around development when some simple and creative ways to address the lot could create a beautiful and enriching development that embodies rather than contrasts with the nature of the Town of Loomis. Such an endeavor would be incontrovertibly upholding the legal requirements AND trust of the Loomis community.

Please contact me directly if any of these perspectives are not clear. I do not believe the developer has properly considered the Loomis community. However, a consensus in this matter is distinctly possible in light of the Town of Loomis General Plan.

With respect and regards,



—Steven D. Harris (916-474-1870)  
5449 Myrtle Dr.  
Loomis, CA 95650

Letter 2

Dear Sirs,

I write to you about concerns regarding the Mandarin Developments on Humphrey road. The concerns brought up by the neighborhood are real. We came off as disgruntled, Mr Mandarin came off as a spoiled child. Not much was resolved. He will build these houses and leave our community, stating the "HOA" will handle that. Not one person said "we do not want these houses built". We asked for respect and our rights to be considered in mutual fairness.

We have concerns with the 400-800 trucks in a two week period. Several people on Myrtle Drive have asthma and other respiratory problems. Please make sure we get at least 5 days notice before trucks and later bulldozers arrive to give people a chance to leave the area or prepare medical needs.

The traffic problem, children walking problem was not resolved. A council member requested 30 minutes before and after school for **RECEIVED**. Will this happen?

APR 13 2017

TOWN OF LOOMIS

Letter 2

At the meeting I requested consideration of a stop sign on Hemptey and the entrance to the "grove". That request was not answered.

The issue of safety for the holding pond to protect children was not answered. A pond is a natural attraction for children. The pond needs fencing

Thank you for your attention.

Also my concern about the elevation of their property and looking into our back yards was answered by Mr Maudarich himself. His question was "Have you looked into their back yards?" I have". Then he remarked "Who would want too".

The point is, He was looking into the back yards



Rachelle J. Byers  
P.O. Box 922  
LOOMIS Ca 95650

Enclose:  
copy page 9, The Grove

4/6/2017

## Letter 2

### Exhibit "A"

#### **The Grove: CEQA Documentation Scope of Work**

---

##### **A. Existing Setting**

The Traffic Assessment will identify the existing transportation setting in the Project area, including current roadway capacities and operating Levels of Service. Data from the Circulation Element Update will be used, and no new traffic counts will be made. The following tasks will be completed:

**Assemble Traffic Count Data** - Relevant information from the Circulation Element Update will be assembled regarding these roadway segments:

1. Humphrey Road from King Road to Arcadia Avenue
2. Humphrey Road from Arcadia Avenue to north Town limits

**Describe Existing Traffic Operations and Safety Deficiencies** - A field review will be conducted to identify any capacity or safety deficiencies that may already exist. Levels of Service will be described based on daily volumes and Circulation Element Update LOS thresholds. Available sight distance at the proposed project access driveways will be investigated.

Current morning and afternoon traffic conditions before and after the school day at H. Clark Powers E.S. will be observed to identify the extent of queuing and short term on-street parking.

**Describe Alternative Transportation Modes** - Current and planned transit operations and facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists will be described.

##### **B. Project Characteristics**

The extent to which the development of the Project may impact the local street system will be determined by identifying potential trips for the construction phase and the operational phase.

During construction activities, the pesticide clean-up phase is anticipated to have the highest number of trips. The removal of 4,000 cubic yards of soil for pesticide remediation is anticipated to result in approximately 400 to 800+ trips, depending on the size of truck used. De Novo will work with the applicant to determine the appropriate assumptions for truck traffic during this phase.

During the operational phase, the number of automobile trips that may be generated by the Project will be estimated through application of trip generation rates presented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publication *Trip Generation Manual, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition*.

The regional distribution of Project primary trips will then be identified based on current travel patterns as well as the location of complimentary land uses.

##### **C. Existing Plus Project Impacts**

**Construction Impacts** - The impacts of the Project during the construction phase will be based on the effect of construction trips on the local roadways. The number of daily trips is not anticipated to be significant, assuming that the soil removal activities are carried out over the course of several weeks. However, the dump truck trips may result in wear and tear on the roadway and could also conflict with school traffic. The analysis of construction impacts will be qualitative and will address the potential for the Project to result in adverse impacts to the physical condition of the roads and for the potential of conflicts with school traffic. beat up the

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

### **Letter 1. Steven D. Harris, March 28, 2017.**

The commenter indicates that there are some concerns not directly addressed in the IS/MND. The commenter states that the project does not comply with the Town of Loomis General Plan and sidelines the local community concerns.

The commenter identifies that the project would double the number of local streetlights, destroy two seasonal wetland watersheds, build a 13-foot retaining/wall fence combination, and grade the site into stand-alone pad separate from local neighborhoods.

The commenter indicates that the initial plans ignored the General Plan and that the MND whitewashed all concerns regarding previously documented General Plans and local community concerns.

The commenter goes on to indicate that the proposed development is a slightly modified version of the urban to suburban transitions common in nearby cities and indicates their belief that the Town of Loomis was created to discourage and disallow this type of development.

The commenter indicates their support for changes to the proposed project to recognize local character, the intent of the law, and the habitat and environment at a sensitive and transitional parcel.

Responses to the comments are provided below and are grouped by topic.

#### Lighting

The commenter indicates that the project would double the number of local streetlights. The project proposes five streetlights, one at the project entry from Humphrey Lane and four lights within the project that would illuminate the internal Grove Circle roadway and sidewalks. The Town requires development projects to minimize offsite light and glare, through implementation of Section 13.30.080 of the Town's Zoning Code, which requires outdoor lighting to be shielded or recessed so that the light source is not visible from off the project site and so that glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site. The Zoning Code also requires outdoor lighting to be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. This comment is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

#### Habitat

The commenter expresses concern for the local wetlands habitat. These comments are noted. Impacts to special-status species and sensitive habitats are addressed in the IS/MND under Section IV. Biological Resources. With implementation of mitigation as discussed in the IS/MND, the Project would not have a significant adverse impact on special-status species or protected habitats. While the Project would change drainage conditions to reduce off-site flooding, these changes would not result in indirect impacts to wetlands (ECORP Consulting, Inc, 2016). In regard to the potential for the Project to affect non-protected species and habitat, this comment is referred to the decision-makers for consideration.

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

### Project Design, Layout, and Character

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) evaluated potential environmental impacts associated with development of the project, including the proposed project design, fencing, etc. The proposed project design, including fencing, is consistent with the type of development and visual character allowed by the Town's land use and planning regulations, including the General Plan and Zoning Code.

The commenter's opinion related to the fenced/walled nature of the Project is noted. The character of the Project, as a small, fenced residential subdivision, is consistent with development types allowed under the RS-10a zoning district. The Project site is not designated Residential Agriculture, Estate Residential, or Rural Residential by the General Plan nor is the project site zoned Residential Agriculture, Estate Residential, or Rural Residential; these more rural designations would result in a more open residential development, with lower or open fences, and larger lots.

The project applicant has submitted a modified site plan that would reduce the height of the retaining walls as much as is feasible, given sanitary sewer and storm drain engineering constraints. At the maximum height, the retaining wall will be reduced to 6 feet, a reduction of 1.5 feet from the approved height of 7.5 feet.

As described in the Response to Comments provided with the March 28, 2017 Planning Commission staff report, while development of the Project would result in visual changes to the area, the change in views and character is consistent with the densities, design, and fencing allowed under the Town's General Plan and zoning regulations would not result in a significant impact pursuant to CEQA. The change of the rural feel of this area is not a significant impact on a recognized aesthetic resource, but may result in psychological and social effects for neighboring residents. This concern is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

### Standards

The commenter indicates that the Town must abide by the intent of the General Plan and hold developers to a standard that exceeds national and state standards and indicated that the MND whitewashed the community concerns. The commenter does not provide any specific details regarding potential conflicts with the standards established by the General Plan or the California Environmental Quality Act. The project has been reviewed for consistency with the Town's standards and requirements established by the General Plan and Zoning Code. An IS/MND was prepared in December 2016 and an Addendum was prepared in April 2017 to address the environmental impacts of the project pursuant to CEQA. This comment is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

Attachment: Stephen Harris letter, January 25, 2017. It is noted that the Town responded to this letter in the Response to Comments attached to the March 28, 2017 Planning Commission staff report for The Grove project.



## The Grove - Response to Comments

### Letter 2. Rochelle J. Byers, April 6, 2017.

The commenter describes their concerns regarding the proposed project and asks for respect and the commenter's and neighborhood's rights to be considered in mutual fairness. The commenter indicated concern that the developer would leave the community once the homes are built and that the "HOA" will handle issues. The commenter's specific concerns are summarized below.

The commenter identifies concerns with the 400 to 800 trucks in a two-week period (the period during which potential soil hazards would be remediated), indicating that several people on Myrtle Drive have respiratory problems and requests at least five days notice before remediation and construction activities.

The commenter indicates that the traffic problem with children walking was not resolved and asks if 30 minutes before and after school for no trucks will happen.

The commenter also requested consideration of a stop sign on Humphrey Road and the entrance to the project.

The commenter indicated that there should be a safety fence for the on-site drainage pond.

The commenter identified a concern about the elevation of the proposed project and people looking into their backyards, referencing Mr. Mandarich's comment regarding looking into backyards.

### Construction Traffic and Air Quality

While the commenter indicated that the removal of soil on the site would generate between 400 and 800 truck trips, these numbers are based on an estimate identified in the initial Scope of Work for the IS/MND and not the traffic analysis for the project. The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by KD Anderson & Associates in November 2016 identified that the removal of approximately 4,580 cubic yards of soil would require 184 truckloads for removal, which would average 18 to 19 inbound and 18 to 19 outbound truck trips per day over a two-week period. The IS/MND identified that the construction traffic, including truck trips associated with soil remediation and project construction, is a potential air quality concern, especially for sensitive receptors. However, as addressed in the IS/MND under Section III. Air Quality, the project would not have any significant impacts related to construction-related emissions. While the total maximum unmitigated project construction emissions were less than significant without mitigation, implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6 is required to ensure that the project does not exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District thresholds of significance.

### Construction Traffic and School Children Safety

The commenter indicates that the project would present risk of traffic hazard to children walking to and from school and requested that no trucks be allowed 30 minutes before and after school. An additional mitigation measure, T-4, has been included in the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration (April 2017) to ensure that conflicts between

## The Grove – Response to Comments

construction traffic and school children are less than significant. Mitigation Measure T-4 is included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and reads as follows:

*“Mitigation Measure T-4: During all site preparation and project construction activities, including implementation of the Removal Action Work Plan, the project applicant shall either:*

- 1) Schedule construction activity to ensure that no construction traffic occurs one-half hour (30 minutes) before or after the start and end of the school day, or*
- 2) Assign personnel at the construction access location(s) to the project site from one-half hour (30 minutes) before and after the start and end of the school day to coordinate construction traffic and ensure that there are no conflicts between construction traffic and pedestrians and bicyclists in the vicinity of the construction access location.”*

### Humphrey Road Stop Sign

As addressed in the IS/MND under Section Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project would not have any significant impacts related to substantially increasing hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. In addition, the project would incorporate street lighting into the design, which would help illuminate nearby sidewalks. The Traffic Impact Assessment indicated that the volume of traffic entering and existing the site is low and would not require a separate left turn lane. While the project would not warrant a stop sign on Humphrey Road, this comment is referred to the decision-makers for consideration.

### Drainage Basin Fencing

The commenter indicates that a drainage basin located on-site is expected to be a hazard to children and indicates that a fence should be placed around this pond. The project proposes a tubular steel fence six feet in height around each storm water detention basin where the basin abuts common or public areas. Where each drainage basin abuts a residential lot, the drainage basin and residential lot will be separated by a six-foot tall wooden fence.

### Backyard Views

The commenter indicates concern that the proposed project will provide views into their backyards. The project proposes a wooden fence six feet in height at the property line of each of the residential parcels. In some cases, the wooden fence will be on top of a retaining wall. The six-foot wooden fence is anticipated to provide the level of privacy typical of a residential subdivision in the RS-10a zone. The commenter’s concern regarding views into their backyards is noted for the decision-makers’ consideration.

### **Planning Commission Comment 1. Mike Carroll. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter voiced concern about the seasonal pond, the effect on the salmon habitat, the proposed fences, and is unhappy about the poisoned plants. The commenter also does not want new project-related street lighting to be installed.

The commenter’s concerns are noted. With regard to fish and wildlife concerns, impacts to special-status species and sensitive habitats are addressed in the IS/MND under Section IV.

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

**Biological Resources.** As discussed in the IS/MND, the project would not have a significant adverse impact on special-status species or protected habitats. The Wetland Delineation (ECORP, 2016) prepared for the project did not identify the wetlands on the project site as 'stream', so the permanent fill of these impacts would not have an impact on fish species that require a year-round stream. Storm water discharge from the project site would be treated for water quality, consistent with the requirements of the Town and the West Placer County Storm Water Quality Control Manual. Compliance with these storm water requirements will ensure that the project does not have a significant impact on water quality associated with storm water discharge from the project site.

The commenter's concern about poisoned plants, which the project applicant indicated was associated with standard weed abatement on the project site at the March 28, 2017 Planning Commission public hearing, is noted for the decision-makers consideration.

### **Project Fencing**

The commenter indicated concern with the proposed fence heights. It is noted that the project has been revised to change the drainage plan so that storm water will continue to be discharged from the three existing discharge points on the project site. As a result of this change, the height of the retaining walls was reduced and the maximum height was reduced by 1.5 feet to six feet.

Under CEQA, the threshold of significance considers whether the Project will affect the environment of persons in general, not whether the Project will affect particular persons. The fences would not characterize the visual environment of the Project site or its vicinity and would have a minimal effect on the overall environment. While development of the Project would result in visual changes to the area, the change in views and character is consistent with the densities, design, and fencing allowed under the Town's General Plan and zoning regulations would not result in a significant impact pursuant to CEQA. This concern is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

### **Lighting**

The commenter indicated concern with the lighting associated with the project. As was previously noted, the project site is not designated for rural residential uses by the General Plan or Zoning Code. The project proposes five streetlights, one at the project entry from Humphrey Lane and four lights within the project that would illuminate the internal Grove Circle roadway and sidewalks and exterior lighting would be associated with the proposed residential uses. The Town requires development projects to minimize offsite light and glare, through implementation of Section 13.30.080 of the Town's Zoning Code, which requires outdoor lighting to be shielded or recessed so that the light source is not visible from off the project site and so that glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site. The Zoning Code also requires outdoor lighting to be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. The Town's infrastructure standards establish the type of pole, pole height, light housing, and type of light to be used for all streetlights. The Grove proposes street lights that are consistent with the Town's standards, with the exception of requesting to use light-emitting diode (LED) rather than high pressure sodium lights for improved energy

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

efficiency. The project would be consistent with the Town’s requirements, including the requirement to shield light to reduce offsite lighting and glare, including nighttime glare, and would not have a significant effect on nighttime lighting conditions. The commenter’s concern regarding lighting is noted for the decision-makers’ consideration.

### **Planning Commission Comment 2. Bell Wenzell. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter voiced concern about site drainage, does not think the drainage plan is complete, and would like the project to be continued at a later date, until the drainage plan is in place.

A complete Preliminary Storm Drainage Report (Meredith Engineering, 2017) has been prepared for the project pursuant to Town standards and requirements. Following the Planning Commission hearing, the project applicant revised the site plan and grading plan (see Figures 1 and 2 of the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration) to change the proposed drainage pattern. The revised project will drain to three discharge areas; these are the same locations where the project site currently discharges storm water. The project now proposes to drain 3.9 acres to a basin at the northwest corner and then discharged to No Name Road. 3.7 acres will be collected and routed to a basin at the southeast corner and then discharged to a ditch along Humphrey Road. 1.4 acres will be collected and discharged at the southwest corner. The change to the drainage pattern will reduce the land area of the project site that drains to No Name Road, as described in the Addendum. An updated Preliminary Storm Drainage Report was prepared to analyze the revised drainage plan. As described in the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration, under both 10- and 100-year conditions, drainage from the project site would be less than current conditions. The two storm water detention basins are sized to accommodate storm waters associated with a 100-year flood event, which is consistent with applicable Town requirements. The proposed detention basins have been evaluated and sized using the County’s depth/duration design charts that have been created using historical rainfall data and are designed to hold up to the volume of storm water from a 100-year storm event while limiting the flows discharged to less than existing conditions.

Additionally, the commenter is referred to the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual, which states that the “the downstream property owner is obligated to accept and make provision for those waters which are the natural flow from the land above and allows for the reasonable increase in drainage runoff by paving or construction of other impervious surfaces.” The proposed project would result in a decrease in flows compared to the existing flows from the project site.

### **Planning Commission Comment 3. Jim Martin. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter stated concern about drainage, and voiced concern about the fencing and the detention pond.

The commenter is referred to the response to Planning Commission Comment 2 (Bell Wenzel) regarding drainage. As described in the response to Letter 2 (Rochelle J. Byers), the project proposes a six-foot tall tubular steel fence where each drainage basin abuts

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

public or common areas. Where each drainage basin abuts a residential lot, the drainage basin and residential lot will be separated by a six-foot tall wooden fence.

### **Planning Commission Comment 4. Steve Harris. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter stated concern about drainage and is concerned that wildlife would be negatively affected by the project. He also stated concern that he does not like that the property has a “gated” feeling. He is also concerned that due diligence has not been completed.

The commenter’s concerns are noted. With regard to wildlife concerns, impacts to wildlife, including special-status species and sensitive habitats, are addressed in the IS/MND under Section IV. Biological Resources. The project would not have a significant adverse impact on special-status species or protected habitats. The commenter’s concerns regarding wildlife are noted for the decision-makers’ consideration.

Regarding the gated feeling of the project, the commenter is referred to the Project Design, Layout, and Character discussion under response to Letter 1 (Steven D. Harris) and the Project Fencing discussion under response to Planning Commission Comment 1 (Mike Carroll). As described in responses to previous commenters, the change in views and character is consistent with the densities, design, and fencing allowed under the Town’s General Plan and zoning regulations would not result in a significant impact pursuant to CEQA. The commenter’s concerns are noted for the decision-makers’ consideration.

The commenters concern that due diligence has not been completed is noted for the decision-makers’ consideration.

### **Planning Commission Comment 5. Bob Martin. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter stated that there are drainage issues and identified concern about the potential effect on No Name Lane. The commenter voiced concern about the maintenance plan for the detention pond. He also asked about appeal and lawsuit procedures.

The commenter’s concerns are noted. As described in the response to Planning Commission Comment 2 (Bell Wenzel), the project has been redesigned to direct storm water flows to three separate basins so that discharge will continue to occur at the three existing discharge points on the project site rather all drainage being collected and conveyed to a single detention basin then released to No Name Lane. The drainage plan and facilities proposed for the project site are designed to reduce discharge to levels less than currently existing conditions. The project has been redesigned to direct storm water flows to three separate basins so that discharge will continue to occur at the three existing discharge points on the project site. The two detention basins have been evaluated and sized using the County’s depth/duration design charts that have been created using historical rainfall data and are designed to hold up to the volume of storm water from a 100-year storm event while limiting the flows discharged to less than existing conditions. The drainage plan and detention basin sizing has been reviewed by the Town Engineer for conformance to the Town and County drainage requirements.

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

The proposed project has also been reconfigured to reduce the project area draining to No Name Road. The previous proposal collected the onsite drainage from 9.0 acres and conveyed it to a detention basin at the northwest corner which then discharged to No Name Road. The proposed drainage for the project would now be distributed to three discharge locations to match the existing drainage discharge points of the property. The project now proposes to drain 3.9 acres to a basin at the Northwest Corner and then discharged to No Name Road. 3.7 acres would be collected and routed to a basin at the southeast corner and then discharged to a ditch along Humphrey Road. 1.4 acres would be collected and discharged at the southwest corner.

Maintenance of the detention basins is addressed through compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Requirements (NPDES) and the Town has required that the project comply with Mitigation Measure HWQ-4 (described in the IS/MND), which requires the project applicant to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), in accordance with NPDES and West Placer Storm Water Quality Design Manual requirements. The SWMP is required to include a maintenance program for the structural storm drain system, which includes the storm drains and detention basin. All of the mitigation measures are adopted as conditions of approval for the project and the Town is responsible for the monitoring the project's compliance with the measures, including long-term requirements for the stormwater detention basin maintenance.

A response to the concern regarding appeal and lawsuit procedures was provided at the Planning Commission hearing.

### **Planning Commission Comment 6. Debbie Clark. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter voiced concern about the detention pond plan.

The commenter's concern is noted. The commenter is referred to the responses to Planning Commission Comments 2 (Bell Wenzel) and 5 (Bob Martin) for a full response to this concern.

### **Planning Commission Comment 7. Jacob Harris. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter agreed with previous comments, indicated that they did not like the proposed entrance sign, stating that it is out of place in the community. The commenter is also concerned about the project's potential to reduce nearby real estate price values, the impact on schools, and is concerned about the potential failure if the detention pond fails, or No Name Lane floods.

The commenter's opinion regarding the proposed entrance sign is noted for the decision-makers' consideration. The commenter is referred to the Project Design, Layout, and Character discussion under response to Letter 1 (Steven D. Harris)

With regard to the commenter's concern about the potential for the detention pond to fail, and the potential impact on No Name Lane, the commenter is referred to the responses to Planning Commission Comments 2 (Bell Wenzel) and 5 (Bob Martin) for a full response to this concern. As stated in the referenced responses, the detention basins have been

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

designed to accommodate a 100-year flood event, consistent with Town requirements, and has been designed in accordance with applicable Town and County data and requirements. The Town has measures in place, as previously described, to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the detention basins.

With regard to the commenter's concern about the potential for a reduction in nearby home price values, this concern does not address any significant environmental issues or project issues and is noted for the decision-maker's consideration.

### **Planning Commission Comment 8. Rochelle Byers. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter stated that a stop sign should be installed at the entrance to the development. The commenter is concerned that elevated homes could encroach upon the privacy of neighbors. The commenter is also concerned about the fences, and the maintenance of the space between the old fencing and the new fencing.

The commenter is referred to the response to Letter 2 (Rochelle Byers) which addresses concerns regarding the stop sign and privacy (views from the proposed homes into adjoining yards).

Regarding the maintenance of the space between the old fencing and new fencing where a single fence would not be shared by adjacent lots, each parcel owner is responsible for maintaining their property. This concern is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

### **Planning Commission Comment 9. Jim Gilbert. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter asked about a possible spillway alternative to address some of the drainage issues so that a portion of the water is retained in the nature area, eliminating the loss of wildlife due to stream drying up.

The commenter's recommendation is noted. As described in the Addendum and under the response to Planning Commission Comment 2 (Bell Wenzell), the project has been redesigned so that storm water discharge will continue to occur at all three points where there is discharge under existing conditions. Regarding the 'stream' drying up and wildlife impacts, the commenter is also referred to the Habitat discussion under the response to Letter 1 (Steven D. Harris). This comment is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

### **Planning Commission Comment 10. Becky Lunders. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter states that she likes the open space that the site presently offers. The commenter was not happy that pesticides were previously used at the site. The commenter thinks that the project has a "gated" community feel, which is not how the commenter envisions Loomis. The commenter would like to see the maintenance plan clearly defined. The commenter also voices concern about dust on No Name Lane. The commenter wants to make sure that the developer does not use neighboring properties as staging areas during the construction process.

The commenter's concern regarding pesticide use is noted; the applicant indicated at the public hearing that pre-emergent weed control had been ap

## **The Grove – Response to Comments**

The commenter's comment regarding the potential use of neighboring properties during the construction process is noted. The commenter is referred to Mitigation Measure HWQ-2 of the MND, which prescribes Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented during construction activities. One of the BMPs describes that 'Streets adjacent to each construction and demolition site shall be kept clean of project dirt, mud, materials, and debris during the construction and demolition periods.' Therefore, nearby streets would be shielded from project construction activities. The developer would also be required to comply with the Town of Loomis Municipal Code, including all ordinances related to protecting neighboring properties from construction activities.

With regard to the comment regarding the "gated" community feel, under CEQA, the threshold of significance considers whether the Project will affect the environment of persons in general, not whether the Project will affect particular persons. The "gated" community feel of the project would have a minimal effect on the overall environment. While development of the Project would result in visual changes to the area, the change in views and character is consistent with the densities, design, and fencing allowed under the Town's General Plan and zoning regulations would not result in a significant impact pursuant to CEQA. This concern is noted for the decision-makers' consideration.

The comment regarding the desire to see the maintenance plan clearly defined is noted. This comment is referred to the decision-makers' consideration.

With regard to concerns about dust on No Name Lane, the commenter is referred to Section III. Air Quality of the MND. With implementation of all mitigation, no significant impacts to air quality were identified in the MND, including concerns about dust. Dust along No Name Lane would remain limited, and would not exceed the applicable Placer County Air Pollution Control District thresholds.

### **Planning Commission Comment 11. Tim Jones. March 28, 2017.**

The commenter voiced concern about the detention pond, drainage issues, and wildlife.

The storm drainage system is designed to comply with Town of Loomis Land Development and Construction Standards, the Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's Storm Water Management Manual and Placer County's Land Design Manual. With regard to wildlife concerns, impacts to special-status species and sensitive habitats are addressed in the IS/MND under Section IV. Biological Resources. The Project would not have a significant adverse impact on special-status species or protected habitats.