

**Draft Responses to Comment Letter C**

**Individual  
Gail Mazzola  
February 20, 2013**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
<b>C -1</b>	My mother Mary Ellen Mazzola and I own 28+ acres on Alpine Blvd. bounded by Farlin Road, better known to the County as APN 406-12-13 and 406-14-05.	This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required. However, upon review of the two assessor parcel numbers provided, the correct numbers being referenced are APN 406-120-13 and 406-140-05.
<b>C -2</b>	In February 2011, when we were told that the Forest Initiative had expired, my mother wrote a letter to you (copy attached) asking that the property be considered for realistic zoning, given our frontage on Alpine Boulevard (all the way to the East Willows map) and the proximity of the Casino right across the Highway. This was well before the study started on our lands.	Staff is in receipt of the letter referenced by the commenter and this information was used to develop a preliminary recommendation at the beginning of the planning process.
<b>C -3</b>	Much later, in the fall of 2012, we saw a map brought to the APG meeting by County staff that called for 1 acre land use classification on our property, and we were alright with that; except that we thought we should have a little bit of commercial on the part of the property that was right at the off ramp.	The Proposed Project developed by a subcommittee of the Alpine Planning Group includes a Rural Commercial designation on a portion of the subject property near the off ramp, as requested by the commenter. However, the remainder of the property went from Semi Rural 1 (SR-1) in the early planning stages to Semi Rural 4 (SR-4) in the Proposed Project. Discussion and rationale for the SR-4 designation is provided in the response to comment C-4 below. (This area is referenced as AL-6 in the rationale provided for the staff recommendation.)
<b>C -4</b>	Together, we attended the Public Action subcommittee held on March 15 <sup>th</sup> . My job requires me to work late into the evening and my mother travels a great deal. It was an effort for us to attend that meeting, but we made it in order to ask	County staff concurs that while the small portion near the off ramp is proposed to be Rural Commercial, the remainder of the property is proposed to be SR-4 under the Proposed Project.

**Draft Responses to Comments**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
	<p>for the change to commercial on that section of our property. When we left, we both believed that the only change to the classification was that our corner would be commercial. Just recently we were told by neighbors that our property and theirs has been changed to 4 acre minimum! It seems crazy planning to be backing up commercial zoning with 4 acre – and, we don’t even know when this happened. We received no notification of any change, and when you work for a living, you can’t keep attending meetings.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project land use map was developed by a subcommittee of the Alpine Planning Group, which held multiple workshops to determine its land use recommendation for the area, including the commenter’s parcels. These workshops were well attended by area residents; however, there was a significant difference of opinion among the community representatives. At the April 26, 2012 meeting, the Alpine Planning Group recommended a land use map that included the SR-4 designation on the subject property. This map became the Draft Plan / SEIR Proposed Project.</p> <p>County staff is in support of the SR-4 designation for the majority of this property. However, the staff recommendation assigns a SR-1 to the two parcels located at the on/off ramps to Interstate 8 at the eastern end of Willows Road. One of these parcels, APN 406-140-05, is owned by the commenter. The higher density is proposed for these two parcels due to their adjacency to the on-ramps (see AL-6 in the rationale provided for the staff recommendation).</p>
<p><b>C -5</b></p>	<p>If any of my neighbors had opposed the 1 acre minimum, I would have been alerted to try to stay on top of it, but none did. Who out there has more “say” on our property than the people who live in the area? It did not appear that this was a recommendation by the county staff.</p> <p>Since I have been told that this is a time for comment, this is my comment: Please restore the 1 acre minimum that we, at the east end of Alpine Blvd., thought we had. I have read my neighbor Len Nielsen’s letter and am in agreement with it.</p>	<p>The County appreciates this comment and acknowledges the request for the SR-1 designation. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will consider this information and will ultimately make the final decision regarding which land use designation to apply.</p>