

Draft Responses to Comment Letter N

Individual  
 Charles A. Jerney  
 March 12, 2013

	Comment	Response to Comment
N -1	My name is Charles Jerney. I live on Star Valley Rd. in Alpine. My family has resided in Alpine since 1952. I have seen many changes and have observed many not so intelligent moves in California in the past several years. Currently there is a push by a few new residents living in the area East of Alpine to impose limitations on long term property owners attempting to curtail development. My family is not currently considering any type of development; however, now is the time to change density rules and regulations which will allow my children or Grandchildren to develop family property in the future, if they should so desire.	This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.
N -2	The community of Alpine will need to grow in the future in order to remain viable. Development will require the annexation of the area East of Alpine into the water district and installation of city water piping into the area. Currently there is a County requirement of five acres of land in order to secure a well permit. There is however the possibility of creating satellite water districts within the former FCI lands. My family is not considering this course of action either.	The County acknowledges that certain areas of Alpine are groundwater dependant and would require annexation and extension of water services to support increased density. It is unclear what the commenter means regarding the possibility of creating satellite water districts within the former FCI lands.
N -3	The crux of my message is that the 68 acres currently owned by my family within the former FCI lands area consisting of 4 parcels and containing two residences will not be further developed within the foreseeable future. The comments by three current members of the ACPG against the changes in density of the former FCI lands are not founded in reality.	The County acknowledges that the commenter and adjacent neighbor do not intend to further develop their respective properties in the foreseeable future.

**Draft Reponses to Comments**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
	My long time friend and neighbor to the East of me sharing a common boundry is also not planning to develop his 468 acres.	
<b>N -4</b>	Roadway changes at this time and calling for infrastructure seem to be placing the cart before the horse, so to speak.	The General Plan, and this General Plan Amendment, do not directly change roadways. Such changes occur through the Capital Improvements Program. However, General Plan changes result in the reservation of rights-of-way to plan for future roadway expansions. In accordance with state law, all elements of a general plan must be consistent with one another. Therefore, the Mobility Element must “provide feasible remedies for the predicted traffic congestion” that would follow development of the land use map. For these reasons, the FCI Lands GPA includes updates to the Mobility Element and Road Network.
<b>N -5</b>	Larger parcel property owners are attempting to make needed changes for the future. The Long Term future. Not the short term future. As development occurs changes will accompany the development at the time. To impose unrealistic development limitations and severely limiting infrastructure restrictions which are currently being proposed by a few residents living on 1 to 2 acres within the former FCI lands at this time; are to kill any future Alpine may have. I also have a question as to how an individual with 1.4 acres of land located on CasaDeRoca gained a water well permit. This same person is one of the more vocal in opposition to planned future development. If you have any questions feel free to contact me.	It is unclear what this comment means or what the commenter is requesting. Therefore, no further response is provided.