

Draft Responses to Comment Letter T

Individual
 Robert Beale
 March 14, 2013

	Comment	Response to Comment
T-1	<p>My family has lived and farmed this land in the Japatul Valley for 85 years. We have been good neighbors to the people who have come in long after my family settled their land, and we have tried to be conscientious concerning the environment.</p> <p>We waited patiently during the General Plan Update (I served on the group that created the first Alpine Community Plan), and then we waited through the FCI review for county staff to initiate a discussion of the Japatul Valley lands. It never came up. Never was mentioned.</p>	<p>This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.</p>
T-2	<p>Not until our near neighbor, Mary Kay Borchard asked when would be appropriate to bring up a request for a reclassification from 40 acre to 20 acre, did staff respond that he doubted any change could be made of that sort.</p> <p>I have 2 wells. One pumps over 500 gallons a minute; the other pumps over 300. My land and my neighbors' lands are gently rolling topography. Our lands together touch lands that are developed at 8 acre minimum, and are far more 'challenged' than ours.</p>	<p>The County acknowledges the request for a Rural Lands 20 (RL-20) designation for the commenter's property on Japatul Lane. The RL-20 designation is consistent with the Draft Plan/draft SEIR Proposed Project, as was recommended by the Alpine Community Planning Group (CPG).</p> <p>However, it should be noted that County staff recommendation is for a lower density designation of Rural Lands 40 (RL-40) for the Japatul Valley area. For reference, this Area of Consideration has been named "AL-8" in the staff report and has been highlighted as an area for discussion during the upcoming public hearing process.</p> <p>The County staff working group that formulated the staff recommendation for AL-8 found that the RL-40 designation</p>

Draft Responses to Comments

	Comment	Response to Comment
		<p>was more appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The subject area is virtually surrounded by National Forest lands. b. Many of the parcels in this area are only accessible by dead-end roads that exceed County Fire Code standards. c. Additional development would require construction of new roads through steep terrain (slopes greater than 25%) to existing roads approximately 1.6 miles apart. d. Further improvement of infrastructure in the subject area, including utilities and road access, would have an adverse impact on wilderness values and would increase the need for fuel management for fire safety. e. The RL-40 density is consistent with how the General Plan land use map applies the RL-40 designation in remote areas with large parcelization outside the County Water Authority boundary. <p>While County staff will be recommending the lower density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres for AL-8, the final determination will ultimately be made by the County Board of Supervisors.</p>
<p>T-3</p>	<p>If we are allowed this change in classification from 40 to 20, any development would involve a road causing Japatul Lane to cease being a dead end road and cause it to connect to Japatul Valley Road south of us. I'm told this creates "connectivity" –something that is desired in fire country.</p>	<p>The property referenced by this comment is more than one mile from a public road (Japatul Valley Road) along a dead-end road. This exceeds the County Fire Code Dead-end Road Requirements, which limits the maximum length of a dead-end road at one mile. Exceeding these standards would prevent further subdivision on this property.</p> <p>The comment assumes that the RL-20 density would result in construction of a road that would create additional connectivity. The County does not agree with this reasoning. Any connectivity improvements would require the</p>

Draft Reponses to Comments

	Comment	Response to Comment
		construction of a nearly two-mile long road over steep terrain. This type of construction is not likely to be economically feasible given (1) the expense of the road, (2) the requirement to cluster development, and (3) the limited subdivision potential, even at a density of one dwelling unit per 20 acres.
T-4	The Alpine Planning Group heard request for RL-20 and approved it overwhelmingly. I do not see anything that specifically addresses us in the SEIR that the public has been asked to comment upon.	<p>The County agrees that the Alpine CPG supports the request for RL-20 for the properties in this area. In this case, staff’s recommendation differs from the Alpine CPG recommendation.</p> <p>The Draft Plan analyzed in the draft SEIR as the Proposed Project showed the RL-20 designation for the Japatul Valley area (AL-8).</p>
T-5	<p>I am joining my neighbors in reasserting that development of this sort in the Japatul Valley will be beneficial to the environment, and will also brighten our economy out here.</p> <p>We ask you to look with favor on our request, as it is reasonable and proper.</p>	The County acknowledges the commenter’s request, which will be included in the Final SEIR and made available to the decision makers for consideration.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK