Maywan Krach

From: Debbi Carr [debbi.carr@ekriley.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 12:21 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Our VOTE IS NO On the PENRYN ORCHARD PROJECT

To: The Placer County Planning Commission & The Board of Supervisors

From: Andrew and Jodie Radakovitz
7605 Granite Hill Lane
Penryn, Ca 95663

Re: Vote to NOT APPROVE the Orchard at Penryn Project(PEIR 20070521)

I would like to raise a couple pertinent points that were not raised during the Penryn Mac meeting last week that I believe directly impact the community of Penryn if this project were to go through as currently planned.

Number one, the fire department has mandated a one way exit egress onto Taylor Road. This is a serious problem. The road where the new 200 - 250 cars would be nosing out onto Taylor Rd. each day(this is conservatively low) is directly preceded by a blind curve. Also, the same northeast bound cars tend to pick up speed at precisely the point where these same cars would theoretically exit onto Taylor Road as they attempt to climb a large hill rising up before them.

This is an accident scene waiting to happen. I cannot believe the very young lady who did the EIR failed to mention this extremely obvious hazard that anyone can see if they were to drive the road for themselves. I would appeal to all of you before you make your final decision to at least see exactly where these cars would be exiting onto Taylor Road and then drive the road for yourselves. I have and do everyday. You will find that the planning has been absent to derelict on this point and I cannot see how the county and the planning department in particular would not be directly responsible for the serious injuries that will result from such reckless disregard.

I found the comments from the young woman who did the traffic portion of the EIR to be insulting if not naive as she only focused on an irrelevant Loomis intersection a few miles away. Does she not know the area? Obviously not. This was a jouvenile attempt at an EIR study to 'put one over' on the community. The Penryn Road widening is not the issue either. While certainly problematic, it is nowhere near the death trap that is Taylor Road. It should also be mentioned that while weekend Harley riders as well as cyclists converge on these roads, a high density project like this will create further hazards and put life at risk. Please consider these points and do not just look at increasing the net tax base.

Also, the Penryn onramp to interstate 80(Westbound) is the shortest one in the county. As cars begin making their morning.commutes, the new high density project will create a 'stacking' phenomenon onto the highway. It is already a problem, but it will become much worse as cars have to avoid the newcomers on short notice. A seamless wall of new vehicles will now hit the freeway simultaneously without gaps and no staggering during the morning commute. The left turn lane prior to entering the freeway is also not long enough to handle the cars idling at the light.

Finally, I would submit that the plan in its current form is just too dense. I understand the letter of the law, but that letter was modified not too long ago regarding 'multi-familly'. Look it up. The area in question was to be used for community retail. It directly conflicts with **the spirit of the law which resides within the Community Plan** which specifically forbids 'high density' residential. So then, which is it? Who is right? Authors of the Community Plan were in attendance at the Mac meeting. They are living witnesses against this project as they were the original community plan publishers.

Give Placer County residents a choice. We moved to Penryn so that we wouldn't become a hybrid community like Orangevale which has the worst planning I've ever seen. Is Orangevale rural or not? Who knows. Who can tell? It is evidence of poor planning, bad judgment and transitional planning supervisors which leaves a community in zoning chaos in both look and feel. I do not want Penryn to become something similarly ruinous and another victim of short sightedness. The look and fit and feel are important. They are also clearly laid out in the Community Plan and the language is very clear and direct. Please read it and become acquainted with it before making your decision for it is the governing document. It is also the spirit of the community. If you do not live in the area in question. Drive it before voting. See the problems on Taylor Road for yourselves. Those accidents, injuries and deaths were forecast and written about here first. Let's not make them come to pass by introducing a traffic quagmire that would have been avoided if only planning took the time to study the issue better.

Thank you for your time.

28 year Penryn Residents
7610 Logan Lane

Debbi and Bill Carr

Please vote "No"

Debbi Carr
Investment Representative
Assistant to Lee Handley
E.K. RILEY INVESTMENTS, LLC
800.485-0319 *national*
916.787.0530 *direct*
916.787-0533 *facsimile*
www.ekriley.com

This email may be privileged and/or confidential. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by anyone other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you receive this email in error, please contact the sender. Email sent to or from this system is subject to review by supervisory personnel, is retained and may be produced to regulatory authorities or others with a legal right to the information. Information has been obtained from sources believed reliable, but the company does not represent this is accurate or complete, and it should not be relied upon as such. Information contained in this communication is not considered an official record of your account and does not supersede normal trade confirmations or statements. Do not send the following by email: buy, sell or cancel orders, or any instructions that would require your signature.

Sent: Friday, February 3, 2012 10:32 AM
Subject: Vote NO to Orchard In Penryn Project

Send your email to cdraecs@placer.ca.gov if you agree

Here's my points as a Penryn resident.

To: The Placer County Planning Commission & The Board of Supervisors

From: Andrew and Jodie Radakovitz
7605 Granite Hill Lane
Penryn, Ca 95663

Re: Vote to NOT APPROVE the Orchard at Penryn Project(PEIR 20070521)

I would like to raise a couple pertinent points that were not raised during the Penryn Mac meeting last week that I believe directly impact the community of Penryn if this project were to go through as currently planned.

Number one, the fire department has mandated a one way exit egress onto Taylor Road. This is a serious problem. The road where the new 200 - 250 cars would be nosing out onto Taylor Rd. each day(this is conservatively low) is directly preceded by a blind curve. Also, the same northeast bound cars tend to pick up speed at precisely the point where these same cars would theoretically exit onto Taylor Road as they attempt to climb a large hill rising up before them.

This is an accident scene waiting to happen. I cannot believe the very young lady who did the EIR failed to mention this extremely obvious hazard that anyone can see if they were to drive the road for themselves. I would appeal to all of you before you make your final decision to at least see exactly where these cars would be exiting onto Taylor Road and then drive the road for yourselves. I have and do everyday. You will find that the planning has been absent to derelict on this point and I cannot see how the county and the planning department in particular would not be directly responsible for the serious injuries that will result from such reckless disregard.

I found the comments from the young woman who did the traffic portion of the EIR to be insulting if not naive as she only focused on an irrelevant Loomis intersection a few miles away. Does she not know the area? Obviously not. This was a jouvenile attempt at an EIR study to 'put one over' on the community. The Penryn Road widening is not the issue either. While certainly problematic, it is nowhere near the death trap that is Taylor Road. It should also be mentioned that while weekend Harley riders as well as cyclists converge on these roads, a high density project like this will create further hazards and put life at risk. Please consider these points and do not just look at increasing the net tax base.

Also, the Penryn onramp to interstate 80(Westbound) is the shortest one in the county. As cars begin making their morning commutes, the new high density project will create a 'stacking' phenomenon onto the highway. It is already a problem, but it will become much worse as cars have to avoid the newcomers on short notice. A seamless wall of new vehicles will now hit the freeway simultaneously without gaps and no staggering during the morning commute. The left turn lane prior to entering the freeway is also not long enough to handle the cars idling at the light.

Finally, I would submit that the plan in its current form is just too dense. I understand the letter of the law, but that letter was modified not too long ago regarding 'multi-familly'. Look it up. The area in question was to be used for community retail. It directly conflicts with **the spirit of the law which resides within the Community Plan** which specifically forbids 'high density' residential. So then, which is it? Who is right? Authors of the Community Plan were in attendance at the Mac meeting. They are living witnesses against this project as they were the original community plan publishers.

Give Placer County residents a choice. We moved to Penryn so that we wouldn't become a hybrid community like Orangevale which has the worst planning I've ever seen. Is Orangevale rural or not? Who knows. Who can tell? It is evidence of poor planning, bad judgment and transitional planning supervisors which leaves a community in zoning chaos in both look and feel. I do not want Penryn to become something similarly ruinous and another victim of short sightedness. The look and fit and feel are important. They are also clearly laid out in the Community Plan and the language is very clear and direct. Please read it and become acquainted with it before making your decision for it is the governing document. It is also the spirit of the community. If you do not live in the area in question. Drive it before voting. See the problems on Taylor Road for yourselves. Those accidents, injuries and deaths were forecast and written about here first. Let's not make them come to pass by introducing a traffic quagmire that would have been avoided if only planning took the time to study the issue better.

Thank you for your time.

Andrew Radakovitz

Maywan Krach

From: Bob and Karen Clifford [haciendabk@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 10:45 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Orchard in Penryn ca

We vote no to this project
Robert and Karen Clifford
7665 granite hill lane Penryn Ca

Follow your bliss.....

Maywan Krach

From: Sandy Delehanty [sandydelehanty@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 1:53 PM
To: Mr. Bungles; jdzakowi@placer.ca.gov; chamdavis@yahoo.com
Cc: signeadcock@sbcglobal.net; philip_barger@hotmail.com; fordmandillo@sbcglobal.net; c.gragg@sbcglobal.net; bethfm@sbcglobal.net; clgragg@sbcglobal.net; joanhess4 @sbcglobal.net; oversizecows@yahoo.com; wes2laurie@sbcglobal.net; gordonandjudyrobbins@hotmail.com; mcsasko@hotmail.com; michael.c.sasko@pfizer.com; bbspurgeon@earthlink.net; caroljim@jps.net; penrynca@jps.net; dkangel58@sbcglobal.net; ariettafrank@aol.com; kareng@ncbb.net; johdot@sbcglobal.net; mastermachine@ncbb.net; bay@taxea.com; debbiccc@yahoo.com; gcheris@gmail.com; penrynpalms@sbcglobal.net; penryn@inreach.com; haciendabk@sbcglobal.net; gilbert_c2002@yahoo.com; daneedavis@yahoo.com; delnofamily@aol.com; joo2dee2@yahoo.com; ejehmann@sbcglobal.net; gollum@ncbb.net; ea_gibson@juno.com; leegranlund@hotmail.com; rhondagresko@peoplepc.com; heather3397@aol.com; cindyanddavid@sbcglobal.net; rhirota@pacbell.net; cseanj2000@yahoo.com; scott@jordanfamilyfarms.com; ckennedy@vfr.net; ksmack@mstar.net; margemarjorie@sbcglobal.net; markperez59@yahoo.com; artndeb@rcsis.com; guy.c.rand@boeing.com; hllnbak@foothill.net; schmit@hughes.net; mschmit@lexusofroseville.net; vince@gomortgagefirst.com; sslava@pacbell.net; strongroof@aol.com; ttravnikar@ncbb.net; hktanson@infostations.com; dtoderean@ozarkinc.com; tammy.toderean@kp.org; myocho@earthlink.net; lvrshaide@msn.com; jdwlandscape17@yahoo.com; Maywan Krach; arass@pacbell.net
Subject: Re: Vote NO to Orchard In Penryn Project

As a 20 year plus resident of Boulder Creek Estates, Penryn I can tell you that Andrew Radakovitz knows what he is talking about when he sites the traffic hazards on Penryn Road and Taylor road. Our son had a close call riding his bike around that blind turn in 1992 and nothing has changed sense. People still bicycle on these roads, cars still speed and the turn is still blind.

As for the obvious ignoring of the language in the Community Plan you should be ashamed to even be considering doing so. We are the same people after all that fought for years to stop Thunder Valley Casino from being built in our community so why are we being attacked by poor planning again. We have had it!

Please vote no on Orchard At Penryn Project PEIR 20070521

Sandra Delehanty
8041 Boulder Creek Road
Penryn, CA 95662

To: jdzakowi@placer.ca.gov; chamdavis@yahoo.com
Cc: signeadcock@sbcglobal.net; philip_barger@hotmail.com; fordmandillo@sbcglobal.net; c.gragg@sbcglobal.net; bethfm@sbcglobal.net; clgragg@sbcglobal.net; joanhess4@sbcglobal.net; oversizecows@yahoo.com; wes2laurie@sbcglobal.net; gordonandjudyrobbins@hotmail.com; mcsasko@hotmail.com; michael.c.sasko@pfizer.com; bbspurgeon@earthlink.net; caroljim@jps.net; penrynca@jps.net; dkangel58@sbcglobal.net; ariettafrank@aol.com; kareng@ncbb.net; johdot@sbcglobal.net; mastermachine@ncbb.net; bay@taxea.com; debbiccc@yahoo.com; gcheris@gmail.com; penrynpalms@sbcglobal.net; penryn@inreach.com; haciendabk@sbcglobal.net; gilbert_c2002@yahoo.com; daneedavis@yahoo.com; sandydelehanty@yahoo.com; delnofamily@aol.com; joo2dee2@yahoo.com; ejehmann@sbcglobal.net; gollum@ncbb.net; ea_gibson@juno.com; leegranlund@hotmail.com; rhondagresko@peoplepc.com; heather3397@aol.com; cindyanddavid@sbcglobal.net; rhirota@pacbell.net; cseanj2000@yahoo.com; scott@jordanfamilyfarms.com; ckennedy@vfr.net; ksmack@mstar.net; margemarjorie@sbcglobal.net; markperez59@yahoo.com; artndeb@rcsis.com; guy.c.rand@boeing.com; hllnbak@foothill.net; schmit@hughes.net; mschmit@lexusofroseville.net; vince@gomortgagefirst.com; sslava@pacbell.net; strongroof@aol.com; ttravnikar@ncbb.net; hktanson@infostations.com; dtoderean@ozarkinc.com; tammy.toderean@kp.org; myocho@earthlink.net; lvrshaide@msn.com; jdwlandscape17@yahoo.com; mkrach@placer.ca.gov; arass@pacbell.net

Maywan Krach

From: GARY HESS [joanhess4@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 11:00 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Proposed high density housing

I respectfully request that more thought be put into the impact high density housing would have on our little town of Penryn. It's not a question of revenue; it's about quality of life for those already residing here. Traffic would be horrendous no matter what measures are taken.

Joan Hess
2351 Brashear Lane
Penryn, CA 95663

Maywan Krach

From: Mr. Bungles [drewrad@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 10:23 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: drewrad@hotmail.com; drew@dimple.com
Subject: Protest Letter re the Orchard at Penryn Project

To: The Placer County Planning Commission & The Board of Supervisors

From: Andrew and Jodie Radakovitz
7605 Granite Hill Lane
Penryn, Ca 95663

Re: Vote to NOT APPROVE the Orchard at Penryn Project(PEIR 20070521)

I would like to raise a couple pertinent points that were not raised during the Penryn Mac meeting last week that I believe directly impact the community of Penryn if this project were to go through as currently planned.

Number one, the fire department has mandated a one way exit egress onto Taylor Road. This is a serious problem. The road where the new 200 - 250 cars would be nosing out onto Taylor Rd. each day(this is conservatively low) is directly preceded by a blind curve. Also, the same northeast bound cars tend to pick up speed at precisely the point where these same cars would theoretically exit onto Taylor Road as they attempt to climb a large hill rising up before them.

This is an accident scene waiting to happen. I cannot believe the very young lady who did the EIR failed to mention this extremely obvious hazard that anyone can see if they were to drive the road for themselves. I would appeal to all of you before you make your final decision to at least see exactly where these cars would be exiting onto Taylor Road and then drive the road for yourselves. I have and do everyday. You will find that the planning has been absent to derelict on this point and I cannot see how the county and the planning department in particular would not be directly responsible for the serious injuries that will result from such reckless disregard.

I found the comments from the young woman who did the traffic portion of the EIR to be insulting if not naive as she only focused on an irrelevant Loomis intersection a few miles away. Does she not know the area? Obviously not. This was a jouvenile attempt at an EIR study to 'put one over' on the community. The Penryn Road widening is not the issue either. While certainly problematic, it is nowhere near the death trap that is Taylor Road. It should also be mentioned that while weekend Harley riders as well as cyclists converge on these roads, a high density project like this will create further hazards and put life at risk. Please consider these points and do not just look at increasing the net tax base.

Also, the Penryn onramp to interstate 80(Westbound) is the shortest one in the county. As cars begin making their morning commutes, the new high density project will create a 'stacking' phenomenon onto the highway. It is already a problem, but it will become much worse as cars have to avoid the newcomers on short notice. A seamless wall of new vehicles will now hit the freeway simultaneously without gaps and no staggering during the morning commute. The left turn lane prior to entering the freeway is also not long enough to handle the cars idling at the light.

Finally, I would submit that the plan in its current form is just too dense. I understand the letter of the law, but that letter was modified not too long ago regarding 'multi-familly'. Look it up. The area in question was to be used for community retail. It directly conflicts with **the spirit of the law which resides within the Community Plan** which specifically forbids 'high density' residential. So then, which is it? Who is right? Authors of the Community Plan were in attendance at the Mac meeting. They are living witnesses against this project as they were the original community plan publishers.

Give Placer County residents a choice. We moved to Penryn so that we wouldn't become a hybrid community like Orangevale which has the worst planning I've ever seen. Is Orangevale rural or not? Who knows. Who can tell? It is evidence of poor planning, bad judgment and transitional planning supervisors which leaves a community in zoning chaos

in both look and feel. I do not want Penryn to become something similarly ruinous and another victim of short sightedness. The look and fit and feel are important. They are also clearly laid out in the Community Plan and the language is very clear and direct. Please read it and become acquainted with it before making your decision for it is the governing document. It is also the spirit of the community. If you do not live in the area in question. Drive it before voting. See the problems on Taylor Road for yourselves. Those accidents, injuries and deaths were forecast and written about here first. Let's not make them come to pass by introducing a traffic quagmire that would have been avoided if only planning took the time to study the issue better.

Thank you for your time.

Andrew Radakovitz

Maywan Krach

From: Todd Wilson [todd@oien-wilson.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 10:56 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Vote to NOT APPROVE the Orchard at Penryn Project(PEIR 20070521)

To: The Placer County Planning Commission & The Board of Supervisors

From: Richard Todd Wilson
3563 Val Verde Rd
Loomis, CA 95650

Re: Vote to NOT APPROVE the Orchard at Penryn Project(PEIR 20070521)

I definitely agree with the entire statement below from Mr. Radakovitz. I drive past the proposed development site and intersections several times per day on the way to Penryn Elementary School, which my two children attend. I'm concerned about the additional time and safety hazard that the incrased traffic resulting from the proposed development would create.

Sincerely,

Todd Wilson

To: The Placer County Planning Commission & The Board of Supervisors

From: Andrew and Jodie Radakovitz
7605 Granite Hill Lane
Penryn, Ca 95663

Re: Vote to NOT APPROVE the Orchard at Penryn Project(PEIR 20070521)

I would like to raise a couple pertinent points that were not raised during the Penryn Mac meeting last week that I believe directly impact the community of Penryn if this project were to go through as currently planned.

Number one, the fire department has mandated a one way exit egress onto Taylor Road. This is a serious problem. The road where the new 200 - 250 cars would be nosing out onto Taylor Rd. each day(this is conservatively low) is directly preceded by a blind curve. Also, the same northeast bound cars tend to pick up speed at precisely the point where these same cars would theoretically exit onto Taylor Road as they attempt to climb a large hill rising up before them.

This is an accident scene waiting to happen. I cannot believe the very young lady who did the EIR failed to mention this extremely obvious hazard that anyone can see if they were to drive the road for themselves. I would appeal to all of you before you make your final decision to at least see exactly where these cars would be

exiting onto Taylor Road and then drive the road for yourselves. I have and do everyday. You will find that the planning has been absent to derelict on this point and I cannot see how the county and the planning department in particular would not be directly responsible for the serious injuries that will result from such reckless disregard.

I found the comments from the young woman who did the traffic portion of the EIR to be insulting if not naive as she only focused on an irrelevant Loomis intersection a few miles away. Does she not know the area? Obviously not. This was a jouvenile attempt at an EIR study to 'put one over' on the community. The Penryn Road widening is not the issue either. While certainly problematic, it is nowhere near the death trap that is Taylor Road. It should also be mentioned that while weekend Harley riders as well as cyclists converge on these roads, a high density project like this will create further hazards and put life at risk. Please consider these points and do not just look at increasing the net tax base.

Also, the Penryn onramp to interstate 80(Westbound) is the shortest one in the county. As cars begin making their morning commutes, the new high density project will create a 'stacking' phenomenon onto the highway. It is already a problem, but it will become much worse as cars have to avoid the newcomers on short notice. A seamless wall of new vehicles will now hit the freeway simultaneously without gaps and no staggering during the morning commute. The left turn lane prior to entering the freeway is also not long enough to handle the cars idling at the light.

Finally, I would submit that the plan in its current form is just too dense. I understand the letter of the law, but that letter was modified not too long ago regarding 'multi-familly'. Look it up. The area in question was to be used for community retail. It directly conflicts with **the spirit of the law which resides within the Community Plan** which specifically forbids 'high density' residential. So then, which is it? Who is right? Authors of the Community Plan were in attendance at the Mac meeting. They are living witnesses against this project as they were the original community plan publishers.

Give Placer County residents a choice. We moved to Penryn so that we wouldn't become a hybrid community like Orangevale which has the worst planning I've ever seen. Is Orangevale rural or not? Who knows. Who can tell? It is evidence of poor planning, bad judgment and transitional planning supervisors which leaves a community in zoning chaos in both look and feel. I do not want Penryn to become something similarly ruinous and another victim of short sightedness. The look and fit and feel are important. They are also clearly laid out in the Community Plan and the language is very clear and direct. Please read it and become acquainted with it before making your decision for it is the governing document. It is also the spirit of the community. If you do not live in the area in question. Drive it before voting. See the problems on Taylor Road for yourselves. Those accidents, injuries and deaths were forecast and written about here first. Let's not make them come to pass by introducing a traffic quagmire that would have been avoided if only planning took the time to study the issue better.

Thank you for your time.

Andrew Radakoviz

From: Maywan Krach
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2012 8:14 AM
To: EJ Ivaldi
Subject: FW: the Orchards at Penryn

FYI

Thanks,
Maywan
530-745-3132

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark Davis [mailto:mdavisjr_trae@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 07, 2012 10:37 AM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: the Orchards at Penryn

To Maywan Krach,
As a property owner in Penryn I wish to express my extreme disapproval of the Orchards in Penryn apartment proposal. My family has lived in Penryn for over 40 years (my brothers and I growing up here) and my husband and I have lived on our property in Penryn for over 11 years. As with all other Penryn property owners, we made the decision to move here to live the country life with the full understanding from county ordinances that population increases would happen around existing cities and that rural would be kept rural. It was never with the understanding that the county would change the rules to suite specific developers, county employees, supervisors, etc. The argument will be made by county officials that the developer in question has spent a huge amount of money on the project so we really can't stop now. My counter to that is that we, as individual property owners, have also spent a huge amount of money to live in Penryn and when you add up all money spent by all individual property owners it will far exceed the amount spent by the developers. In addition, we live, spend, vote, etc. here. This is our home. The developers will build, move on, and leave the mess that apartments will ultimately bring (traffic, pollution, vandalism, crime, problem children in our country schools, use of county resources such as fire, police, etc.). In addition, the people that may live in these apartments will not be finding work in Penryn but will be commuting to cities where there are already an abundance of apartment buildings.

Please work to stop this ridiculous proposal!
Please forward this email to EJ.

Thank you,
Cynthia Davis
Penryn property owner

From: Jerald Starkey [jerclaudstarkey@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 9:35 AM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: Orchard at Penryn --- 150 apartments proposal

Dear Ms. Heckert,

I am attaching a copy of the letter I sent Supervisor Jim Holmes. It reflects my considered opinion AGAINST the proposed apartments in Penryn. Please include this letter with other comments on this wrongheaded "Orchards" proposed project. The project should be denied.

7175 Allen Lane

Penryn, California 95663

May 18, 2012

Supervisor Jim Holmes

175 Fulweiler Aveue

Auburn, California 95603

Subject: Orchard at Penryn

Dear Jim,

I was talking with another Penryn resident, Greg, a few days back, and he told me that he had had a meeting with you about the Orchards project. Greg said you told him that you [or perhaps Placer County] had been talking with the developers about trying to get some

extra "benefits" to the area from the project. We are not looking for benefits. We want less renters, we want no apartments.

Jim, "benefits" are not what the residents of Penryn want. We want a MUCH smaller project or no project at all. Surely the impact of that Penryn MAC meeting could not have been lost on you. Every single speaker was against the project. No one from the audience stood to defend the project. No one even from the development team stood to defend the project. **The entire Penryn MAC voted against the project.** Now that was a profound statement. In the more than twelve years of attending MAC meetings, I have never seen a project voted down unanimously by the MAC members. Even the Bickford project had its defenders.

Building 150 apartments in a small, rural community is completely inappropriate and wrong. The developers are being willfully blind and ignoring the community's statements/explanations about how that property came to be zoned for heavier use --- so the Buddhist Church could create senior housing. A huge influx of rental housing and the transient, renting families which it would draw, is an anathema to a small, rural community where people own acreage and stay for decades, for lifetimes.

The developer has made NO EFFORT to listen to the community's concerns. Despite all the comments to the draft EIR, the only thing the developers did was to reconfigure their footprint. Nothing changed! They just rearranged the buildings! They refused to diminish the number of units, which is where the impact to Penryn truly lies. That area should have, at the very maximum, four units per acre. Even that would be seriously "crowded," by our standards.

The developers must be anticipating a huge payday in the future on their very substantial investment. This project has already cost them plenty, and the minimal mitigations they will need to provide will cost them millions. I am certain they will do everything in their power to keep the 150 designated units they appear to be getting away with. They will probably try to "sweeten the pot" for the county, but this will be of ZERO benefit to the residents of Penryn, who viscerally and practically unanimously oppose this invasion of non-residents.

Jim, I wish I could threaten you with withholding my vote and campaigning against you, but I won't be doing that. Even though we disagree on most policy questions, I have found you to be an honest and sincere man, a hard worker, and someone who valiantly sits

through a lot of meetings in a lot of venues. You are a profound improvement over your predecessor, who was clearly out of her depth and disinterested in the work. But Jim, I sure wish you could find it in your heart [and in your head] to stand with the people of Penryn on this one.

Please help us defeat, or at the very least, substantially diminish the Orchards project in Penryn. I look forward to more years of seeing you at the Penryn Mac and being a dependable stone in your shoe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Starkey

cc: Planning commission

Kathi Heckert

From: Donna Delno [delnofamily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2012 5:54 PM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: Re: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

thank you. How can one man's idea...change the future of our small rural town? We sold our house in the city, to come raise our kids in the country .
We work SOOO hard to live here, have animals, water issues, for our rural lifestyle. etc, to have 1 person come along and change the future of our town. It should be voted on by the town. Moving in that many renters will permanently damage our town. There is nothing for them to do here. They will race thru our streets. They will not wave to each other and will drive too fast near our bike rides and horse riders.
Why can one person submit a development idea that NO ONE HERE WANTS< and then be able to ruin our lifestyle of our 4000 residents? He doesn't even live here! This is also what was spoken at the Penryn MAC meeting.
Donna and Stefan Delno 125 Diablo View Lane, Penryn

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathi Heckert <KHeckert@placer.ca.gov>
To: 'Donna Delno' <delnofamily@aol.com>
Sent: Fri, Jun 15, 2012 9:29 am
Subject: RE: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

I will add your comments to the Commissioners packet.

Thank you.

Kathi Heckert, Senior Board /Commission Clerk
Placer County CDRA
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn CA 95603
(530) 745-3082

From: Donna Delno [mailto:delnofamily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2012 8:57 AM
To: Kathi Heckert; Jim Holmes
Subject: Re: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

How can 1 man's idea.....ruin the lives of thousands of residents who live in Penryn?
How can 1 man's idea to develop apartments in a rural area.....be able to ruin the rural, quiet and pristine town of Penryn?
Can we vote on this? NO ONE WANTS THIS DEVELOPMENT--it will ruin our town.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathi Heckert <KHeckert@placer.ca.gov>
To: Kathi Heckert <KHeckert@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: EJ Ivaldi <EJIvaldi@placer.ca.gov>
Sent: Thu, Jun 14, 2012 10:56 am
Subject: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

This is going out to those who provided an e-mail addresses for notification for the Orchard at Penryn project at the MAC meeting or provided commented on the EIR. 441

If you provided an address you will also receive a paper copy via US Mail.

Thank you for your interest.

Kathi Heckert, Senior Board /Commission Clerk
Placer County CDRA
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn CA 95603
(530) 745-3082

From: Donna Delno [delnofamily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2012 8:57 AM
To: Kathi Heckert; Jim Holmes
Subject: Re: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

How can 1 man's idea.....ruin the lives of thousands of residents who live in Penryn? How can 1 man's idea to develop apartments in a rural area.....be able to ruin the rural, quiet and pristine town of Penryn? Can we vote on this? NO ONE WANTS THIS DEVELOPMENT--it will ruin our town.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathi Heckert <KHeckert@placer.ca.gov>
To: Kathi Heckert <KHeckert@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: EJ Ivaldi <EJIvaldi@placer.ca.gov>
Sent: Thu, Jun 14, 2012 10:56 am
Subject: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

This is going out to those who provided an e-mail addresses for notification for the Orchard at Penryn project at the MAC meeting or provided commented on the EIR.

If you provided an address you will also receive a paper copy via US Mail.

Thank you for your interest.

Kathi Heckert, Senior Board /Commission Clerk
Placer County CDRA
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn CA 95603
(530) 745-3082

Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, California 95603

ATTN: Kathi Heckert

We appreciate your time to read our concerns about the Orchard at Penryn project.

Years ago, a 10 acre parcel of land owned by the Buddhist Church was changed as a gesture of goodwill, giving them the opportunity to build housing for the elderly community of their congregation. Unfortunately, they never did build these homes. As a result of the residents of the small rural area of Penryn not changing the zoning, the selling of that land is now jeopardizing the future of Penryn. Never was this change meant to be interpreted that Penryn intended to allow a complete overall change of the rural character of Penryn.

The present proposed plan does not meet the Community Design of the Penryn Parkway Plan. It clearly **violates** the intent of the **Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan**.

- The plan clearly states that only one high-density area is intended within the plan. This is the pre existing mobile home park on Auburn-Folsom Road.
- The project will not preserve and maintain the predominantly rural character/lifestyle of Penryn.
- The project does not fit the small and large agricultural nature of the surrounding homes. Neighboring property owners are permitted to own animals such as goats, horses, chickens. This is very typical of the Penryn community.
- The plan, as outlined by the Penryn Parkway Development, states that the development **shall be of a relatively low density** and **where multiple family residential is proposed, structures shall be clustered together in such a way as to preserve the maximum amount possible of undeveloped open space onsite.**
- The Orchard at Penryn is planned to be gated and walled. The Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan states that the **residential developments should be designed to encourage human interaction, bicycle and pedestrian circulation, and the creation of neighborhood identity as opposed to isolated, walled-off sub-communities which do not foster these qualities**

On November 2007, Michael Johnson, the Director of the Planning Department at that time, notified the developer **there was not sufficient benefit to the community to allow such high density and that 4 units per acre is the maximum density staff can support**. What has happened to allow such a drastic change? What benefit to the community of Penryn is the Orchard at Penryn offering to the Penryn residents?

The Orchard at Penryn project will create an increased traffic impact at the intersections of Taylor/King Roads and Taylor/Horseshoe Bar Roads.

- Del Oro will have increased trips exiting Taylor Road in order to reach the school site to the south.
- Penryn School will also have increased traffic on English Colony Way. There are no sidewalks on both Taylor Road and English Colony Way for the pedestrians.
- There is impaired visibility on Taylor Road at the proposed exit site.

- Local bikers and the Del Oro track team use Taylor & Penryn Road. The increased vehicle traffic will inevitably cause safety issues.

The land has contaminated soils and hazardous waste on site, which will require a cleanup. This clean up will require relocation of 12,000 cubic yards which unavoidably will cause contaminated soil polluting our air quality. Lead, DDT, DDE, Endrin and methoxychlor are some of the chemicals in the soil, which will pose a potential hazard to future occupations.

The increased traffic and the removal of the existing trees and the contaminated soil will produce increased levels of air pollution.

Placer County has some of the best oak woodland habitats in Northern California. This project, as it is propose, Penryn will lose native oak woodland at an alarming rate.

There are two wetland swales and a single seasonal wetland in the proposed project that will be eliminated. Property owners of the eastern side of the project have wetlands along their property which cannot be eliminated.

This project will displace owls, deer, turkeys and many other animals and watching this wildlife is one of the blessings of living in rural Penryn.

The Loomis School District does not have the resources to remedy the increase in class sizes. Overcrowded classrooms will jeopardize the education of our children.

MAC president and MAC attendees have voiced their concerns that it's statically proven that low-income homes and rentals bring in increased crime. Penryn is known as being a safe community to live in, one with very little reported crime!

The increased noise and disruptions from the concentrated housing will detract from the peaceful rural community characterized by Penryn. This noise will especially affect the families in the neighboring existing homes.

Thank you for permitting us to present our concerns. We truly appreciate your time and attention. Please consider honoring the original outlined plan created by the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan and the Penryn Parkway and we ask that the density of this area remain consistent with the five acre single family homes currently in that area.

Lorna Bunting

Marianne Stovall

Kathi Heckert

From: Vicki Thomson [vicylyn@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 9:39 AM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: Re: legal notice for Orchard at Penryn 6-28-12 PC Hearing

Well,
Thank you for the email, although the time of the meeting makes it very difficult for us that have a full time job. Very disappointed that we will not be able to attend this meeting. Please be advised that we are absolutely against this project.

Please take our vote as 2 say NO to going forward with the building of the Orchard at Penryn.

Signed
Vicki Thomson and Michael Thomson

On Thu, Jun 14, 2012 at 10:54 AM, Kathi Heckert <KHeckert@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

This is going out to those who provided an e-mail addresses for notification for the Orchard at Penryn project at the MAC meeting or provided commented on the EIR.

If you provided an address you will also receive a paper copy via US Mail.

Thank you for your interest.

Kathi Heckert, Senior Board /Commission Clerk

Placer County CDRA

3091 County Center Drive

Auburn CA 95603

(530) 745-3082

Balestrein
2889 Penryn Rd
Penryn, CA 95663
916-652-6683

Planning Commission
3091 Country Center Dr.
Auburn, CA 95603

RECEIVED
JUN 19 2012
PLANNING DEPT

Re: Orchard At Penryn

As Penryn residents of many years, we have enjoyed living close to nature and a simple, quiet way of life.
Now it seems that there is a plan to violate not only nature, but the residents of this community as well.
This plan will not only disturb the wildlife and trees, but it is going to add even more traffic than we currently have.
Please consider giving yourselves and the residents of Penryn the gifts of integrity, fairness, and honor.
We have been much too tolerant of the development and changes, and it would be rewarding to all concerned if you attempted to reweave the fabric of trust.
Let us enhance a sense of purpose and leave the land in beauty to those who follow us.

Arietta and Frank Balestrein

Kathi Heckert

From: Chuck-Muriel Davis [chamdavis@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 8:21 PM
To: Kathi Heckert
Cc: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Orchard at Penryn-Comments on Cumulative Impacts- PC on 6/28/12

June 20, 2012

RE: Orchard at Penryn- Comments on Missing Cumulative Impacts, for PC on 6/28/12

To: The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors

The Chapter 14 Cumulative Impacts section of the EIR is still MISSING 2 critical development projects in the Penryn Parkway, both near the site of the Orchard at Penryn project!

1. The 85-unit Orchard Park townhomes on Boyington, near I-80, is an ACTIVE project, and is not yet completed. This project may add 170 more cars and more than 170 more people to the Penryn Parkway area.

2. The 23-unit Penryn Townhomes project on Penryn Rd, adjacent to the shopping center by I-80, has already been approved, although construction has not yet started. This project could add another 46 more cars and more than 46 more people to the Penryn Parkway area.

These 2 projects should have been included in the Cumulative Impact section; I had mentioned these 2 projects back during the NOP process. No doubt, the critical impact on the traffic problems reported in the EIR is really worse than reported, since these two projects are NOT included in the cumulative impact section.

We ask the Planning Commission to recognize that the Orchard at Penryn project is too big for the Penryn Parkway area and that it would create a critical traffic impact to the Penryn/Loomis area.

Sincerely,
Muriel & Chuck Davis
6/20/12
POB 397
Penryn, CA 95663

Kathi Heckert

From: Chuck-Muriel Davis [chamdavis@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 3:12 PM
To: Kathi Heckert
Cc: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Orchard at Penryn-comment letter for PC hearing on Jun 28, 2012

June 20, 2012

RE: Orchard at Penryn at PC Hearing on June 28, 2012

To: Planning Commissioners and the Board of Supervisors

The proposed 150 apartment planned development (PD), Orchard at Penryn, does NOT benefit the Loomis/Penryn community because the project is too dense for the area, creates additional traffic problems, and is inconsistent with the rural Penryn setting! The project violates the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan (HBPCP), as well as county zoning codes! The following excerpts are from public documents and are only a small extraction of the information available: (the BOLD is for emphasis).

-------HBPCP, App B, pg 5, Planned Residential Development(PDs):

B.3. It must be recognized that the **maximum density permitted by the zoning may not be achieved due to the above constraints**. The size and number of parcels within the remaining developable area is dependent upon compatibility with surrounding properties and the goals and policies of the community plan, including the intent of the land use district(s) in which the project is located.

B.4. **PDs should be used only if there is an overriding benefit to the community ..... The overriding benefit of a PD would not be to add more home sites to a parcel of land.**

-------HBPCP, App B, pg 6, C.Discussion:

PD designs that result in clustered lots which give a conventional, uniform appearance (i.e. tract homes, urban subdivisions) are not considered to be consistent with a rural environment. Protection of site sensitive areas and **adherence to the community plan will take precedence over the maximum number of lots allowed by the zoning.**

-------HBPCP, p 80-81, Penryn Parkway Development Policies:

d. Development shall be of a **relatively low density, low profile type**.....

-------HBPCP, p 3, F. General Community Goals:

F.4. PROVIDE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WHICH **CREATES FUNCTIONAL, ATTRACTIVE. COHESIVE NEIGHBORHOODS WHICH ARE REASONABLY INTEGRATED WITH ADJOINING NEIGHBORHOODS RATHER THAN PHYSICALLY ISOLATED FROM THEIR SURROUNDINGS.**

F.6. **MAINTAIN THE PENRYN PARKWAY COMMERCIAL AREA AS A HIGHWAY-SERVICE ORIENTED RETAIL AREA** WHICH ALSO ALLOWS FOR RESIDENTIAL USES. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD CAREFULLY CONSIDER THE IMPACTS ON SURROUNDING LAND USES AND EXPAND

THE RANGE OF COMMERCIAL USES TO BEUER(i.e. "better") SERVE THE LOCAL RESIDENTS AS WELL AS THE AREA'S VISITORS

-------HBPCP, Community Design Element, p 75, Purpose:

Retention of the rural character of the area by **minimizing the environmental impact of new development** is a primary goal of this Plan.

-------Zoning, Ch 17, Part 2,Div VII, 17.54.080 PDs:

A.2. Provide a procedure that can relate the type, design, and layout of residential development ..... in a manner consistent with the **preservation of** important environmental characteristics and **the property values in the area** and **is compatible with existing adjacent land uses** and land use districts as shown on the general plan or any applicable specific or community plans.

.....

B.3. Community Plan Consistency. , **All PDs shall be consistent with the goals and policies of the Placer County general plan or any applicable specific or community plan.**

--------Zoning Ch 17.02.050.D:

D.2. Community Plan Standards. When conflicts occur between the provisions of this chapter and standards adopted by ordinance in any applicable community plans, including those areas within the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), **the provisions of the community plans shall apply.**

D.3. Specific Plans. **When conflicts occur between the provisions of this chapter and standards adopted as part of any specific plan, the provisions of the specific plan shall apply.**

Please send this project back to planning to have the density reduced to be "relatively low" and to design the project according to the HBPCP's Penryn Parkway guidelines (e.g. requiring a retail element along Penryn Rd). Please remember that the Community Plan takes precedence!

Sincerely,

Muriel & Chuck Davis

POB 307, Penryn

6/20/2012

References:

http://qcode.us/codes/placercounty/

6-21-2012

451

Placer County
CDRA / Planning Department
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA. 95603

This Lett is in regards to The orchard At Penryn project. I have Lived for 49year next To The preposed project. I have no objectio To IT.

Gus Curtis
3005 Taylor Rd.
Loomis, CA.
95650

Parcel #
04-013-001-000

RECEIVED
JUN 22 2012
PLANNING DEPT.

Kathi Heckert

From: Tim Onderko [tim@themoneybrokers.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2012 11:07 AM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: Opposition to 150 apartment Penryn project

Kathi, I understand you're collecting the support/opposition letters for the Planning Commission on the proposed Penryn Apartment project.

On behalf of my family, I want to express our sincere opposition to the project. We live in the Town of Loomis and moved here a year ago for many reasons. Among the major reasons we moved here from the City of Sacramento was because of it's small and intimate experience, low housing density and slow growth plan. It's our opinion that the proposed project will adversely impact the small town experience of Penryn and Loomis and Penryn.

Additionally, we are high propensity voters. This is a top priority for us and will influence the way we vote in upcoming elections. Please inform all appropriate elected officials and influential decision makers that we're closely watching their position and votes on this project. VOTE NO ON 150 APARTMENT PROJECT.

Respectfully,

Tim Onderko
3145 Orchard Park Ct.
Loomis, CA 95650

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

PLACER GROUP
P.O. BOX 7167, AUBURN, CA 95604

June 26, 2012

Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Dr.
Auburn, CA 95603

SUBJ: Orchard at Penryn

Please accept the following as part of the record for this proposed project.

If the proposed 150 apartment development is to be approved, due to its density and location, it must incorporate public transportation amenities both for public safety and future demands.

Although public transportation may be less than adequate or lacking in most rural areas of the County, it can be assumed that the need for public transportation options will increase as populations age and/or these apartments become occupied. It can be further assumed that as this need grows, public agencies will be pressed to provide safe, adequate, and convenient-to-reach public transportation transfer facilities.

Thus, any approval of this proposed project must include strict measures to accommodate the public transportation needs at this stage of the planning. Even though the full need may not materialize for a number of years, to not adequately plan and provide for such amenities as conditions of approval now is to guarantee that they will never be provided—or may come later with a hefty price tag to taxpayers.

Such amenities should include safe, ample turnouts for bus stops and other "park and ride" accommodations at the public road entrances to the project. The paved turnouts should include, but not be limited to, kiosks to protect citizens from weather impacts (heat, cold, wind, rain, etc.) with benches for citizens using/waiting for the public conveyance, car pool ride, or other option (e.g., secure bike lock facilities). The turnouts should be safe for adults and children and sized to accommodate the largest of the public transportation vehicles and school busses in use today.

We urge the Planning Commission to include such a provision as a condition of approval and/or as further mitigation of the traffic impacts this project will create.

Thank you for considering our views,

Marilyn Jasper

Marilyn Jasper, Chair

Commissioners 6/27/12

Robert Grigas
2212 PO Box
Loomis, CA 95650
(916) 223-1394

Placer County
Planning Commission
Auburn, CA

Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Regarding: Proposed Project Orchard at Penryn housing development

Dear Sirs,

I am strongly opposed to the Orchard at Penryn development.

There are many reasons this is not good for our community at this location:

- The housing density is to great at 10 units per acre. 4 to 6 units per acre would be acceptable to the area.
- The community plan called for lesser density
- The Penryn MAC opposed to the project and it does not have community support
- Traffic and noise mitigation are not completely addressed.

Please consider modification to reduce the density of this project and not allow the current project to proceed as proposed.

Sincerely,

Robert Grigas
Resident

Attached to Comments 6/25/12 PC Hearing

PLACER COUNTY

SHERIFF

CORONER-MARSHAL

DEVON BELL

June 27, 2012

EJ Ivaldi, Supervising Planner, Planning Services Division
Placer County Community Development/Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Orchard at Penryn (PSUB 20070521)

Dear Mr. Ivaldi,

At your request, I reviewed the calls for service for Boyington Road, near the existing Orchard at Penryn townhomes, including addresses along Orchard Circle. To provide a comprehensive sample I searched our records from July 2010 – June 2012.

There were 29 calls made to our office, twenty-two that included the following non-crimes: seven tow services; six (at same address) for a juvenile runaway; four allied agency assists for disabled vehicles, fire/medical aids, etc; two civil matters; two 9-1-1 accidental hang-ups; and one noise complaint.

There were seven criminal calls that included the following: two for trespass (at same address, reporting party knew suspect); one dispute (originated in the City of Roseville); one harassing phone call (reporting party knew caller); one petty theft (item taken was returned); and one probation search (unable to provide details). Of the aforementioned incidents over a two year period, only three resulted in crime reports.

Our office submitted a Law Enforcement Impact Report to Environmental Coordination Services in September 2011. Our ability to handle law enforcement needs generated by developments is not based on calls for service by housing type or response area, but by an increase in population. Funding for personnel, equipment, training, and facilities is calculated per resident.

Our staffing ratio of 1 deputy per 1,000 residents in unincorporated areas is addressed in the 1994 Placer County General Plan in the Public Facilities and Services section, under Policy 4.H.1. Based on the accepted average of 2.5 residents per dwelling unit, for 150 multiple dwelling units, we averaged an increase of 375 residents for the Orchard at Penryn project. For this development the Board of Supervisors could provide funding equivalent to one third of one deputy.

Sincerely,

Amanda Rogers
Community Services Officer II
Placer County Sheriff's Office

Auburn Justice Center
2929 Richardson Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

(530) 889-6922
arogers@placer.ca.gov

DEL ORO AQUATIC CENTER

Received after agenda was posted 6/28/12 front counter

June 28, 2012

Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn CA 95603

Dear Sirs,

My husband and I are the leading contributors to a project with far-reaching community benefits: the new Del Oro Aquatic Center located at Del Oro High School in Loomis. The first phase of this project will cost approximately $2 million, and our family has pledged to match contributions from the community up to a total of $1 million. That means that every contribution from the community is actually doubled when applied to the cost of the pool. Our family's contribution to the project has not been limited to our financial donation. As Chairperson of the Friends of the Del Oro Pool, I work with a group of unpaid volunteers on a daily basis to organize fundraisers and contact businesses and individuals for capital contributions. I also work with local and regional media to publicize our efforts. The Del Oro Aquatic Center will replace the existing pool which is over 40 years old and deteriorating rapidly. It is an important project that will benefit the community for many years to come through swim lessons, competitive swimming and water polo, and senior fitness and aquatic therapy.

I have been informed that The Orchard at Penryn development is willing to contribute $75,000 to the pool project, which given our family's matching commitment, will yield a $150,000 contribution to the pool fund. This contribution by the property owner is very significant and will help greatly to reach our overall goal for the project. As long time members of the community, my husband and I wish to express our support for the Orchard at Penryn project, and urge you to approve the project.

Sincerely,

Grace Kamphefner
Chairperson, Friends of the Del Oro Pool

RECEIVED
JUN 28 2012
CDRA

Del Oro Aquatic Center Giving Campaign, c/o Placer Union High School District
P.O. Box 5048, Auburn, CA 95604

The Friends of the Del Oro Pool is a volunteer organization working with the Placer Union High School District to fundraise and construct a new community Aquatic Center at Del Oro High School, Loomis, CA

EJ Ivaldi

From: Teri Ivaldi on behalf of Placer County Board of Supervisors
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 10:46 AM
To: Jennifer Pereira; Ruth Alves; Linda Brown; Jocelyn Maddux
Cc: EJ Ivaldi
Subject: Email fr Michael Neal re opposition to Penryn Apartments "The Orchard"

FYI

Teri Ivaldi,
Senior Administrative Aide,
Placer County Board of Supervisors
Community Outreach | Public Information Office
530-889-4010 Domes | tsayad@placer.ca.gov

From: Ann Neal [mailto:aneal@jps.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 28, 2012 4:41 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Penryn Apartments "The Orchard"

"The Orchard" apartment in Penryn, recently approved by the planning commission, is a flagrant contradiction of the Community Advisory Committee recommendations concerning housing density for the Penryn area. How this was approved by the Planning Commission gives one pause about who is in charge of development decisions in this area. This project should be absolutely rejected by the Board. That kind of project belongs in another area, like Los Angeles. Thank you for your consideration. Michael B. Neal, 8320 King Road, Loomis, 95650. Ph: 916/652-5225.

From: Michelle Romero [mromero100@ymail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2012 9:02 AM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: 150 apts in penryn

i am strongly against the penryn apt project you will be hearing an appeal on (9/11).
i won't enumerate my many reasons for why i object to the project. i'm sure you will see and hear all of the reasons why this is an inappropriately scaled project for the area when you review the appeal paperwork.

i was surprised the planning commission ever approved the project. it seems the only benefit to come from the development is financial for the developer. We, on the other hand, will live with the fallout of HD housing, and the flood gates of additional housing that it will trigger. this community was planned to be the way it is. people, including myself, bought here because of how it is and how the zoning assured me it would be. this project is a bait-and-switch on the residents. if i wanted city i would go to the city. please vote no.

michelle romero
9020 horseshoe bar rd
loomis

RECEIVED
AUG 27 2012
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd X COB X CoCo___
TSI X___ CEO___ Other___
AUG 27 2012 * MJ | CDRA

Sup D1___ Sup D4___ Aide D1___ Aide D4___
Sup D2___ Sup D5___ Aide D2___ Aide D5___
Sup D3___ Aide D3___ * ___

From: Donna Delno [delnofamily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2012 4:50 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: NO APARTMENTS FOR PENRYN--YES FOR ROCKLIN< THO

PLZ Supes
NO APARTMENTS FOR PENRYN! THIS IS RIDICULOUS. This development is perfect for Sierra College/Highway 80 NOT PENRYN.
Why does one man's development idea, get to change 5000 Penryn residents .....way of life? NO HIGH DENSITY HOUSING FOR PENRYN. It is not needed here but needed in Rocklin, near the college and jobs...
NO--not in the community plan

NO apartments in Penryn!
REALLY

From: Delnos
Diablo View
Penryn

From: GARY HESS [joanhess4@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2012 6:36 PM
To:
Subject: 150 apartments in Penryn

I speak on behalf of everyone I know when I say high-density housing will detract from the rural nature of Penryn and surrounding cities. There are so few places like Penryn left. Let's not let this one go the way of so many others.

Thank you,

Joan Hess

Your response in this matter will be duly noted. A public servant who works on behalf of their community will be remembered when voting time comes.

From: Patricia Gray [pgray2233@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2012 6:34 PM
To: Ashley Gibian; Teri Ivaldi; Jennifer Montgomery; Jennifer Pereira; Heidi Paoli
Subject: stop apts in Penryn

Dear Mr.Uhler,Mr. Duran,Ms.Montgomery and Mr. Weygant and all,
I have lived in Penryn over 30 years. I have seen the impact of traffic on Taylor and Penryn Rd. Please do not allow the 150 Apts. proposed for Penryn. This is a quiet country area and can not safely support more traffic, noise or wear and tear on our roads. Also,we are trying to live in harmony with our wild creatures and they need to have land to survive.
Thank you,
Patricia Gray
1740 Clark Tunnel Rd,
Penryn,Ca 95663

From: tara wells [tara@re4u.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2012 12:38 PM
To: Jennifer Montgomery; Teri Ivaldi; Ashley Gibian; Jennifer Pereira; Heidi Paoli; Ruth Alves
Cc: stop150apts@gmail.com
Subject: Please don't let them build!!!

I'm writing this email in regret of the way our local supervisors have chosen to ignore the values and lifestyle of the local people in their community.

First of all I live in Loomis but I didn't choose this town by mistake I chose this town after living in Folsom for 10 years and because I'm in outside sales I have traveled to every community from Vacaville North. I chose Loomis because it had the same core values I was looking for.

Folsom although I nice community for some, for me it had out of control growth, followed by extreme traffic and tight clustered living. I believe when you choose a community you choose it for the values it has not because you want to change it to look exactly like the community you just moved from. Just like a good marriage you search for the lifestyle that fits your needs, and in my case that was a much more rural environment and less amenities is very much OK with me. But like everything else people want to move into a community and then want to take or add all the stuff they just moved away from. That's why Loomis was a perfect fit for me with a small town environment and more values for our local landscape and animals then for rapid growth bought by the mighty dollar.

I don't think one of our district supervisors live in the Loomis, Penryn or New Castle area to understand the mind set or local values of our community instead you have drawn up some kind of plan on some paper and have decided that money is more important to you then asking the local community if this is the kind of growth in which they are interested in. I can't understand why the local supervisors don't understand that we don't want to look like Rocklin or Auburn. If people want that kind of lifestyle with big box stores, outlets, clustered home then there are many community to move to but if people like myself are looking for a more quiet peaceful lifestyle then there are a lot fewer choices, so for those of us that choose this lifestyle why would YOU make the decision to take that away from US?

The 150 apartments on Penryn Road would drastically change the face of our community and not in a positive way. Now we would have a big blight on the community in an area of beautiful homes set on large parcels. The traffic added to the community would be unbearable, with traffic on a quiet relaxing stretch of road would now be constant traffic moving in and out of that location not to mention the added burden to Taylor Road. Has anyone of you been on Taylor Road at 8:00 in the morning? The traffic backs up so bad that sometimes even when the light is green at King & Taylor or even worse Horseshoe Bar & Taylor you can't move because that traffic is either trying to turn left into the school or turn left toward Starbucks. It will now be even worse for Del Oro high school.

Has anyone done a study on what this does to OUR local wildlife? I can't tell Rocklin and Auburn to stop decimating their community and destroying all their local wild life and resources I sure don't want some outsider from San Diego telling me that the decimation of my local area is just fine, because it isn't. I LOVE all the local wildlife, trees open landscape that's why we all moved here if I wanted to live in an apartment lifestyle I wouldn't have chosen Loomis. The impact on our local open space and parks will be intolerable.

I am a small investor and own many small apartment complexes that range from triplexes to 12 plexes so I have some idea of what kind of environment this could be, I know what I deal with on a small scale with evictions, noise, police calls, drugs and just flat out disturbances. I can only imagine that this will be a huge burden to our area both financial and in local resources.

Why does this builder want to build here? There are plenty of areas to build in Rocklin or Auburn and both those community would love to have them. Our local supervisors shouldn't be so quick to sell us out. There is always time to grow but once it starts there is no turning back the pages and wishing that maybe something's are better left alone. I understand dollars and sense but selling out to the mighty dollar just makes us look weak with NO backbone to stand up for our local values.

Please listen closely to what we are saying and understand and appreciate that this is where we live, this is our home!

Sincerely,

Tara Wells
Resident of Loomis since 1998

From: Beth Spurgeon [bandbspurgeon@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2012 4:47 PM
To:
Subject: 150 apartments project planned for penryn

August 26, 2012

As a Penryn resident, I am very concerned that the Orchards At Penryn, 150 apartment will have too much of an impact on our
rural atmosphere.

I do not feel that this project will serve the local residents or be good for the environment.
The impact that this will have on us is very disturbing.

There will be noise and traffic. Our roads are not able to accommodate another approximately 300+ vehicles and the dangers it
will involve.

The land and all of the natural habitat of the wildlife will be destroyed. We need to offer the best protection to our residents, land and wildlife.
The land in this area is a limited resource.

Thank you for your consideration with this problem.

Beth Spurgeon
7760 Penryn Estates Dr.
Penryn, Ca. 95663
916-652-6789

JACKIE MARIE HOWARD
ATTORNEY AT LAW

TELEPHONE: 916-773-7373 • FAX: 916-773-2323

210 ESTATES DR., STE. 202 • ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ___ CoCo ___
TSI ___ ✓ CEO ___ Other ___
SEP - 6 2012
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ✓
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ___ ✓ LK

RECEIVED
SEP 10 2012
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

August 31, 2012

Jack Duran
Placer County Supervisor, District 1
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Jack Duran,

I reside in Penryn and have for over 32 years. I attended Penryn Elementary School and Del Oro High School. I am writing to express my concerns, and my Penryn relatives' concerns, about the proposed development of 150 apartments in Penryn. The site is not far from Del Oro or where my relatives and I live.

If you haven't seen the land at issue lately, I encourage a visit. The land is as rural and natural and full of wildlife and trees, as it has been for as long as I have known Penryn since the late 1970's. Deer travel across the land, while hawks and other wildlife fly above and over the property.

My relatives and I do not support the proposed large development. The variations that will be allowed to destroy the beautiful old, oak trees are incredible. For example, I have heard that on 7.5 acres, all of the trees but two will be removed because the removal allowance would be increased to allow trees up to 24" in width to be demolished.

I don't quite understand. People move to rural areas such as Penryn to get away from developments, including large apartment complexes, busy roads, increased pollution, and places with fewer trees and wildlife. The community in Penryn consists of many, many long-time residents. If these Penrynites wanted to live near big apartments complexes, they would have moved long ago.

A question that baffles me is "Why does such a battle for residents of a great rural community occur against a developer who is not a resident of Penryn?" The only answer that makes sense is money. Do we really think it's good policy to support and create such large developments in such rural areas as Penryn? Even if the community plan states the corridor is for commercial, why one-hundred and fifty apartments? This is too large, with too many negative effects on the area. It seems too many people who live in large, developed areas have difficulty empathizing with rural-minded people. Not everyone wants to live in cities. Many of us, like my parents, are farmers in Penryn and wish to maintain this lifestyle without interference from large developments.

The residents of Penryn will be responsible for the burden of future and ongoing additional taxes and costs that will be created by this development, while the developer will see financial gain. The residents will also shoulder the associated crime and transitory effects of such an apartment complex. People who participate in criminal ways can afford "upscale" apartments, so architecture alone does not eliminate this issue. In fact, it could act as a good "front" for hiding people involved in criminal activities, especially given how remote the location is from sheriff and other law enforcement hubs. Apartments are transitory in nature, and 150 of them will undoubtedly bring in an element not currently associated with Penryn's quiet, rural community.

We are not supportive of the development based on all of its negative effects. Penryn's small size should not allow for a big money developer to roll-over the residents for the developer's own financial interest. In fact, the size of Penryn should argue for maintaining it rural character. These communities have continued to disappear over the decades as "big city" ideas are allowed to move in.

We ask that you vote against such development and speak up for the Penryn residents who wish to continue to live in their quiet, rural community.

Please reply back regarding your perspective and opinion on this development. If you prefer email, you may reach me at Jackie@JackieMarieHowardLaw.com. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jackie Marie Howard

Jackie Marie Howard,
Attorney At Law

RECEIVED
SEP 06 2012
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Donna Delno [mailto:delnofamily@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 5:21 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors; Jim Holmes
Subject: No high density housing needed in Penryn

Please do not allow high density housing in Penryn. IT IS NOT NEEDED--there is no infrastructure in place, no jobs here and Del Oro has a full capacity of 1710 kids. Our roads cannot handle any more traffic on Taylor Road.

Approving this is a direct violation of the community plan.
Delnos
Diablo View
Penryn

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other
DB/JJ/J
SEP - 5 2012

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 ✓

From: Cord Lamphere [mailto:c_lamphere@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 12:23 PM
Subject: Penryn 150 Apt Project on Penryn Rd

Please stop the 150 Apartment project on Penryn Rd.
This is a violation of our community plan and does not fit in the Penryn or Loomis community.
I live in Penryn because I do not want to live in Stanford ranch. Please don't ruin Penryn.

The many issues included:
- School impacts
- Traffic impacts
- Crime impacts
- Community fit
- Community plan specifics

I went to the Penryn MAC meeting where there was a unanimous vote against the project. Each time I go to a meeting there are hundreds of people who actually live here that voice objections and raise real issues with the project. Each time the voices fall on what seem like deaf ears. There is always an excuse why the people there cannot do what they are supposed to do and that is serve the community.

Just because zoning laws allow a project doesn't mean that it should be built. There are many other pieces of the community plan that must be met.

I am sure it is in your best interest to do the right thing for the Penryn community so please stop this project and save our Penryn.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,
Cord Lamphere

7880 Callison Rd
Penryn, CA 95663

RECEIVED
SEP 10 2012
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓ Michael Johnson
SEP 05 2012

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * SP

From: Jeff Eberhart [mailto:jeff@fpfnorcal.com]
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2012 10:36 AM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: NO to Penryn Aprartments

I've never gotten involved in this kind of thing before but this one is hitting too close to home not to. We moved from Roseville to Loomis 3 years ago to get away from the congestion. Adding apartments will change what is special about the Loomis/Penryn area. The high school is at capacity and my daughters elementary school averages 26 children per classroom. There is no more room. Not to mention the traffic impact on and around Penryn Road. The intersection of Penryn and Taylor is already dangerous enough without adding another 300 or so cars in and around that area. Please leave rural Penryn, rural. Thank you.

Regards,

Jeff Eberhart
Mortgage Consultant
First Priority Financial
p: 916.606.3779
f: 916.647.0964
e: jeff@fpfnorcal.com
www.fpfnorcal.com

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/HD
SEP 07 2012
Michael Johnson
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5 ✓
Sup D3 Aide D3 *

Michael Johnson

470

Original Message-----
From: Shannon [mailto:shannon.l.knight@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2012 3:37 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: No on the Orchard!

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed apartment complex, The Orchard.

My family and I moved to Penryn last Fall from Roseville. We had been living in an upscale apartment complex near the Galleria and The Fountains, while saving up to purchase a home in the country.

Even though our apartment complex was recently built, quite beautiful, and well kept, it was also loud and very regularly visited by the police and fire department for crimes and domestic disputes committed by the residents there.

One of the residents in this upscale complex, (keep in mind that prospective residents were all screened before receiving the approval to reside there) took it upon himself to set up a meth lab in his garage. On top of the illegal drug distribution, the lab blew up one night which burned an entire section of garages and exposed everyone to great danger. There seem to always be some kind of altercation (domestic disputes, domestic violence) occurring just because of the sheer concentration of people.

My family moved to Penryn to leave the noise and crime associated with the apartment culture we experienced first hand. Not rundown, neglected and Ill-managed apartments, but upscale and new--like the ones that are being proposed.

We saved our hard earned dollars and were finally able to purchase three acres very near to the proposed Orchard complex, right off Taylor Road and Penryn.

We would be directly impacted by the increase in noise, traffic patterns, unavoidable crime, increased development and complete change to our small country town. We don't need the increased influx of problems unavoidably caused by concentrated apartment population.

Apartments, even new, well kept, and well managed are magnets for problems, noise and crime. Please do not bring this to Penryn.

Kind Regards,

Shannon Knight
Penryn Resident

Sent from my iPhone

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ✓ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
SEP 10 2012
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ✓ SP

Michael Johnson

Michael Johnson

From: Kristin Carruth [mailto:mkccarruth@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2012 7:19 AM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Penryn Apartment Project

NO APARTMENTS IN PENRYN!!!!! PLEASE!!!!! THIS IS A QUIET, RESPECTABLE COMMUNITY!!!!!

We bought our homes for the space between neighbors and minimal traffic. With the economy, our homes are already worth less than we paid 15 years ago. Apartments won't help. Penryn takes pride in continuing to be an upscale, quiet, uncongested foothill community. Please do your part to fight for us!!

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/HA
SEP 10 2012
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * ✓ SP

Michael Johnson

From: Mike Carruth [mailto:mikec@fillner.com]
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2012 5:56 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Penryn apartments

Board of Supervisors,
My family and I moved to Penryn to enjoy the rural life style. Our children where raised here and attended the local schools. We moved here because of the standards of building and property use. It would be a shame to see apartments come into our community that do not meet our current codes and life style. Please see it within yourselves to maintain our country/rural atmosphere and not allow a non-conforming apartment complex ruin our community.

Thank you
Michael Carruth

Sent from

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓ Michael Johnson
DB/KD
SEP 11 2012

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 *

From: Ruth Alves
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2012 9:19 AM
To: EJ Ivaldi
Subject: FW: please forward

From: Penryn Update [mailto:penrynupdate@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2012 11:17 PM
Subject: Fw: please forward

I have been asked to forward this information on to you and also to ask you to forward it on to your neighbors. If any of them want to be included in these community information notices please have them email me at penrynupdate@yahoo.com. Thanks for your support.

UPDATE 9/10/12- **NO 'Stop 150 Apts' appeal hearing on Sept 11th!**

The county rescheduled the appeal hearing at the Board of Supervisors(BOS) for

Sept 25th. HOWEVER, because 1 supervisor will be absent at the Sept 25th hearing, the Stop 150 Apts group submitted a request on 8/29/12 to reschedule the BOS appeal hearing to another date, when ALL 5 supervisors will be present.

It was discovered on Friday, Sept 7th, that the BOS WILL definitely have the Orchard at Penryn appeal hearing on SEPT 25th! (but no official notice is out yet)

The Board could vote yes or no on the request to reschedule the hearing to another date. Because there is no way to determine the decision of the BOS, we must attend the SEPT 25th hearing as if the appeal hearing will be held.

PLEASE attend the SEPT 25TH BOS HEARING!

Here is the map to 175 Fulweiler Ave, Auburn, CA.

-----Original Message-----
From: dddegordon@juno.com [mailto:dddegordon@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 5:45 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: 150 Apartments are WRONG!

Supervisors-

Do not, repeat, DO NOT vote in favor of those Penryn Apartments!

How can you, as our reresentatives, vote for high density housing that is in violation of our community plan? The 150 apartments are the WRONG thing, in the WRONG place, and the NEGATIVE impact on traffic, schools, wildlife and the present citizens IS UNACCEPTABLE!

DO NOT VOTE IN FAVOR of the "Orchard"!!!!!!!!!!!!

Deirdre Gordon
Loomis

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI CEO ✓ Other ✓ Michael Johnson
SEP 13 2012
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * ✓

-----Original Message-----
From: douggordon@juno.com [mailto:douggordon@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 10:12 AM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Orchard at Penryn

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please do not allow the proposed high density development at Orchard at Penryn. It is not consistent with the neighborhood, the zoning, and the community plan and should not be permitted. I think this area will be be best off in the long run if we have a good plan and stick to it. I moved to the Loomis/Penryn area partly because of the open, low density and request that you do not change it for this project.
Thank you,
Doug Gordon
DougGordon@juno.com
7921 Rasmussen Road
Loomis, ca 95650

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ✓ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓ Michael Johnson
SEP 13 2012
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ✓

476

Hope
Lutheran Church & School

16 September 2012

Jack Duran
Placer County Supervisor
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Supervisor Duran,

It has come to our attention that Hope Lutheran Church was represented to the Planning Commission as possibly being in favor of the Penryn Road apartment project adjacent to our church property.

In an effort to set the record straight, the Church Council of Hope Lutheran has always chosen to maintain a "**neutral**" position on the 150-unit project.

Thank you for your service,

Ben Bodding, Church Council Secretary
Hope Lutheran Church

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/LD
SEP 18 2012

Michael Johnson

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * ✓ LK

7117 Hope Way Penryn, CA 95663
Church: (916) 652-4273 • Pastor Jonathan Kehren • pastorkehren@sbcglobal.net
School: (916) 652-0459 • Principal Paul Leifer • principalleifer@sbcglobal.net
www.hlcpenryn.org

County of Placer Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, California 95603
530-889-4010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BOS Rec'd COB Co.Co.
TSI OPO Other
SEP 19 2012
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3

September 17, 2012

Subject: The Orchard at Penryn

Dear Supervisor Jennifer Montgomery,
My name is Marianne Stovall, a Penryn resident of 35 years. I was at the Placer County Planning Commission Hearing on June 28, 2012 and I have no other choice but to write this letter for the following reason- it is obvious to me that the heartfelt concerns that had been brought to the commissioners' attention that day meant very little to them.

"The Planning Commission has chosen to accept certain environmental impacts resulting from the Orchard at Penryn project because complete eradication of impacts is impractical and would unduly compromise some other important economic, social, or other goal. It finds and determines that the Orchard at Penryn project and the supporting environmental documentation provide for a positive balance and that these benefits to be obtained by the project outweigh any remaining environmental and related potential detriment of the project" (Statement of Findings and Overriding Consideration prepared by North Fork Associates, page 49). I totally disagree. How can overburdened traffic on Taylor and Penryn Roads, evictions, noise, police calls, drugs, disturbances, over crowded schools be called benefits? I find it odd that the Penryn Parkway was set aside to "preserve and maintain the rural character and lifestyle" of Penryn and, yet, one obstacle, which is inevitable, is that the land is contaminated and 11,600 cubic yards of hazardous waste must be removed. And, to what end? The desecration of the trees, vegetation and protected wetland swales; not to mention, the inevitable disturbance of the existing owls, deer and other wild life, the very character of Penryn that the plan intended to preserve! The final report calls these negative impacts "significant and unavoidable". Yes, they are significant but they are NOT unavoidable. This is just a way to avoid confrontation and accomplish the planning department's goals! If I had wanted to live in a community of apartments, I would have moved to Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln or Auburn! And, why is it that my home was built on land of a pre-existing pear orchard and we removed no contaminated soil?

It is obvious that the County of Placer is set fast in accepting this high-density multi-family apartment development of 10 units per acre! Why? Is it because two previous projects, the Orchard condominiums on Boyington (8.5 units per acre) and the Penryn Townhomes, not yet built (7.5 units per acre), have already been approved? And, if the Orchard at Penryn is successfully approved at 10 units per acre, I would ask- how will it preserve and keep in character with the rural lifestyle of Penryn? Presently, there are 65 acres for sale in Penryn Parkway, 28 of which are being sold by Peter Halo, a realtor who stood up at the Planning Commission

Hearing and said the Orchard of Penryn "was the greatest thing that could happen to Penryn"! How many more parcels of land will follow suit? Ironically, the community design of the Penryn Parkway Plan specifically called for only one high-density area within the plan- the existing mobile home park on Auburn Folsom Road. Even the incorporated community of Loomis doesn't have as many apartments as Penryn will.

In the Statement of Findings and Overriding Considerations prepared by North Fork Associates (pages 39-41), it states that "CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly obtain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." There are four. The EIR concluded that the Alternative B, the Reduced Density Alternative (one-third less than the original proposal), "is environmentally superior to the proposed project because it avoids or reduces some of the project's significant effects. This alternative would reduce most of the proposed project's impacts, including impacts to biological resources, transportation and circulation, air quality, hydrology and water quality, utilities, . . . visual resources." However, the explanation went on to say that "this analysis demonstrates that the profit from the reduced unit count measured by the fixed development costs . . . and fixed operating costs would not allow a sufficient return on investment." I ask- when was the county ever responsible to the builder! These are risks that a builder must consider before investing!

I also read in the Planning Commission Staff Report (Number 5, page 12) that the Planning Commission found that the proposed project "will bring substantial benefits to the County" and that the "benefits outweigh the . . . unmitigated adverse impacts" BUT I saw no mention how it benefits Penryn! I find it strange, though, that Mr. Michael J. Johnson, Placer County's Planning Director, in his letter dated November 9, 2007 stated, "As proposed, I cannot see any substantial community benefit that would justify 10 units per acre. If no community benefits are proposed to justify a higher density, the maximum density staff can support is a density of four units per acre." I, at the Planning Commission Hearing, thinking that "benefits" meant the positives that this project would bring to the community of Penryn, stood up and asked the commissioners to expound on these benefits and the chairman's reply was, "We don't know. That is why we are here. You tell us." I was appalled! After the hearing, I sought out Mr. Michael Johnson only to find that the "benefits" that were justifiably accepted was money for the Del Oro pool and playground equipment for the Penryn Grammar School. You may be interested to know that I, without thinking, let the words "You mean money can change your decision?" slip out my mouth. Is that all that is required to turn the heads of our county planning department? I truly thought that our county representatives upheld the guidelines that they represent but I am sorely disappointed. I thought that their position was to uphold what is just and good for the residents of Penryn, NOT the county. I thought that these men surely must love Placer County and share the same values

that I do. I know that you cannot deny that Placer County is very unique in so many ways! I went away from that hearing very deflated. I went away with a new understanding- guidelines can be violated, heads can be turned away in favor of money that is called "benefits", and that growth, contrary to the sentiment of the very people who live in that community, is paramount. I must at this time, point out that the Final Orchard at Penryn Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared by Hausrath Economics Group (page 5) shows that this apartment complex will cost us, as Placer County taxpayers $203,200 to $240,000 per year for at least the next 20 years. Must our county government succumb to money over the common good of its people?

And, please, don't overlook this fact- the intent of the 166 acre Penryn Parkway, as stated by E. J. Ivaldi at the Placer County Planning Commission Hearing, "was to designate a concise, identifiable area that would encourage a compact commercial core, thereby, eliminating the need for scattered commercial sites within the outlying rural areas of Penryn." This is true. He continues, "The actual area of Penryn Parkway left to be developed . . . is intended as a highway service-oriented retail area which also allows for multiple family, residential uses and *that* is *specifically* stated with the Community Plan." This is also true. But, tell me- after all the remaining land designated for commercial use is approved for residential homes and apartments, how can Penryn ever become an incorporated city? Homes and apartments do not sustain cities. I see only one of two options for Penryn- to remain as is, unable to determine its own future or consider merging with Loomis! E. J. Ivaldi continues, "The land use designation of Penryn Parkway does not specify an allowable density or establish a minimum and maximum lot size; therefore, density is generally determined by the zoning designation." Here, I must object. It does! He overlooked stating that the Penryn Parkway designated the properties to be of "relatively low" density. So, what is "relatively low"? The answer is found in the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan (page 25)- low density is defined as 2.5 dwellings per acre to 1 dwelling per 2.3 acres, AND medium density as 2-4 dwellings per acre and high density as 4-10 dwellings per acre. Both zonings, as defined in the 15-acre property alone would allow 10 units per acre, BUT, because they are in the Penryn Parkway, the "relatively low" density applies and, according to county code, when there is a conflict in zoning, the community plan applies! In other words, the Penryn Parkway guidelines supersede zoning guidelines! Even at medium density defined as 2-4 dwellings, how could this project ever be approved at 10 dwellings? What an outrageous interpretation; or is it wishful thinking by way of the planning commission? They failed to properly consider and apply mandatory Community Plan standards when determining the project's plan. The Orchard at Penryn proposal is inconsistent with the policies set forth in the General and Community Plans and the Penryn Parkway! This violation must be stopped!

I am asking you, the Supervisors of Placer County, to please consider the overwhelming pleas that we, the citizens of Penryn, and Loomis, present before you. Please don't vote for an out-of-town San Diego developer whose only intent is to maximize density to maximize profits. It may be good for the county BUT it is NOT

GOOD for us, those who live in Penryn, a small, quiet community of homes scattered about the rolling hills, protected primarily by the ridge and Highway 80. We moved here to escape the big city. It is no secret; everyone who I know, as well as my family, came here to Penryn for the same reason- to live untouched by the progress that has surrounded us. The impact of this big, densely constructed project will substantially change the Penryn that we know, forever. We don't want to be a Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln or Auburn! I read in a recent Loomis News article that "sometimes some things are best left the way they are". Why change Penryn? It is just fine the way it is! There are plenty of properties with communities in Placer County that would love such a development as the Orchard of Penryn. The developer would need to change the name and, YES, this development could and would benefit all!

Sincerely,

Marianne L. Stovall

Marianne L. Stovall
1835 Willow Brook Lane
Penryn, California 95663
916-663-1064

Note- the underline, also within quotes, is added for emphasis.

Date: Mon, 17 Sep 2012 07:37:02 -0800
Subject: Stop the 150apts.
From: m3sewell@gmail.com
To: jholmes@placer.ca.gov
CC: glen.sewell@gmail.com; stop150apts@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Holmes,

I have been an official resident of Loomis for 4 years now, I currently reside just off of King Road near Taylor Rd. Although, my husband and his whole family have lived here in Loomis for over 35 years, We love this area and feel blessed everyday to be able to be here in such a wonderful, non-commuter town. Before here, we lived in Tracy for 17 years. Throughout those 17 years, we saw plenty of growth which in turn caused traffic congestion and pollution, over-crowding of our schools and in order for me to make sure my children got to school on time we would have to leave 35 minutes early and the school was about 5 blocks away.
We were attracted to this area not only because of our family roots, but because of the relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere, not much congestion and over-all "home town" feeling; That's what makes Loomis "Our Town". For the building of the approved apartments down the road from me, has me nervous. This Town we have is Beautiful and Enjoyed by so many wonderful families, and many more should be able to enjoy this atmosphere, but at what cost? I am close to schools and town, but if those approved apartments go up, there is no telling what kind of congestion, not only traffic wise but school wise as well, we will have to cope with on a daily basis. We already have an over abundance of Children populating our schools in this area, and without the proper planning and correct support and direction we would, as a community, suffer great consequences of overcrowding schools, streets and not to mention the "Home Town" feeling that will fly away with the wind. As a taxpayer and resident of Loomis, I urge you to **NOT** follow through with the building of these apartments and respect Loomis as the Town it was meant to be.

Thank You for your time,
Melanie Sewell
916-517-5364

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ✓ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/HN
SEP 24 2012
Michael Johnson
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ✓ SP

From: sarah martinez [mailto:smartinez160@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 7:53 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Penryn Orchards Project

I am not in favor of the Penryn Orchards Project on Penryn Road. As a 23-year-old resident of Penryn, I have hoped that I could always rely on the rural nature of this town. With the influx of at least 300 more people in this town, the character of Penryn is undoubtedly going to change for the worse. Please review the appeal and vote in favor of preserving Penryn's heritage by voting against this travesty.

Sarah Martinez
2332 Lynnwood Ln.
Penryn, CA 09663
916-652-0679

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
SEP 20 2012
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 ✓ SP

Michael Johnson

From: Shawna Martinez [mailto:flower14woman@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 7:09 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Penryn Orchard Apartments

This letter is in support of the appeal directed against the Orchard Apartments in Penryn. This project is not appropriate for Penryn and will encourage unbridled sprawl in future developments. The Penryn community plan calls for lower density housing in this area, and should be reflected in the zoning. In addition, this project will place an unfair burden on the rural schools in this area, traffic will be unmanageable on Taylor Rd, and it could possibly encourage higher crime rates in the Loomis basin. This is a bad plan for Penryn and the Board of Supervisors should repeal it.

Shawna Martinez
2332 Lynnwood Ln.
Penryn, CA 09663
916-652-0679

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo ✓
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓ Michael Johnson
RD/RH
SEP 20 2012

Sup D1___ Sup D4___ Aide D1___ Aide D4___
Sup D2___ Sup D5___ Aide D2___ Aide D5___
Sup D3___ Aide D3___ ✓ SP

From: Michelle Romero [mailto:mromero100@ymail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 10:01 PM
To: Teri Ivaldi
Subject: NO on 150 apts in penryn

I am strongly against the 150 unit Penryn apt project you will be hearing an appeal on (9/25). I won't enumerate my many reasons for why I object to the project. I'm sure you will see and hear all of the reasons why this is an inappropriately scaled project for the area when you review the appeal paperwork. Please examine these objectively and you will see that the project is wrong on many levels-- the EIR is inadequate, the flagrant violation of the community plan and zoning, and the unending financial-social-cultural-infrastructure impacts that we, the residents, will pay for indefinitely. The developer likes the project because he can take his profit and leave. There isn't any benefit to us

This is so evident that I am surprised the planning commission approved the project. We will live with the fallout of HD housing, and the flood gates of additional housing that it will trigger. This community was planned to be the way it is. People, including myself, bought here because of how it is and how the zoning **assured me it would be**. This project is a bait-and-switch on the residents. If I wanted city I would go to the city. But I don't want city which is why I sold my house in the city and moved here. D**o the duty you are in place to do...Please vote no.**

Michelle Romero
9020 Horseshoe Bar Rd
Loomis , CA 95650

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ✓ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
SEP 19 2012
Michael Johnson
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ✓ SP

From: Chuck-Muriel Davis [mailto:chamdavis@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2012 5:07 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Cc: Jim Holmes
Subject: Comment letter to BOS on the Orchard at Penryn project Appeal.

To: bos@placer.ca.gov

Please distribute the attached comment letter to all 5 supervisors for the Orchard at Penryn Appeal hearing.

Thank you,
Muriel Davis
9/19/12

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo ✓
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
SEP 20 2012
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * ✓ SP

Michael Johnson

RE: BOS hearing on the appeal of the Orchard at Penryn (PSUB 20070521) approval by the Planning Commission

September 19, 2012

TO: Board of Supervisors of Placer County

Here are a few of the many reasons for which we ask that you vote to rescind the Planning Commission approval of the project.

The EIR for the Orchard at Penryn project is INCOMPLETE:

The Chapter 14 Cumulative Impacts section of the EIR is **MISSING 3 development projects in the Penryn Parkway**, all of which are near the site of the Orchard at Penryn project!

1. The **85-unit Orchard Park** townhomes on Boyington, near I-80, is an ACTIVE project, and is not yet completed. This project may add 170 more cars and more than 170 more people to the Penryn Parkway area.

2. The **23-unit Penryn Townhomes** project on Penryn Rd, adjacent to the shopping center by I-80, has already been approved, although construction has not yet started. This project could add another 46 more cars and more than 46 more people to the Penryn Parkway area.

3. The **shopping center** (aka Penryn Outlets) at Penryn Rd and I-80 is still unfinished with its several phases of construction. As this center increases in size, the traffic will increase in the Penryn Parkway.

These three projects should have been included in the Cumulative Impact section; I had mentioned 2 of these projects back during the NOP process. No doubt, the significant impacts on the roads are really worse than reported in the EIR, since these three projects are NOT included in the cumulative impact section.

The Orchard at Penryn violates the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan (HBPCP) :

- The HBPCP says the Penryn Parkway is to be of "relatively low density" and the 10 units per acre, as proposed in this project, is considered high density in both the HBPCP and the General Plan. The community plan takes precedence over zoning!
- The project is inconsistent with the neighboring rural estates of 2.3+acres, and the HBPCP says that residential developments are to be "reasonably integrated with adjoining neighborhoods rather than physically isolated from their surroundings".
- The project destroys the natural resources, including trees, (e.g. 25 Blue Oak trees, which are endangered) and riparian areas, all of which the HBPCP was created to protect. The HBPCP says that the "Protection of site sensitive areas and adherence to the community plan will take precedence over the maximum number of lots allowed by zoning".

We request that you vote in favor of the Appeal and reject the Orchard at Penryn project as approved by the Planning Commission on June 28, 2012. The density of this project needs to be reduced to 4 dwellings per acre and be redesigned to preserve more of the natural resources, including the blue oaks and riparian areas, to be consistent with the neighboring rural agricultural estates, and to abide by the HBPCP design guidelines for the Penryn Parkway.

Sincerely,
Muriel & Chuck Davis
Penryn
9/19/12

From: Charles Gragg [mailto:c.gragg@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2012 8:17 AM
To: Teri Ivaldi
Subject: Orchard at Penryn Project

You must be acutely aware by now that the residents of Penryn and the
surrounding area have spoken in regard to reversing the approval of the
Penryn Orchards Project. I wont bore you with the details as they have
been presented to you and the other Supervisors on numerous occasions
over the past year. The Planning Commission approval of this project
was akin to them spitting in the face of citizens and joining forces
with the developer. A dangerous trend that must be reversed. I urge you
to do the right thing and vote to reverse the Planning Commissions
approval of this ill conceived project.

Charles H Gragg
Penryn, CA

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI CEO ✓ Other ✓
SEP 20 2012
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 ✓

Michael Johnson

From: Ronald Martinez [mailto:ronmartinez2010@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2012 1:26 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: The Orchards

Members of the Board,

I am a Penryn resident asking the Board to reconsider the preliminary approval of The Orchard project. An appeal hearing is scheduled before you on September 25 with the request to consider two appeals.

If approved, The Orchard Project will adversely impact the citizenry of Penryn and the Loomis Basin. This high density, rental property will have a negative impact upon our roads with significant vehicle traffic flowing down Taylor Road. It will impact the Loomis Schoold District by placing a greater burden upon a very high performing K-8 school, and will impact the PUHSD with Del Oro HS now enrolled with a maximum capacity of 1700 students. Furthermore, the impact upon Public Safety, though minimized in the EIR, will be significant. This development proposes high density rental units. Again, though minimized in the EIR, a review of any similar unit development such as Auburn Greens or Electric Street in Auburn will reflect a much higher Sheriff's Office call for service.

Perhaps the arguments in favor might support the project based upon two factors: private property rights and cost neutrality. Please don't accept these arguments! Private property rights are constitutionally guaranteed. But so are the rights of a community to plan, regulate and administer the type and location of development in a manner consistent with the vision and expectation of the citizenry. The cost impact upon local resources has not been fully recognized. Yes, school districts receive funding (but a a lower rate and not for the full cost of infrastructure needs, just check your local bond measures). Road impacts, traffic mitigation, infrastructure, and public safety costs for high density development are partially mitigated in development fees.

Please support the citizens of Penryn and the greater Loomis Basin, reconsider and reject The Orchards project.

Ron Martinez
2332 Lynnwood Lane
Penryn, CA

(916) 871-2641

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ___ CoCo ___
TSI ___ CEO ___ Other ___
DB/HH
SEP 21 2012
Michael Johnson

Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ *

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ___ CoCo ___
TSI ___ CEO ___ Other ___
DB/MH MJ
SEP 24 2012
489
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
D3 ___

From: Donna Delno [mailto:delnofamily@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 22, 2012 8:52 AM
To: Joyia Emard; Jim Holmes; gary@garyliss.com; penrynupdate@yahoo.com; chamdavis@yahoo.com; cherylschmit@att.net; jasuppal70@live.com; Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: 29 Loomis Crimes in 6 weeks. Unacceptable

Attention:
There has been almost 1 crime a day in Loomis since August 1st. Including a rape on 9/13 on Craig Street. Rape, car thefts, thefts, burglary, drugs...UNACCEPTABLE in our wonderful Loomis. and Penryn areas.

Please help me **NOT allow the 150 PENRYN APARTMENTS** for the sole reason that we cannot handle even our own residents, let alone another 500 people until the current crime problem is corrected and brought down for good. This is unacceptable and scary. I found all the data on crimemapping.com and entered the Loomis zip code, selected "no boundary" and the research dates of Aug 1 to Sept. 22. I am sure there is even more info not listed.
Donna Delno

Larceny-theft/ Except Motor Vehicle Theft	120008573	3900 BLOCK PEACH DR	Placer County Sheriff	9/19/2012 02:00 AM
Larceny-theft/ Except Motor Vehicle Theft	120008555	5500 BLOCK BROOKS AV	Placer County Sheriff	9/18/2012 07:30 PM
Larceny-theft/ Except Motor Vehicle Theft	120008451	6200 BLOCK BRACE RD	Placer County Sheriff	9/16/2012 05:05 PM
Forcible Rape	120008482	5900 BLOCK CRAIG CT	Placer County Sheriff	9/13/2012 03:00 PM
DUI Alcohol/ Drug	120008316	3900 BLOCK TAYLOR RD	Placer County Sheriff	9/12/2012 06:39 PM
Larceny-theft/ Except Motor Vehicle Theft	120008277	6600 BLOCK HIGH CLIFF RD	Placer County Sheriff	9/8/2012 12:00 PM
Larceny-theft/ Except Motor Vehicle Theft	120008170	3900 BLOCK SIERRA COLLEGE BL	Placer County Sheriff	9/7/2012 10:00 AM
Theft From Locked Vehicle	120008364	CONNIE CT/ MARGARET DR	Placer County	9/6/2012 10:00 PM

Larceny-theft/ Except Motor Vehicle Theft	120007215	3900 BLOCK TAYLOR RD	Placer County Sheriff	8/11/2012 08:50 AM
Drunk In Public	120007131	3400 BLOCK REYMAN LN	Placer County Sheriff	8/8/2012 08:38 PM
Assault/ Battery Simple	120007132	6000 BLOCK THORNWOOD DR	Placer County Sheriff	8/8/2012 12:10 PM
Vehicle Theft	120007063	3900 BLOCK TAYLOR RD	Placer County Sheriff	8/6/2012 09:00 PM
Mail Theft	120006985	6300 BLOCK KING RD	Placer County Sheriff	8/4/2012 02:00 PM
Felony Drug Offense	120006915	6200 BLOCK BRACE RD	Placer County Sheriff	8/2/2012 08:26 PM
Assault/ Battery Simple	120006875	3300 BLOCK MARGARET DR		

Michael Johnson

From: Renee [mailto:renee@starstream.net]
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 9:15 AM
To: Teri Ivaldi
Subject: 150 Apts.

My name is Renee Altaffer. I have lived in Penryn for 15 years. I do not want the 150 Apt. project approved for Penryn. Please respect the area you represent and vote no on the building of this project and others like it.

Renee Altaffer
7069 Kayo Drive
Penryn, CA 95663
916-663-4964

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
PB/NA
SEP 24 2012

Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ ✓ SP

Michael Johnson

Michael Johnson

492

From: Jerald Starkey [mailto:jerclaudstarkey@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 11:12 AM
To: Teri Ivaldi
Subject: vote: Stop 150 Apartments

My husband and I bought five acres in Penryn in 1977. We moved here when the population was listed as 1500. We built our home; we raised our family. We have a barn, a chickenhouse; we have sheep, horses, chickens, a goat, as well as cats and dogs. Our zoning is us: we are Rural Residential.

As members of this small community, we have purchased with our work and with our resources the life we value most. Our daily commitment to our home and land spans 35 years, so far. We are here for the duration.

In 1991, the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan was worked on and carefully written by community members trying hard to preserve our rural lifestyle while allowing for some reasonable growth. The Plan, adopted by the County, specified that development "shall" be of "relatively low density," allowing high density in only one 12 acre area, to recognize an existing mobile home park. A primary goal of the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan was/is to maintain the unique rural character of the area. This was not a casual goal.

Flash-forward to present day: a San Diego developer intends to build 150 family apartments on a 15 acre parcel. A low density or even medium density definition would yield a maximum of 60 apartments. The outrageous request of 10 units per acre --- 150 apartments --- should not even be momentarily entertained. Placer County's Zoning Ordinance provides that when there is a conflict between the Community Plan and the zoning, the Community Plan prevails.

The Community Plan is in place to protect our community. It was created, carefully crafted with discussion and compromise, and adopted by Placer County in 1991. Neither the [unelected] Planning Commission nor any subsequent Board of Supervisors should be allowed to subvert the specific intent or the specific definitions of a duly-adopted Community Plan.

No San Diego developer should be granted the ability to ruin a northern California rural community just because they bought some land and designed a profit-making apartment complex.

I respectfully request that, as a Placer County Supervisor, you **uphold** the Penryn Community's legal right to determine the amount and direction of development in their small part of Placer County.

Sincerely,

Claudia Starkey
7175 Allen Lane
Penryn, California 95663

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ___ COB ✓ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/HN
SEP 24 2012

Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ✓ SP

Michael Johnson

From: Michelle Rossetti [mailto:iambugged@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 4:02 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Subject: Proposed PENRYN Appts

To The Board of Supervisors:
I am against the Orchard Apartment Complex considered for PENRYN town because of these reasons:
1. Increase of traffic
2. Degradation of rural life
3. Probable increase in crime
4. Homeowners / property owners monetary investment in community vs renters non monetary investment 5. No real need for rental apartments in Penryn 6. Negative impact on our schools 7. Decrease in desirability as a place to live.

I hope you consider your current constitutes and take a NO stance on continuing to promote this unnecessary and unwelcome development into our community.
Regards,
Michelle Rossetti
Penryn School Parent and Placer County Homeowner/Voter

Sent from my iPhone

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/MJ
SEP 26 2012

Michael Johnson

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * ✓ SP

RECEIVED 494

OCT 05 2012

CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

From: Jenny Terhorst [mailto:wildlife_jt@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 6:40 PM
To: Jenny at home
Subject: Please STOP the building of Walmart in Auburn!

Dear Placer County Board of Supervisors Members -

Please reopen the Environmental Impact Report to address the facts that the toxins (dioxins and furans) were not considered during the EIR process, as well as to consider the economic effects leading to the blight and decay now that the project is a known Walmart.

Thank you,
A concerned resident

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓ Michael Johnson

SEP 25 2012

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 * ✓ SP

From: **Paul Katz** <pckatz@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Sep 28, 2012 at 8:11 AM
Subject: 150 apartment project on Penryn Road
To: bos@placer.ca.gov

Dear BOS,

This is just a quick note to tell you why my wife and I adamantly oppose the 150 apartments and to implore you to do everything in your power to stop them and to put in place any rules and regulations to safeguard us from future projects as well. This proposed project will degrade the very life and rural atmosphere that attracted these people to build their high density housing here.

When my wife and I moved here from an area of Roseville that was once low density but has continued to high density as was planned we were assured that this area was committed to low density by its people and it's long term plan. We feel betrayed! If I wanted to live on the corner of Sunrise and Cirby I would have stayed in Roseville where I knew the plan was high density housing. Don't let this happen here.

There are plenty of areas for higher density housing. Just because someone owns some land and sees an opportunity to make a lot of money here is no reason to compromise the lives of those of us who were promised a less congested life. This is how this starts. If this development is allowed to proceed the precedent is set and others will follow. You will not be able to deny others the opportunity to make money if this project opens the door.

Please stop this project.

Sincerely,

Susan and Paul Katz
3311 Sierra Springs Ct.
Penryn

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
DB/MB
SEP 28 2012
Michael Johnson

Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 ✓ SP

-----Original Message-----
From: Kay [mailto:kdukes@starstream.net]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2012 11:46 AM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Cc: Jim Homes@bos@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Penryn Apts

Please reconsider what the impact the 150 apartments will have on our downtown Loomis area. We love our small town and don't need more traffic, noise and pollution.

Thank you.

Kathryn Dukes

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ✓ CoCo
TSI ✓ CEO ✓ Other ✓
SB/HN
OCT - 1 2012
Michael Johnson
Sup D1 Sup D4 Aide D1 Aide D4
Sup D2 Sup D5 Aide D2 Aide D5
Sup D3 Aide D3 ✓ SP