

ITEM 1 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 001

From: [Susie Lacy](#)
To: [CPAC-Antelope](#)
Cc: "[Susie Lacy](#)"
Subject: Tierra Del Sol PLNP2019-00014
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 8:38:34 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Good Morning,

As a Homeowner in this area and licensed Real Estate Broker I oppose this project. The last thing Quiet Knolls needs is more dense, rental housing.

Sincerely,

Susie Lacy
Broker/Owner
Realty World Lacy & Spadoni Inc
(916) 837-0703
Lic # 01057370 Since 1989
www.susielacy.com

ITEM 1 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 002

From: [Gloria Frantz](#)
To: [CPAC-Antelope](#); [Biner, Marianne](#); [Rose, Kate](#)
Cc: gigifrantz2@yahoo.com
Subject: PLNP2019-00014: Tierra Del Sol
Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 6:48:10 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Council Members:

I live at [8029 Quiet Knolls Drive](#) which is directly across the street from the proposed project, specifically Lot 6. I have two specific areas of concern that I would like addressed with the inclusion of additional Conditions of Approval on the project entitlement. I would like to ensure that the proposed building layouts and driveway encroachment location along Quiet Knolls Drive proposed by the Applicant are not revised after Approval of the entitlement. I request that the following two Conditions of Approval be applied to the proposed project to ensure that the proposed building layout and driveway encroachment location will be maintained through the development and construction process and not changed after project approval:

1. The Building Permits for the structures on Lots 1 through 9 shall be required to be constructed with the balcony location over the garage on the southeast side of the buildings as shown and proposed by the Applicant on Exhibit P4.
2. The Improvement Plans shall show the construction of the northeast side of the southernmost driveway encroachment onto Quiet Knolls Drive in a location that is no further northeast than the existing soundwall on the northwest side of Quiet Knolls Drive as shown and proposed by the Applicant on the preliminary Grading Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gloria J Frantz
8029 Quiet Knolls Dr
Antelope Ca 95843
916-835-8895

Sent from my iPhone

ITEM 1 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 003

From: [Luis Tomas](#)
To: [CPAC-Antelope](#)
Subject: Re: Comments/Questions - Antelope Community Planning Advisory Council
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 8:24:50 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

I and other residents on Quiet Knolls Drive who participated in this hearing are extremely disappointed with your inability to consider our questions/concerns. We asked questions in which you did not answer, but chose to rather ignore. You all should be ashamed in your position and responsibilities.

Of all concerns asked by the board in regards to traffic congestion and parking, you approved the motion. How is it you achieve this motion when there are many unanswered questions on your part? Seriously... *What the fuck....* we addressed our concerns, you had questions with no answers, and yet you approve.

In regards to parking, you are well aware there is not adequate parking and residents of this development will not restrict to parking in complex but rather park on street side, more particularly also parking in front of residents of existing neighborhood.

No thank you,

On Thu, Sep 3, 2020 at 6:44 PM Luis Tomas <luismiguel.a.tomas@gmail.com> wrote:

Question(s):

Please describe what the development plan is. (e.g. single housing, yard space, driveway space, apartments, townhomes?)

For the proposed 70 units, will there be adequate parking inside development site or is parking expected to park resort to neighboring community, parking in front of resident homes on Quiet Knolls Drive?

Possible intersection?

Possibility of Quiet Knolls Drive being widened, removing yard space from existing neighboring homes on Quiet Knolls Drive?

Thank you,

From: jody.wilhelm-re.com
To: [Luis Tomas](#)
Cc: [CPAC-Antelope](#); [Townsend, Stephanie](#); [Munoz, Alma](#); [Pahule, Chris](#)
Subject: Re: Comments/Questions - Antelope Community Planning Advisory Council
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 9:16:24 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Hi Luis-

Speaking for myself only- I understand your frustration. I used to live over there off of Diane Dr many years ago and would frequent Pokelma Park with my kids. I've seen the parking congestion and through traffic issues myself, and it isn't a new problem. For the record, myself and Member Kearney did vote against approving it because we didn't feel those items were adequately addressed, even with them saying they would ask DOT for further evaluation. We were told we couldn't qualify our answers-only a straight Yay or Nay. Both of us voted Nay, but were out voted.

Jody Wilhelm

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Matthew Kearney](#)
To: [CPAC-Forwarder-jody-wilhelm-re](#)
Cc: [Luis Tomas](#); [CPAC-Antelope](#); [Townsend, Stephanie](#); [Munoz, Alma](#); [Pahule, Chris](#)
Subject: Re: Comments/Questions - Antelope Community Planning Advisory Council
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 9:45:24 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Dear Luis,

Also speaking for myself and not the other CPAC members, I share your concerns and frustrations.

Perhaps this is not fair to the applicant, but as I pointed out during the CPAC discussion, I am disturbed that the Department of Transportation (DOT) has not done a traffic impact analysis. Especially since it is anticipated that Antelope Rd. will be diverted in the near future. I have no doubt that there will be an impact. To be fair, there was a stipulation that the DOT “consider” doing a traffic impact analysis; however, a guarantee to consider is not necessarily a guarantee to actually do one. The DOT could still opt not to do that. And even if they did do a traffic impact analysis, we wouldn’t know what that impact would be since we were required to vote on it tonight. That—and that alone—should be enough of a concern to pump the breaks a bit on this. I don’t know if all the CPAC members fully understood this when they cast their vote, but here we are. Nevertheless, that is at least why I was not able to vote in favor of the project. I, like you, feel I need more information before I feel comfortable with this project.

To the other members of the County, as a member of the Antelope CPAC, I am troubled about tonight’s procedure. Specifically, I am concerned that during the community member commentary, members of the community were sort of herded through and only given 3 minutes to articulate their concerns. Moreover, community concerns were never addressed until after all the members of the community had been heard. This can make it more difficult to recall all the concerns at once, and makes it more likely that certain concerns slip through the cracks and, as a result, are not addressed. I noticed that happened with at least one concern tonight. In my opinion, what should have happened was that each concern should have been discussed and addressed by the applicant and/or County immediately after each member had expressed their concerns. That should be cause enough to revisit this.

I was also troubled that when I asked if I could qualify and explain my “Nay” vote, I was told I could only give a straight up Yay or Nay. Apparently Member Wilhelm shares my frustration about this. I believe that if I had been given the chance to fully articulate and qualify my vote, I could have explained these concerns more fully. And, perhaps, the vote may have been different. But I was told I could not. So, there was nothing I could do.

I don’t know if there is anything the County can do to remedy or let us revisit this (my guess is there is not since we were already required to cast votes). But if there is, I would strongly encourage the County to do so.

Sincerely yours,

CPAC member Kearney

From: [Luis Tomas](#)
To: [CPAC-Forwarder-jody-wilhelm-re](#)
Cc: [CPAC-Antelope](#); [Townsend, Stephanie](#); [Munoz, Alma](#); [Pahule, Chris](#)
Subject: Re: Comments/Questions - Antelope Community Planning Advisory Council
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 10:02:16 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Jody,

I appreciate your sincere and considerate response. I, and I'm sure others, did not agree with the 'Yay' or 'Nay' vote without qualifying your answers. In my opinion and experiences, it is important to consider all information when seeking approval/disapproval from those involved in a situation in which a community is affected. With qualifying answers, it would have most definitely been beneficial to have transparency with not only the community tonight but your board.

I am not against new development, nor change, but am not pleased with how tonight's meeting was lead... especially when I began dialing 916-875-2500 to speak final thoughts before closing of discussion, only to hear the decision to close this window of opportunity was abruptly ended.

Jody, thank you for voting 'Nay'.... please thank the others as well. I appreciate your conscious vote and people such as yourself who really care, take into consideration all information before making such a decision as seen tonight...

I'm glad to hear there are people in government who haven't lost sight.

Take care,

Luis

From: [Matthew Kearney](#)
To: [Luis Tomas](#)
Cc: [CPAC-Forwarder-jody-wilhelm-re](#); [CPAC-Antelope](#); [Townsend, Stephanie](#); [Munoz, Alma](#); [Pahule, Chris](#)
Subject: Re: Comments/Questions - Antelope Community Planning Advisory Council
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2020 10:18:16 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Dear Luis,

Please see my response to your concern as well (it is in the other thread) which I also CC'd the County leaders. I am continuing to CC the other County leaders in this thread as well so that they not only see your response, but are also aware that some CPAC members (myself and Member Wilhelm, perhaps more) share your concerns and are deeply frustrated by tonight's procedure.

More importantly, however, your reply hints at a more serious problem with tonight's meeting. In a time of COVID, we are all doing our best to cope with the changes, but technology was definitely an issue at tonight's meeting. The explanations given by me and Member Wilhelm in our previous replies to your email, combined with the fact that you were not able to get through to the public comments is, in my opinion, enough of a reason to invalidate tonight's vote. Again, I am including the County members on this email thread in the hope that they will fully consider these concerns.

Kind regards,

Matt Kearney
Member, Antelope CPAC

Sent from my iPhone

From: luismiguel.a.tomas
To: [CPAC-Forwarder-makearney](#)
Cc: [CPAC-Forwarder-jody-wilhelm-re](#); [CPAC-Antelope](#); [Townsend, Stephanie](#); [Munoz, Alma](#); [Pahule, Chris](#)
Subject: Re: Comments/Questions - Antelope Community Planning Advisory Council
Date: Friday, September 4, 2020 7:13:37 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.

Good Morning Matt,

I read and appreciate your response. Thank you for bringing this to further attention.

It sounds so unreal to have voted with little discussion with the questions/concerns shared.

If not too much to ask, I would like to receive update(s) as it relates to meeting.

Kind regards,

Luis

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone