



Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

TR-TAC: Village East LLC's application for a "zone change"

1 message

Sandy Sloan <sandy.sloan@gmail.com>
 To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us, Sandy Sloan <sandy.sloan@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 27, 2015 at 11:18 AM

Please make my comments available to TR-TAC

I am writing to put in the record my comments made at the April 10, 2015 TR-TAC meeting.

I have been a resident of Kirkwood for 35 years, first on Hawkweed and now in East Meadows. I am also a real estate and land use attorney in the Bay Area.

As a member of the Kirkwood community, I was closely involved in negotiating with the Resort over the details of the Specific Plan. Our friends of Kirkwood Association undertook surveys of residents' concerns, held community meetings, meetings with the PUD and meetings with the developer. Every section of the Specific Plan is important.

The request before you is very serious. It is not an application for design review or a use permit. It is an application to amend the Specific Plan, which for Kirkwood is our General Plan—our constitution. This particular site was to be for residents of the valley—for a school or for parks and recreation—uses for residents, not for day time skiers.

The EIR and Specific Plan sections addressing this area were well thought out and carefully crafted. To show you how important the use restrictions were on the site, I want to share with you a copy of a letter that Jim Hinton, then President of the KMA Homeowners Association wrote in 2002. Even though the Specific Plan contained the restriction of use to parks and recreation, Mr. Hinton wanted to make sure that the Final EIR itself was corrected to contain the restriction of use. That parking was prohibited was so important, KMA and the entire community wanted to make sure it was noted in every document.

To rezone this area for surface parking would be a travesty. It would also be inconsistent with at least two dozen objectives and policies of the Specific Plan. To name a few:

- Setting development back from stream beds (p. 27)
- Minimizing impervious surfaces (Conditions of Approval, p. 8)
- Minimizing large expanses of unnecessary surface parking (p. 41)
- Screening parking facilities from public view (p. 41)
- Minimizing congestion (p.41)
- Visual compatibility (p. 81)
- Encouragement of parking garages (p.26)
- All of Chapter 7 on Natural Resource Conservation (p.73)

The proposal is also inconsistent with the Master Parking Plan which is incorporated into the Specific Plan by reference on page 42.

Others have talked and will talk about the foolishness of putting a parking lot on this site next to the PUD infrastructure, the destruction of a heavily treed area, the negative visual impact, the loss of a recreational trail for hiking and cross country skiing, but I wanted to focus on how this proposal would gut the integrity of the Specific Plan.

Recently Vail Resort proposed widening Kirkwood Meadows Drive and placing parking on both sides of the road—a proposition opposed by the community. Now a Kirkwood development entity is proposing this ill-founded huge surface parking lot for the benefit of the Resort. This piecemeal approach is unacceptable and contrary to the law. What is the Resort planning? What do the annual parking reports show? Is more parking needed? Does the Master Parking Plan need to be updated? If so, an overall approach is needed and most likely multi-level parking structures need to be built. Kirkwood Capital Partners (and all its real estate entities) needs to work with

4/27/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - TR-TAC: Village East LLC's application for a "zone change"

the Resort to determine if more parking is needed and work with the community on a compact solution.

Sprawl is never good, especially in a beautiful rural environment in a recreational setting where view corridors are paramount.

If this proposal goes forward, a full EIR would be needed. However, this proposal should be rejected immediately before any more time is wasted on it.

Thank you,
Sandy Sloan



(9 pages)

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Fwd: TC-TAC School Site Parking Lot Comments

1 message

Aaron Mount <aaron.mount@edcgov.us>
To: Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Tue, Apr 28, 2015 at 8:49 AM

Kirkwood Comments

Aaron Mount
Associate Planner

County of El Dorado
Community Development Agency
Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5355 / FAX (530) 642-0508
aaron.mount@edcgov.us

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

From: **Sandy McKay** <SMcKay@kmpud.com>
Date: Tue, Apr 28, 2015 at 8:48 AM
Subject: TC-TAC School Site Parking Lot Comments
To: "Aaron Mount (aaron.mount@edcgov.us)" <aaron.mount@edcgov.us>, "Chuck Beatty (cbeatty@amadorgov.org)" <cbeatty@amadorgov.org>, "Zach Wood (zwood@alpinecountyca.gov)" <zwood@alpinecountyca.gov>
Cc: Michael Sharp <msharp@kmpud.com>, Terry Woodrow <twoodrow@alpinecountyca.gov>, "LMorgan@amadorgov.org" <LMorgan@amadorgov.org>, Brian Peters <bpeters@alpinecountyca.gov>, Susan Grijalva <sgrijalva@amadorgov.org>, "Casey Blann (CBlann@vailresorts.com)" <CBlann@vailresorts.com>, "Nate Whaley (nwhaley@kirkwoodcp.com)" <nwhaley@kirkwoodcp.com>, "Sandy Sloan (sandy.sloan@gmail.com)" <sandy.sloan@gmail.com>, Allan Sapp <allansapp@gmail.com>, "Geoff Smith (gmssmith@ix.netcom.com)" <gmssmith@ix.netcom.com>, Standish O'Grady <sho@ogrady.us>, "Eric Richert (eric.richert@gmail.com)" <eric.richert@gmail.com>, Peter Dornbrook <kmpudboarddornbrook@gmail.com>, Bob Epstein <bob@bobepstein.to>, Bob Ende <rende@mac.com>

TC-TAC Committee Members:

Attached please find additional comments from the Kirkwood Meadows Public Utility District regarding the proposed school site parking lot in Kirkwood, along with a copy of the TC-TAC's formation agreement as referenced in the letter. We look forward to further discussion on this subject at the May 8th meeting.

Thank you,

Sandy

Sandy McKay

Project Coordinator

4/28/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: TC-TAC School Site Parking Lot Comments

Kirkwood Meadows Public Utility District

P.O. Box 247, 33540 Loop Road

Kirkwood, CA 95646

209-258-4444 x110

www.kmpud.com

2 attachments



TC-TAC School Site Parking 04272015.pdf
146K



TC-TAC Formation Document Rev 1992.pdf
413K



**KIRKWOOD MEADOWS
PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**

April 27, 2015
Via email

Mr. Aaron Mount
EL DORADO COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
2850 Fair Lane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
aaron.mount@edcgov.us

Mr. Chuck Beatty
AMADOR COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642
cbeatty@amadorgov.org

Mr. Zach Wood
ALPINE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
50 Diamond Valley Road
Markleeville, CA 96120
zwood@alpinecountyca.gov

Re: **Kirkwood Specific Plan Amendment and Rezone – School Site Parking Lot**

Dear Tri-County Technical Advisory Committee Members:

Please accept this as further correspondence and request for clarification from the Kirkwood Meadows Public Utility District (District) regarding Village East, LLC's proposed Specific Plan Amendment and Rezone to allow for a parking lot at the currently zoned school site at Kirkwood.

At the Tri-County Technical Advisory Committee (TC-TAC) meeting held on April 10, 2015 the Committee heard many questions raised by Kirkwood community members, but it was left unclear as to who and when these questions would be answered. The District has been fielding many information requests asking if these questions will be addressed. It would be beneficial if TC-TAC could answer these questions and at least provide a timeline or framework on dealing with public review at the next meeting scheduled for Friday, May 8th. As an ex-officio member of the Committee, the District would like to understand how the many issues raised will be addressed by TC-TAC.

The Committee divided the proposal into two parts, the zoning change request and the actual construction aspects that would be handled under a separate proposal.

As far as the zoning change, the Committee wanted to insure that the application is complete, while leaving the decision making process to the Amador Planning Commission and the Amador Board of Supervisors. Please confirm that TC-TAC will not only make sure that the application is complete, but will also make a recommendation as to the appropriateness of this proposal. Attached is the TC-TAC formation document which states that the purpose of this Committee is to "develop and implement a cooperative and integrated program of land-use regulation for the Planning Area in order that the unique aesthetic attributes of the Planning Area shall be preserved and strengthened". Given this stated purpose, it is important that the Committee address the land use issues raised and recommend whether the proposal conforms to the existing Specific Plan and Master Parking Plan, and whether the proposal is consistent with Kirkwood's "unique aesthetic attributes".

The District has significant concerns and needs to understand how these concerns will be resolved, including:

P.O. Box 247
Kirkwood, CA 95646
www.kmpud.com

(209) 258-4444
Fax (209) 258-8727
e-mail: kmpud@volcano.net

TC-TAC Public Comment
PC Rcvd 04-27-15 to 04-28-15

1. The number of parking spaces proposed will, at times, create a volume of auto and pedestrian traffic on the north leg of Loop Road that will prevent emergency vehicles from responding quickly to emergency calls. Existing parking lots already prevent use of the south leg of Loop Road when skier traffic is present; the proposal will at times completely block emergency traffic from moving quickly from the District's firehouse and onto Kirkwood Meadows Drive.
2. The parking lot location will cause more cars and people to be walking and driving very close to the District's main propane tanks, dispensing equipment, the District's emergency diesel fuel tank and the Wastewater Treatment Plant. How will this significant safety and security problem be addressed?
3. The District is concerned about additional parking lot runoff draining into the meadow, and ultimately into the groundwater supply. There may be ways to mitigate this risk, but the current proposal provides no indication of mitigation nor even acknowledgment that the risk exists.


Additionally, the District recommends the 2001 Master Parking Plan, referenced as the governing document for parking in Chapter 5 of the Kirkwood Specific Plan, be reviewed to insure that the guidelines set forth are being followed.

At the close of the April 10th meeting TC-TAC requested from the proponent: 1) a broader aerial view of the site (north and east), likely in two maps to preserve the scale, showing all of Loop Road (Firehouse ingress and egress) and East Meadows; 2) a Metes and Bounds description for alignment and an affinity map showing tree locations and other descriptions of the 2-acre site made as an overlay to the map(s); and 3) to provide alternative solutions and a justification of the project. The District supports and appreciates these requests.

In summary the District asks that in reviewing the proposed project, the Committee consider all safety issues raised and adherence to the planning documents that govern development within Kirkwood.

Please let me know if you have any questions on the above comments.

Sincerely,



Michael Sharp
General Manager

Attachment: TC-TAC Formation Document

cc: KMPUD Board of Directors
Terry Woodrow
Lynn Morgan
Brian Peters
Susan Grijalva
Casey Blann
Nate Whaley
Parking Committee

AGREEMENT

This agreement is made and entered into this 15th day of September, 1992, by and between the Counties of Alpine, Amador, and El Dorado, referred to hereinafter as the "Counties".

WHEREAS, the Counties have certain common boundaries as set forth in Attachment "A" hereto, which attachment is incorporated hereinafter by reference as though set forth in full; and

WHEREAS, State Highway 88 is an increasingly heavily trafficked major regional highway through the Sierra Nevada; and

WHEREAS, Said Highway 88 forms or is close to a boundary between Amador and El Dorado Counties; and

WHEREAS, Kirkwood Meadows is a ski development located at the intersection of all three Counties' boundaries; and

WHEREAS, the increasing pressure for development along Highway 88 and in Kirkwood Meadows has caused the Counties to recognize the need for cooperation and communication regarding the Counties' land-use planning for the area impacted by said Highway and Kirkwood Meadows; and

WHEREAS, the Counties desire to cooperate and communicate regarding their land-use regulation for said impacted area, which is more particularly described as the area adjacent to Highway 88 east from Dew Drop in Amador County to its intersection with

Highway 89 at Picketts Junction in Alpine County and then along Highway 89 to Luther Pass and the parts of the three Counties which are affected by development along said routes (the "Planning Area" hereinafter); and

WHEREAS, each County maintains a technical advisory committee of land-use planners, public work officials, sanitarians, and similar officials; and

WHEREAS, the Counties desire to work together to regulate the development of the Planning Area cooperatively to communicate with each other as to proposed development in the Planning Area.

THE PARTIES HERETO AGREE as follows:

1. It is the purpose of this agreement to develop and implement a cooperative and integrated program of land-use regulation for the Planning Area in order that the unique aesthetic attributes of the Planning Area shall be preserved and strengthened. The meetings held pursuant to this agreement shall attempt to promote and carry out said purpose. However, the Counties and any boards, commissions, or other official bodies or persons acting on the Counties' behalf shall not be bound by any recommendation of the Tri-County Technical Advisory Committee (TC-TAC) but shall consider such recommendation prior to carrying out the policies of the County.

2. The TC-TAC shall consist of technical advisory staff from each County and shall include representatives from El Dorado National Forest, Toiyabe National Forest and Kirkwood Meadows Public Utility District as ex-officio members of the Committee.

Said Committee shall meet as set forth herein in order to report, review and advise each other on proposed developments and other events which may occur in or otherwise affect the Planning Area and shall make recommendation to the affected County or Counties. Said meetings shall occur on reasonable notice whenever called by the Planning Director or other designated person in any of the Counties.

3. Said meetings shall be held in the County Seat of the County calling the meeting unless the Planning Directors or other designated persons agree that said meeting shall be held elsewhere. Each County shall bear its own costs incurred by the members of the Technical Advisory Committee in attending said meetings.

4. Said TC-TAC shall review the needs for public services in the Planning Area and shall advise their respective Counties on said needs in order to ensure that said needs are reviewed by the Counties when said Counties are deciding on any proposed development in the Planning Area.

5. The TC-TAC, or member thereof, shall keep the respective boards of supervisors and planning commissions of each County informed as to any development proposed in or affecting the Planning Area and, further, shall keep said boards and commissions informed as to the actions recommended at any meetings of the TC-TAC. Copies of the minutes of said meetings of the TC-TAC shall promptly and regularly sent to the respective boards of supervisors and planning commissions of each County.

6. Semi-annually the boards of supervisors of the

Counties shall meet jointly in order to review each County's land-use policies regarding the Planning Area, provided however, that said boards may meet more often than semi-annually as they seem advisable. The semi-annual meetings of the boards of supervisors shall be held at a time and location agreeable to the boards, at which time said boards shall review land-use, public services, and related matters from the operators, property owners, and residents of the Planning Area, and other members of the public.

7. In order for the TC-TAC to be informed as to proposed development in the Planning Area, the planning director or other designated person in each of the Counties shall be responsible to give notice of any meeting or hearing at which any proposed development in the Planning Area may be discussed by any County board, commission, or other official body or person to his counterparts in other Counties. In addition, the planning director or other designated person in each County shall report to the planning directors or other designated persons in other Counties on actions taken or decisions made regarding any proposed development in the Planning Area by any board, commission, or other official body or person in the County.

8. The meetings of the TC-TAC shall be held pursuant to the provisions of the Brown Act, Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 54950) of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code of the State of California.

9. This agreement may be terminated by any one of the Counties giving notice to the other Counties that the first County

desires to terminate the agreement.

10. The Planning Area as defined herein or other provisions of this agreement may be reviewed by the TC-TAC on an annual basis. Any proposed amendments shall be referred to each County's Board of Supervisors for approval.

Dated: October 20, 1992 C. J...
Alpine County

ATTEST:

Barbara K Jones
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dated: October 9, 1992 [Signature]
Amador County

ATTEST:

Catherine J. Gianini
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dated: September 15, 1992 Vernon F. Gentry
El Dorado County
VERNON F. GENTRY, Chairman

ATTEST:

Margaret E. Moody
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
(LOUISE/TC-TAC.AGR)