

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 001

From: [Elizabeth Nolan](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Carmichael Promenade Ctrl No. PLNP2020-00055
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2020 6:26:21 PM

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

Hello~

My home is one of the five homes in Brentwood Estates that borders this property on the West side and subsequently will be impacted by this proposed project. The following are my comments/concerns:

- Single story homes will be built along the perimeter of the property to include the area adjacent to Brentwood Estates.... Correct?
- Will new fencing/solid barrier be constructed around this proposed project to include the area adjacent to Brentwood Estates or are you proposing to incorporate our existing fencing into your project (the fencing in place varies in height and some of the fencing is as low as five feet in height) I would like to see new fencing or appropriate barrier around the entire perimeter of this proposed project.
- It appears there will be a 15 foot setback with an additional 24 feet of extra depth that "buffers Brentwood Estates" ... What will this look like? Is the 39 feet measured from our fence to the edge of the new home's property (patio/yard) or the rear of the structure. Will there be a fence around the home or will the buffer be part of the back yard?
- Traffic is always a concern along Fair Oaks Blvd. especially during commute hours... Will there be both an exit and entrance to your community on Marshall as well as Fair Oaks Blvd. (I understand entering and exiting from/to Fair Oaks Blvd. will be right turns only)
- Lastly, will the landscaping on the West side of the property be a mix of trees and shrubbery which would be preferable.

This proposed project appears well thought out with lots of landscaping both in the interior and around the perimeter of the development – the area that borders Fair Oaks Blvd. looks very attractive with the proposed trees lining the street.

Thank you for taking the time to review my comments/concerns. Elisabeth Nolan

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 002

From: [Jami Fritsch](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Carmichael Promenade APN: 245-0240-008, 009, 014, 026 and 028
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 6:01:58 PM

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

Good Afternoon,

It has come to our attention that a proposed single family housing project has been submitted for our neighborhood. We are extremely concerned about the traffic and noise impact that this development will cause. We live on Marshall Avenue and are 1 lot away from the area that is the proposed development. Currently, Marshall Ave. has quite a bit of traffic from people trying to cut through our neighborhood from Winding Way to Fair Oaks Blvd. If an entrance or exit from this development onto Marshall Ave. is created the impact on traffic will increase greatly! There are no sidewalks nor street lights in our neighborhood and a huge rise in vehicles will impact the safety of our families and homes that are on Marshall. There are many children that live on Marshall and the increased vehicle traffic will make walking or biking on Marshall a very risky proposition. The noise that will come from The Oak Tree Mini Park area will detrimentally impact the peacefulness of our neighborhood. Please reconsider the request to put such a densely populated housing project in this area. We purchased our home on Marshall Avenue to live in a peaceful environment with quiet streets that people can walk on without worrying about being hit by a vehicle.

Thank you,

Kevin and Jami Fritsch
4109 Marshall Ave.
916-996-2041

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 003

From: [Aric Mills](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Carmichael Promenade Project
Date: Monday, June 8, 2020 2:08:38 PM

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

My name is Aric Mills. My wife and I have lived on Valiant St. for 22 years. I am writing regarding the Carmichael Promenade project: PLNP2020-00055.

46 zero lot homes on 6.5 acres is too many. Very disappointing. We're okay with thoughtful development but not this.

The last developers—over ten years ago— wanted to connect Valiant St. To Fair Oaks Blvd. The entire neighborhood came out against that. If there is a plan to try that again—it will not stand.

Thanks for letting me express my thoughts.—Aric Mills

Sent from my iPad

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 004

From: [Mark & Terri](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Carmichael-Old Foothill Farms CPAC meeting June 17, 2020 Agenda Item #3
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2020 9:26:53 AM

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

To Carmichael/Old Foothills Farms CPAC members,

These comments are on agenda item #3 tonight Carmichael Promenade

Without actually hearing from the applicant, and without being expert in reading the online documents, I have some preliminary comments.

1. It is unclear if they plan a gated entrance. Please NO Gates.
2. I am very concerned with the aesthetics on Fair Oaks Blvd. While it looks like they plan on saving some trees (but never enough), I want to make sure that some are outside any fences and that there is additional landscaping. Any fencing should be visually pleasing along Fair Oaks Blvd.
3. There should be a bond or money in a special account before any grading or tree removal begins to insure any mitigation, if the project is not completed with the care needed.
4. One question that needs to be considered is whether there needs to be a limit on left turns out of the Fair Oaks Blvd. exit because of the high traffic volumes and the nearby left turn only lane.
5. In addition to adequate sidewalks, there needs to be provisions for an adequate bike lane along Fair Oaks Blvd. While it might not connect right now to a through bike lane, it is imperative to plan for it now. Many bikes ride that road and it is extremely dangerous.

Thank you,
Terri Friedman
3818 Bryan Way
Carmichael

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 005

From: roseaschu@aol.com
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: continuance
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 8:42:32 AM

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

We ask for continuance of project on Engle Road PLNP2019-00214-4748 Engle Road Bldg conversion.

Rose Ann Schueler

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 006

From: [Christy Satfield](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Control No. PLNP2020-00055
Date: Wednesday, June 17, 2020 11:49:03 AM

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

Please reject the CARMICHAEL PROMENADE project on the north side of Fair Oaks Blvd and the west side of Marshall Ave.

Forty-six homes at that location will greatly increase traffic on both streets, Fair Oaks and Marshall, and will increase street wear and tear. There will also be an increase of noise from traffic to the surrounding streets and an increase in air pollution. Already crowded schools close by will be impacted by more students. They are crowded enough. Thank You.

Sincerely,
Christy Satfield
4136 Valiant St
Carmichael CA 95608

Sent from my iPhone

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 007

From: m.narlesky
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: CPAC June 17 Agenda item 3
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2020 3:29:21 PM
Attachments: [CPAC June 17 Agenda item 3.pdf](#)

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

Agenda Item #3 PLNP2020-00055
Marc and Marta Narlesky
June 17, 2020

Dear Carmichael CPAC board members,

We are writing to express concerns about the plans for the development Carmichael Promenade Project on Marshall Ave. in Carmichael, CA. The proposed plan is to build 51 houses on the corner of Marshall Ave and Fair Oaks Blvd. This project will significantly increase traffic, not only on Fair Oaks Blvd; it will also increase traffic in Mapel Grove neighborhood. The current infrastructure is decrepit. Roads are in serious need of repair. Marshall Ave. is already used as a cut through from Fair Oaks Blvd. to Winding Way. Drivers cutting through our neighborhood exceed the speed limit on a regular basis. Mapel Grove is a walking neighborhood. People of all ages regularly walk on these country lanes. This includes students walking to school, children playing, and adults walking with and without pets. There are no sidewalks and limited access for the increased number of cars. Marshal Ave, near Fair Oaks Blvd. is barely wide enough for two cars to pass without slowing significantly. Increased traffic would necessitate road repair, additional stop signs, and perhaps speed bumps. Does the builder plan to improve Marshall Ave. all the way to Mapel Lane and then on through Barrett to Winding Way? Given improvements and limitations on Marshall Ave., the drivers would likely then detour to Prospect Drive causing a greater need for road repair and speed limiting interventions there. Conservatively, 51 homes could potentially add 100 -150 cars taking multiple trips on roads in disrepair being shared by pedestrians who have no sidewalks. We specifically purchased a used home in a quiet existing neighborhood, with country lanes, and this development will harm the appeal of the neighborhood.

Has an environmental impact study been conducted to determine the affects of the new housing replacing a green area? Have you considered the increased number of cars and the associated pollution, the displacement of whatever animal populations currently live in that space, and the increased strain on utilities and services.

Can the sewer, water and other utilities handle this new load? What mitigation factors will be implemented?

Is there a way to create the access point from Fair Oaks Blvd rather than Marshall Ave.? Fair Oaks Blvd. traffic is very fast, often exceeding the speed limit. The access point on

Marshall Ave. does not allow enough time for cars to turn onto Marshall Ave. and slow before turning into the access driveway without causing traffic congestion or worse, accidents. There must be a way to deter the increase of traffic from our quiet walking neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Marc and Marta Narlesky
4209 Prospect Dr.

Agenda Item #3 PLNP2020-00055
Marc and Marta Narlesky
June 17, 2020

Dear Carmichael CPAC board members,

We are writing to express concerns about the plans for the development Carmichael Promenade Project on Marshall Ave. in Carmichael, CA. The proposed plan is to build 51 houses on the corner of Marshall Ave and Fair Oaks Blvd. This project will significantly increase traffic, not only on Fair Oaks Blvd; it will also increase traffic in Mapel Grove neighborhood. The current infrastructure is decrepit. Roads are in serious need of repair. Marshall Ave. is already used as a cut through from Fair Oaks Blvd. to Winding Way. Drivers cutting through our neighborhood exceed the speed limit on a regular basis. Mapel Grove is a walking neighborhood. People of all ages regularly walk on these country lanes. This includes students walking to school, children playing, and adults walking with and without pets. There are no sidewalks and limited access for the increased number of cars. Marshal Ave, near Fair Oaks Blvd. is barely wide enough for two cars to pass without slowing significantly. Increased traffic would necessitate road repair, additional stop signs, and perhaps speed bumps. Does the builder plan to improve Marshall Ave. all the way to Mapel Lane and then on through Barrett to Winding Way? Given improvements and limitations on Marshall Ave., the drivers would likely then detour to Prospect Drive causing a greater need for road repair and speed limiting interventions there. Conservatively, 51 homes could potentially add 100 -150 cars taking multiple trips on roads in disrepair being shared by pedestrians who have no sidewalks. We specifically purchased a used home in a quiet existing neighborhood, with country lanes, and this development will harm the appeal of the neighborhood.

Has an environmental impact study been conducted to determine the affects of the new housing replacing a green area? Have you considered the increased number of cars and the associated pollution, the displacement of whatever animal populations currently live in that space, and the increased strain on utilities and services.

Can the sewer, water and other utilities handle this new load? What mitigation factors will be implemented?

Is there a way to create the access point from Fair Oaks Blvd rather than Marshall Ave.? Fair Oaks Blvd. traffic is very fast, often exceeding the speed limit. The access point on Marshall Ave. does not allow enough time for cars to turn onto Marshall Ave. and slow before turning into the access driveway without causing traffic congestion or worse, accidents. There must be a way to deter the increase of traffic from our quiet walking neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Marc and Marta Narlesky
4209 Prospect Dr.

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 008

From: [Catherine Cook](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Catherine Cook](#)
Subject: Engle Rd Apartments Project
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 9:46:28 AM

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

I live on Engle Rd less than a quarter mile from this project. I ask for a continuance so that we can find out about the project before it is approved by CPAC. If we can't get a continuance, then I Vote NO on the project !!

Catherine Cook

Sent from my iPhone

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 009

From: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: FW: Agenda Item PLNP2019-00213 - 4748 Engle Road Office Building Conversion
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 8:26:51 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

For the public record.

I sent a separate email to Stephanie, but we will be requesting a continuance of this item, which is second on tomorrow's Carmichael CPAC agenda.

Kind regards,

Kimber Gutierrez, Associate Planner
Office of Planning and Environmental Review
(916) 874-7529



The Office of Planning & Environmental Review (PER) continues to provide essential services although our physical offices are closed until further notice during the COVID-19 state of emergency. Many staff are working remotely and we are modifying our business practices during this period. Please see our website at www.planning.saccounty.net for the most current information on how to obtain services. Please note our practices are pursuant to Federal, State, and County emergency declarations including County Resolution 2020-0159 and 2020-0160.

From: Mel Marvel <mmarvelisnow@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 5:21 AM
To: Gutierrez, Kimber <GutierrezK@saccounty.net>
Cc: Bloise Nick <nickb812@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fwd: Agenda Item PLNP2019-00213 - 4748 Engle Road Office Building Conversion

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

This is a correction to the address of Kim Gutierrez. Sorry about my spelling error.

To CPAC Board Members,

I am the treasurer of Mission Oaks
North Neighborhood Association

(MONNA), representing over 1500 homes in our neighborhood preservation area (NPA). I am asking you to vote for a continuance before you vote on this project because we have just learned about it and we have not had an opportunity to review the project in depth. I was unable to access the planning documents until Tuesday morning June 16. There is No Public Notice posted on the Property, there was no notice to our Association, and it appears that the developer is requesting several variances that DO NOT COMPLY with our NPA.

Past precedent has been for the developer to contact MONNA and present their project at our general meeting or at the very least to our Board of Directors. Thus, neighbors have a chance to see the proposal, participate in discussion and then ask questions about the project before it is considered by the CPAC. This time has been very different; we can't attend the CPAC meeting and hear the presentation and then state our recommendations for changes or improvements. On behalf of

MONNA, I would like the developer to contact us and set up a date to present the project to our association.

We would like our concerns to be heard before a final recommendation is voted on by the CPAC.

Thank you, for your consideration of my request,

Melvin Marvel, MONNA Treasurer
4316 Engle Road



SACRAMENTO
COUNTY

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 010

From: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Kathy Webb](#)
Subject: FW: Carmichael Promenade
Date: Friday, June 12, 2020 12:01:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

For the public record.

Kind regards,

Kimber Gutierrez, Associate Planner
Office of Planning and Environmental Review
(916) 874-7529



The Office of Planning & Environmental Review (PER) continues to provide essential services although our physical offices are closed until further notice during the COVID-19 state of emergency. Many staff are working remotely and we are modifying our business practices during this period. Please see our website at www.planning.saccounty.net for the most current information on how to obtain services. Please note our practices are pursuant to Federal, State, and County emergency declarations including County Resolution 2020-0159 and 2020-0160.

From: Kathy Webb <webbka72@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2020 11:57 AM
To: Gutierrez, Kimber <GutierrezK@saccounty.net>
Subject: Carmichael Promenade

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

Hello and Happy Friday, Kimber!

I understand that the Carmichael Promenade project of long ago has been resurrected. This is a large project that many throughout the community are interested in...lucky you!

Can you PLEASE add my name to the project mailing list?

I would like to share my comments with you regarding the new project.

1 - The project is proposing too many units...even 46. It's too cramped. They can do better. There's a cluster of trees...could they not make a little open air space there? I understand the intent...add housing and for the developer to make money...but they can do better here and their future residents will be happier!

2 - The gated access. Carmichael residents have spoken and they do NOT want gated communities. If someone wants to build in our community, they should respect that. NO gates. They've happened before and we don't want anymore.

3 - There shouldn't be ANY vehicular access on/off Marshall. That small county road cannot safely support traffic from a subdivision of this size. I know, I know...they'll claim limited use and they'll add street improvements, but the road does not have the capacity to support the volume AND the existing homes deserve safety. It makes absolutely

no sense to allow traffic into Marshall.

Thanks for listening. I would greatly appreciate it if you would share these comments with the applicant and CPAC members.

Have a great weekend!

Thanks!
Kathy Webb
2625 Garfield Ave
Carmichael, CA 95608



SACRAMENTO
COUNTY

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 011

From: [Townsend, Stephanie](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Evans, Florence](#); [Munoz, Alma](#)
Subject: FW: Carmichael Promenade - PLNP2020-00055: 6/17 CPAC Workshop Comments
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 10:59:43 AM
Attachments: [Carmichael Promenade CPAC WS Comments.docx](#)

For the Record

Stephanie Townsend
Deputy Clerk
Board of Supervisors | Clerk of the Board
700 H Street, Suite 2450, Sacramento, CA 95814
916-874-8022

-----Original Message-----

From: smaesloan@comcast.net <smaesloan@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2020 3:01 PM
To: Gutierrez, Kimber <GutierrezK@saccounty.net>
Cc: CPAC-Carmichael-OFF <CPAC-Carmichael-OFF@saccounty.net>
Subject: Re: Carmichael Promenade - PLNP2020-00055: 6/17 CPAC Workshop Comments

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

Hi Kimber:

Attached are my comments for the June 17, 2020, CPAC meeting, Agenda Item 3: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade

I've cc'd the CPAC committee; however, if I should be submitting my comments to the Board Clerk, please let me know.

Thank you, and please let me know if you have any comments or feedback.

Sincerely,

Sue Sloan
4049 Marshall Ave.
Carmichael, Ca 95608
smaesloan@comcast.net
1-916-202-9449

Date: June 14, 2020

To: Kimber Gutierrez, Associate Planner, County of Sacramento
Carmichael-Old Foothill Farms CPAC Members

From: Sue and Dave Sloan, Property Owners
4049 Marshall Avenue, Carmichael

Subject: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Carmichael Promenade (CP) project.

Introduction:

We would like to introduce ourselves. We are Sue and Dave Sloan, and we live at 4049 Marshall Avenue. To give you context, the entire south boundary of our property shares the Carmichael Promenade's north boundary.

We have lived on Marshall Avenue for 17 years. We purchased our property in 2003 because we wanted to live in Carmichael, and the property offered us the semi-rural environment we desired. We knew at the time that the adjacent land would someday be developed; however, we moved forward with the purchase because we were confident the protections outlined in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA for the surrounding neighborhood would be honored and the rural nature of our property preserved.

Over the past 17 years, we have invested a significant amount of money and time improving our property to make it our forever home. We both recently retired, and we want to continue to live in our home and in this Carmichael community. It is important to us that as we continue to "grow old" in this community, our quality of life, our property value, and our neighborhood are preserved. We therefore have a vested interest in the Carmichael Promenade development and ensuring it is designed in such a way that neither we nor our neighborhood are adversely impacted.

Comments:

The following comments are in response to the applicant's June 2020 Carmichael Promenade Project Profile (CPPP) proposal. It is our understanding this proposal replaces the applicant's original 51-lot proposal and will be the one discussed at the June 17, 2020, CPAC meeting. Additional comments may be provided after the CPAC workshop is held.

1. North boundary and west boundary lot size and rear yard setback

CPPP Exhibit D shows nine single story homes to be placed along the north boundary (lots 33-41) and five single story homes to be placed along the west boundary (lots 42-46). Exhibit D also states that the typical lot sizes will be 45 feet by 75 feet (3,375 square feet). Exhibit F shows the rear yard setback for both boundaries will be a minimum of 15 feet, with the west boundary having an additional 24 feet landscape buffer.

Lot size:

The proposed lots on the north and west boundaries do not meet the lot size requirements specified in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA (SPA). Section 505-54(d) states “No structure shall exceed one story, or 20 feet, when located within 100 feet of the west or north boundary of the SPA zone. *Lots within this area shall conform to area and width standards as established for the RD-5 zoning district.*” The Sacramento County Zoning Code specifies that for RD-5 zoning, “*minimum interior lot sizes are 5,200 square feet and corner lots 6,200 square feet,*” and *minimum lot width is “62 square feet.”*

Furthermore, the proposed zero-lot-line single-family structures on the north and west boundaries do not meet the SPA requirements specified in the SPA. Although the SPA allows "cluster" or "zero lot-line" development, Section 505-54(g) specifically excludes the west and north boundaries [505-54(d)]:

Section 505-54(g): Except as otherwise provided in Section 505-54, development shall be of "cluster" or "zero lot-line" type to maximize land utilization. At the same time, this will allow for greater than normal setbacks providing for the protection of the developed property surrounding the SPA and greater landscape buffering along Fair Oaks Boulevard.

We request that the applicant modify the plans so that all lot sizes and structures located on the north and west boundaries conform to SPA Section 505-54(d). Furthermore, we ask the County to ensure that all applicable SPA standards and zoning requirements for these boundaries are met. The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors (BOS) clearly intended to preclude high-density housing on the west and the north boundaries by including Section 505-54(d) in the SPA. As a matter of fact, the BOS makes this clear in Section 505-50 - Intent, in which it recognizes the need for increased housing, but at the same time its duty to “*protect the established adjoining residential development.*” We further believe the BOS’s desire to preserve the “quality” of semi-rural neighborhoods is supported by the Carmichael Community Action Plan (Appendix to the 1975 Carmichael Community Plan), adopted by the BOS in 2006, which specifies that projects within semi-rural neighborhoods should be built using the existing zoning of 1 or 2 homes per acre and *rezones should be discouraged in order to protect the rural character of a neighborhood.*

Currently, the CPPP site plan shows four lots (33-36) plus the Heritage Oak amenity, along the north boundary that is shared with our property. It is our opinion that four zero-lot-line houses along the north boundary across from our home creates a “wall” of buildings with no open space, except for a 15 feet rear yard, which provides

minimal separation from our property. We will be left to contend with the noise, lighting, garbage cans, etc., from four separate lots. Without a doubt, this will negate the semi-rural nature of our property and negatively affect our quality of life as well as our property value. We believe the same would be true for the property owners to the west of us, who will also contend with the same issues along their property lines.

Rear Yard Setback:

It appears that, based on the lot depth of 75 feet currently specified in the CPPP, the applicant's plan to provide a minimum 15 feet rear yard setback is the minimum allowable by zoning codes for an RD-5 zone; however, from our perspective, this is insufficient. It will result in an intrusion upon our privacy and, as stated in the previous comment, impact our quality of life, property value, and the semi-rural nature of our property. We have a narrow lot, and as a result, our home sits within approximately 19 feet of the north boundary of the applicant's property. This means that the distance between our home and any house placed across from ours on the north boundary will be a maximum 34 feet from our living space. We literally would be able to watch the television of the other house from our home.

The CPPP states: "The project design takes into consideration the surrounding residential properties and provides meaningful buffers and transitions between higher density area and lower density areas." We disagree. There are no "meaningful buffers" or "transitions" on the north boundary. **We ask the applicant to either increase the rear yard setback and/or add "meaningful buffers" to the north boundary. The west boundary has been allotted a 24 feet buffer in addition to the 15 feet rear yard setback and we ask the developer to do the same on the north boundary.**

2. Fencing

The CPPP does not address fencing; however, it is our understanding that the applicant has indicated that as of now, it is proposing to keep the existing fencing along the north property line, but is willing to work with the neighbors on fencing details.

The fencing that runs along our property line on the north boundary of the development is *our* fence. It is not a shared fence with the adjacent property. It was never intended to be a shared fence. **We assert that our fence shall not be removed as a result of the CPPP development nor shall the applicant plan to use it as fencing for the CPPP development.** For context, this is an old chain link fence. The fence running along the south boundary of our property (applicant's north boundary) in the front of our property is approximately 4 feet high. The remainder of the fence, which extends from our house to the back of our property, is approximately 5 feet high. This is not a privacy or security fence.

We request the applicant address perimeter fencing in its plan. At a minimum, the applicant should include 6-8 feet high privacy/security fencing, preferably a sound wall of some type, along the entire perimeter of the development. If this is a gated community as the proposal indicates, then it seems even more reasonable that a privacy/security fence should be included for the entire perimeter of the development, to be maintained by the HOA.

3. Drainage

We would like the applicant to meet with us to discuss water drainage from our property to the applicant's property.

Our property has contended with water drainage issues that predate our purchase of the property. Over the years, we have dealt with water drainage issues from the property to the north of us as well as water runoff from Marshall Avenue. We have invested a significant amount of money attempting to alleviate some of the problems. Despite our attempts, our property still takes on a significant amount of water runoff from Marshall Avenue during heavy rains. It runs down our driveway and floods until it overflows onto the applicant's property.

We recognize the applicant has prepared a drainage plan; however, we want to ensure the applicant understands the above drainage problem and takes every reasonable action to mitigate potential issues with water backup on our property and/or flooding of its lot(s).

4. Traffic – Marshall Avenue

The CPPP indicates there will be a resident only access gate on Marshall Avenue for entry to/exit from the Carmichael Promenade community. This gate must be used by tenants who (1) cannot enter the CP community through a right-hand turn from Fair Oaks Boulevard or (2) want to leave the CP community but do not want to make a right-hand turn onto Fair Oaks Boulevard. This will definitely increase traffic congestion on Marshall Avenue, which already contends with heavy traffic for a rural street.

Some of the current traffic issues on Marshall Avenue:

- a. Significant amount of traffic for a rural street,
- b. Street parking exacerbated by the lack of parking available to surrounding apartment tenants (tenants from surrounding apartment complexes park on Marshall Avenue creating significant congestion),
- c. Inability of vehicles travelling in opposite directions to pass due to (1) the narrowing of Marshall Avenue at the point across from the south side of the applicant's Marshall Avenue parcel, and (2) congested street parking,
- d. Street pavement and shoulder conditions,
- e. Speeding cars. The street has only one speed bump between Fair Oaks Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue.

When I spoke with Marshall Avenue neighbors, one of the top concerns was the increase in traffic that would be created by the CP community. Most would prefer there be no access to Marshall Avenue from the CP community.

We ask that the applicant and the County take all necessary actions to mitigate the potential traffic issues on Marshall Avenue.

Closing:

In approximately 2004, a developer presented plans to develop the Carmichael Promenade. The plans did not take into consideration the intent or the zoning ordinances specified in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA, nor did the plans “respect the rights” of the adjoining properties and neighborhood. The Board of Supervisors ultimately denied the application, which the developer appealed. For two years, neighbors and Carmichael community members “fought” this development for the above reasons. It wasn’t that anyone was against the development; it was that everyone wanted the area to be developed in accordance with the SPA and zoning requirements, and to be done in a thoughtful and respectful way. Eventually, the developer worked with neighbors and Carmichael community members to develop a plan that was acceptable to all and that met, for the most part, the intent and “spirit” of the SPA. This plan was approved in 2006. It is disheartening that we have to go through this again and present the same arguments and facts that were presented from 2004-2006. For context, we ask the new applicant as well as the County and the CPAC to review the historical documents for the Carmichael Promenade (April 26, 2006 Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes, Item 03-SDP-SPP-0087 – Carmichael/Gamel). Here is the link:
<<http://www.agendanet.saccounty.net/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=3629&doctype=summary&itemid=128074>>

Although times have changed, the need for housing hasn’t, which we recognize. But the need to protect existing neighborhoods from crowded, suffocating in-fills that degrade the quality of life and property values of existing neighbors hasn’t changed either. Let’s work together to develop a thoughtful, respectful plan that provides the housing needed but at the same time conforms to the SPA and zoning standards, and preserves and protects this Carmichael neighborhood and adjoining neighbors.

We look forward to working with the County, the applicant, and Carmichael community in the planning of this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 012

From: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: FW: Carmichael Promenade - PLNP2020-00055: 6/17 CPAC Workshop Comments
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 8:33:36 AM
Attachments: [Carmichael Promenade CPAC WS Comments.docx](#)

For the public record.

Kind regards,

Kimber Gutierrez, Associate Planner
Office of Planning and Environmental Review
(916) 874-7529

The Office of Planning & Environmental Review (PER) continues to provide essential services although our physical offices are closed until further notice during the COVID-19 state of emergency. Many staff are working remotely and we are modifying our business practices during this period. Please see our website at www.planning.saccounty.net for the most current information on how to obtain services. Please note our practices are pursuant to Federal, State, and County emergency declarations including County Resolution 2020-0159 and 2020-0160.

-----Original Message-----

From: smaesloan@comcast.net <smaesloan@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2020 3:01 PM
To: Gutierrez, Kimber <GutierrezK@saccounty.net>
Cc: CPAC-Carmichael-OFF <CPAC-Carmichael-OFF@saccounty.net>
Subject: Re: Carmichael Promenade - PLNP2020-00055: 6/17 CPAC Workshop Comments

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

Hi Kimber:

Attached are my comments for the June 17, 2020, CPAC meeting, Agenda Item 3: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade

I've cc'd the CPAC committee; however, if I should be submitting my comments to the Board Clerk, please let me know.

Thank you, and please let me know if you have any comments or feedback.

Sincerely,

Sue Sloan
4049 Marshall Ave.
Carmichael, Ca 95608
smaesloan@comcast.net
1-916-202-9449

Date: June 14, 2020

To: Kimber Gutierrez, Associate Planner, County of Sacramento
Carmichael-Old Foothill Farms CPAC Members

From: Sue and Dave Sloan, Property Owners
4049 Marshall Avenue, Carmichael

Subject: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Carmichael Promenade (CP) project.

Introduction:

We would like to introduce ourselves. We are Sue and Dave Sloan, and we live at 4049 Marshall Avenue. To give you context, the entire south boundary of our property shares the Carmichael Promenade's north boundary.

We have lived on Marshall Avenue for 17 years. We purchased our property in 2003 because we wanted to live in Carmichael, and the property offered us the semi-rural environment we desired. We knew at the time that the adjacent land would someday be developed; however, we moved forward with the purchase because we were confident the protections outlined in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA for the surrounding neighborhood would be honored and the rural nature of our property preserved.

Over the past 17 years, we have invested a significant amount of money and time improving our property to make it our forever home. We both recently retired, and we want to continue to live in our home and in this Carmichael community. It is important to us that as we continue to "grow old" in this community, our quality of life, our property value, and our neighborhood are preserved. We therefore have a vested interest in the Carmichael Promenade development and ensuring it is designed in such a way that neither we nor our neighborhood are adversely impacted.

Comments:

The following comments are in response to the applicant's June 2020 Carmichael Promenade Project Profile (CPPP) proposal. It is our understanding this proposal replaces the applicant's original 51-lot proposal and will be the one discussed at the June 17, 2020, CPAC meeting. Additional comments may be provided after the CPAC workshop is held.

1. North boundary and west boundary lot size and rear yard setback

CPPP Exhibit D shows nine single story homes to be placed along the north boundary (lots 33-41) and five single story homes to be placed along the west boundary (lots 42-46). Exhibit D also states that the typical lot sizes will be 45 feet by 75 feet (3,375 square feet). Exhibit F shows the rear yard setback for both boundaries will be a minimum of 15 feet, with the west boundary having an additional 24 feet landscape buffer.

Lot size:

The proposed lots on the north and west boundaries do not meet the lot size requirements specified in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA (SPA). Section 505-54(d) states “No structure shall exceed one story, or 20 feet, when located within 100 feet of the west or north boundary of the SPA zone. *Lots within this area shall conform to area and width standards as established for the RD-5 zoning district.*” The Sacramento County Zoning Code specifies that for RD-5 zoning, “*minimum interior lot sizes are 5,200 square feet and corner lots 6,200 square feet,*” and *minimum lot width is “62 square feet.”*

Furthermore, the proposed zero-lot-line single-family structures on the north and west boundaries do not meet the SPA requirements specified in the SPA. Although the SPA allows "cluster" or "zero lot-line" development, Section 505-54(g) specifically excludes the west and north boundaries [505-54(d)]:

Section 505-54(g): Except as otherwise provided in Section 505-54, development shall be of "cluster" or "zero lot-line" type to maximize land utilization. At the same time, this will allow for greater than normal setbacks providing for the protection of the developed property surrounding the SPA and greater landscape buffering along Fair Oaks Boulevard.

We request that the applicant modify the plans so that all lot sizes and structures located on the north and west boundaries conform to SPA Section 505-54(d). Furthermore, we ask the County to ensure that all applicable SPA standards and zoning requirements for these boundaries are met. The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors (BOS) clearly intended to preclude high-density housing on the west and the north boundaries by including Section 505-54(d) in the SPA. As a matter of fact, the BOS makes this clear in Section 505-50 - Intent, in which it recognizes the need for increased housing, but at the same time its duty to “*protect the established adjoining residential development.*” We further believe the BOS’s desire to preserve the “quality” of semi-rural neighborhoods is supported by the Carmichael Community Action Plan (Appendix to the 1975 Carmichael Community Plan), adopted by the BOS in 2006, which specifies that projects within semi-rural neighborhoods should be built using the existing zoning of 1 or 2 homes per acre and *rezones should be discouraged in order to protect the rural character of a neighborhood.*

Currently, the CPPP site plan shows four lots (33-36) plus the Heritage Oak amenity, along the north boundary that is shared with our property. It is our opinion that four zero-lot-line houses along the north boundary across from our home creates a “wall” of buildings with no open space, except for a 15 feet rear yard, which provides

minimal separation from our property. We will be left to contend with the noise, lighting, garbage cans, etc., from four separate lots. Without a doubt, this will negate the semi-rural nature of our property and negatively affect our quality of life as well as our property value. We believe the same would be true for the property owners to the west of us, who will also contend with the same issues along their property lines.

Rear Yard Setback:

It appears that, based on the lot depth of 75 feet currently specified in the CPPP, the applicant's plan to provide a minimum 15 feet rear yard setback is the minimum allowable by zoning codes for an RD-5 zone; however, from our perspective, this is insufficient. It will result in an intrusion upon our privacy and, as stated in the previous comment, impact our quality of life, property value, and the semi-rural nature of our property. We have a narrow lot, and as a result, our home sits within approximately 19 feet of the north boundary of the applicant's property. This means that the distance between our home and any house placed across from ours on the north boundary will be a maximum 34 feet from our living space. We literally would be able to watch the television of the other house from our home.

The CPPP states: "The project design takes into consideration the surrounding residential properties and provides meaningful buffers and transitions between higher density area and lower density areas." We disagree. There are no "meaningful buffers" or "transitions" on the north boundary. **We ask the applicant to either increase the rear yard setback and/or add "meaningful buffers" to the north boundary. The west boundary has been allotted a 24 feet buffer in addition to the 15 feet rear yard setback and we ask the developer to do the same on the north boundary.**

2. Fencing

The CPPP does not address fencing; however, it is our understanding that the applicant has indicated that as of now, it is proposing to keep the existing fencing along the north property line, but is willing to work with the neighbors on fencing details.

The fencing that runs along our property line on the north boundary of the development is *our* fence. It is not a shared fence with the adjacent property. It was never intended to be a shared fence. **We assert that our fence shall not be removed as a result of the CPPP development nor shall the applicant plan to use it as fencing for the CPPP development.** For context, this is an old chain link fence. The fence running along the south boundary of our property (applicant's north boundary) in the front of our property is approximately 4 feet high. The remainder of the fence, which extends from our house to the back of our property, is approximately 5 feet high. This is not a privacy or security fence.

We request the applicant address perimeter fencing in its plan. At a minimum, the applicant should include 6-8 feet high privacy/security fencing, preferably a sound wall of some type, along the entire perimeter of the development. If this is a gated community as the proposal indicates, then it seems even more reasonable that a privacy/security fence should be included for the entire perimeter of the development, to be maintained by the HOA.

3. Drainage

We would like the applicant to meet with us to discuss water drainage from our property to the applicant's property.

Our property has contended with water drainage issues that predate our purchase of the property. Over the years, we have dealt with water drainage issues from the property to the north of us as well as water runoff from Marshall Avenue. We have invested a significant amount of money attempting to alleviate some of the problems. Despite our attempts, our property still takes on a significant amount of water runoff from Marshall Avenue during heavy rains. It runs down our driveway and floods until it overflows onto the applicant's property.

We recognize the applicant has prepared a drainage plan; however, we want to ensure the applicant understands the above drainage problem and takes every reasonable action to mitigate potential issues with water backup on our property and/or flooding of its lot(s).

4. Traffic – Marshall Avenue

The CPPP indicates there will be a resident only access gate on Marshall Avenue for entry to/exit from the Carmichael Promenade community. This gate must be used by tenants who (1) cannot enter the CP community through a right-hand turn from Fair Oaks Boulevard or (2) want to leave the CP community but do not want to make a right-hand turn onto Fair Oaks Boulevard. This will definitely increase traffic congestion on Marshall Avenue, which already contends with heavy traffic for a rural street.

Some of the current traffic issues on Marshall Avenue:

- a. Significant amount of traffic for a rural street,
- b. Street parking exacerbated by the lack of parking available to surrounding apartment tenants (tenants from surrounding apartment complexes park on Marshall Avenue creating significant congestion),
- c. Inability of vehicles travelling in opposite directions to pass due to (1) the narrowing of Marshall Avenue at the point across from the south side of the applicant's Marshall Avenue parcel, and (2) congested street parking,
- d. Street pavement and shoulder conditions,
- e. Speeding cars. The street has only one speed bump between Fair Oaks Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue.

When I spoke with Marshall Avenue neighbors, one of the top concerns was the increase in traffic that would be created by the CP community. Most would prefer there be no access to Marshall Avenue from the CP community.

We ask that the applicant and the County take all necessary actions to mitigate the potential traffic issues on Marshall Avenue.

Closing:

In approximately 2004, a developer presented plans to develop the Carmichael Promenade. The plans did not take into consideration the intent or the zoning ordinances specified in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA, nor did the plans “respect the rights” of the adjoining properties and neighborhood. The Board of Supervisors ultimately denied the application, which the developer appealed. For two years, neighbors and Carmichael community members “fought” this development for the above reasons. It wasn’t that anyone was against the development; it was that everyone wanted the area to be developed in accordance with the SPA and zoning requirements, and to be done in a thoughtful and respectful way. Eventually, the developer worked with neighbors and Carmichael community members to develop a plan that was acceptable to all and that met, for the most part, the intent and “spirit” of the SPA. This plan was approved in 2006. It is disheartening that we have to go through this again and present the same arguments and facts that were presented from 2004-2006. For context, we ask the new applicant as well as the County and the CPAC to review the historical documents for the Carmichael Promenade (April 26, 2006 Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes, Item 03-SDP-SPP-0087 – Carmichael/Gamel). Here is the link:
<<http://www.agendanet.saccounty.net/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=3629&doctype=summary&itemid=128074>>

Although times have changed, the need for housing hasn’t, which we recognize. But the need to protect existing neighborhoods from crowded, suffocating in-fills that degrade the quality of life and property values of existing neighbors hasn’t changed either. Let’s work together to develop a thoughtful, respectful plan that provides the housing needed but at the same time conforms to the SPA and zoning standards, and preserves and protects this Carmichael neighborhood and adjoining neighbors.

We look forward to working with the County, the applicant, and Carmichael community in the planning of this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 013

From: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
To: [Munoz, Alma](#); [Townsend, Stephanie](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Proposed Development
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 3:30:32 PM
Attachments: [Letter of opposition Marshall development.pdf](#)

Flo Evans
Clerk of the Board Office
P 916-874-8150 | C 916-599-0112

-----Original Message-----

From: Heidi Gleason <hgleasondoyle@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 3:25 PM
To: Clerk of the Board Public Email <BoardClerk@saccounty.net>
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Development

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

We are very concerned with the proposed development that will be considered at the June 17 meeting, agenda item #3. Please consider our attached letter. Our apologies for the delay. We have been out of town, and just learned of this proposal.

Randy and Heidi Doyle

June 16, 2020

Opposition to Proposed Development
Carmichael, CA
Agenda Item #3
CPAC Meeting on 6/17/2020

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing you to make you aware of our strong opposition to the proposed development off of Marshall Avenue, in Carmichael. It is #3 on the agenda for your June 17th meeting.

This proposed development is for over 50 homes off of a small, narrow section of Marshall Avenue, located between Fair Oaks Blvd. and Lincoln Avenue. There is no way the surrounding infrastructure can support this many additional residents. Our primary concerns revolve around the safety of neighborhood residents, traffic impact, and the already dilapidated state of the surface streets in the immediate and connected streets.

Our home is located about 2 blocks north of the proposed development, on the corner of Marshal and Prospect Avenue. Over the 20 years that we have lived here, we have seen significant increases in the amounts of traffic on Marshall Avenue. This is primarily due to Marshall now being one of the only short-cuts to traffic with no stop signs or even speed bumps traveling between the busy streets of Fair Oaks Blvd on the south and Winding Way on the north. Both the rates of speed as well as the traffic have increased significantly. The streets in the neighborhood are winding, have no sidewalks, and have numerous walkers on a daily basis. We have seen near misses of speeders and pedestrians at our intersection more times than we can count. We have also had our mailbox wiped out on three separate occasions due to drivers unable to navigate the small hill or bend in the road safely. There are also no street lights in the neighborhood, which can make things even more treacherous.

The section of Marshall that is the proposed access road to this this development is a narrow, barely one and a half lane road, with very poor visibility, and also no sidewalks. Several parked cars usually line both sides of the road, making visibility even poorer and virtually no room for more than one car to pass. The visibility at the corner of Marshall and Fair Oaks Blvd is also extremely poor, and has been the location of several accidents, including one fatal accident.

In addition to the safety and related traffic concerns, it is important to mention that the state of the road pavement is abysmal and literally crumbling in many sections. Despite a few attempts to patch things, there are still potholes, huge cracks, and even chunks of the road missing. The impact of 50+ homes to the surrounding streets would make things even worse.

At a minimum, if any future development is considered along this section of Marshall, it would be imperative that a stop sign be installed at the corner of Marshall and Prospect to slow traffic, the street be widened as well as repaved, and the visibility issues along Marshall from the corner at Fair Oaks Blvd to Lincoln Ave. be improved. PLEASE do not approved this development unless these items are included.

Respectfully,
Randy and Heidi Doyle

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 014

From: [Catherine Cook](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Catherine Cook](#)
Subject: Fwd: Agenda Item PLNP2019-00213-44748 Engle Road Office Building Conversion
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 9:52:01 AM

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

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

From: Catherine Cook <cookfortner@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Jun 13, 2020 at 7:00 PM
Subject: Agenda Item PLNP2019-00213-44748 Engle Road Office Building Conversion
To: <boardclerk@saccounty.net>
CC: Catherine Cook <cookfortner@gmail.com>

To CPAC Board Members,

I am President of Mission Oaks North Neighborhood Association (MONNA), representing over 1500 homes in our neighborhood preservation area (NPA). We are asking for a continuance before you vote on this project because we have just found out about it and we have not had an opportunity to review the project. There is No Public Notice on the Property, there was no notice to our Association, and it appears that the developer is requesting several variances that DO NOT COMPLY with our NPA.

Past precedent has been for the developer to contact MONNA and present their project in front of our general meeting. Neighbors have a chance to see the proposal, participate in discussion and then ask questions about the project. This time has been very different, we can't even attend the CPAC meeting and hear the presentation. On behalf of MONNA, we invite the developer to contact us and set up a date to present the project to the neighborhood. We want to specifically know what variances are being requested and why. We would like our concerns to be heard before a final recommendation is submitted by CPAC.

Thank You,

Catherine Cook, MONNA President

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 015

From: [Nick Bloise](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Fwd: Carmichael Promenade - PLNP2020-00055: 6/17 CPAC Workshop Comments
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 1:28:50 PM
Attachments: [Carmichael Promenade CPAC WS Comments.docx](#)

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

Fyi

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

From: <smaesloan@comcast.net>
Date: Sun, Jun 14, 2020, 3:01 PM
Subject: Re: Carmichael Promenade - PLNP2020-00055: 6/17 CPAC Workshop Comments
To: Gutierrez. Kimber <GutierrezK@saccounty.net>
Cc: <CPAC-Carmichael-OFF@saccounty.net>

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

Hi Kimber:

Attached are my comments for the June 17, 2020, CPAC meeting, Agenda Item 3:
PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade

I've cc'd the CPAC committee; however, if I should be submitting my comments to the Board Clerk, please let me know.

Thank you, and please let me know if you have any comments or feedback.

Sincerely,

Sue Sloan
4049 Marshall Ave.
Carmichael, Ca 95608
smaesloan@comcast.net
1-916-202-9449

Date: June 14, 2020

To: Kimber Gutierrez, Associate Planner, County of Sacramento
Carmichael-Old Foothill Farms CPAC Members

From: Sue and Dave Sloan, Property Owners
4049 Marshall Avenue, Carmichael

Subject: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Carmichael Promenade (CP) project.

Introduction:

We would like to introduce ourselves. We are Sue and Dave Sloan, and we live at 4049 Marshall Avenue. To give you context, the entire south boundary of our property shares the Carmichael Promenade's north boundary.

We have lived on Marshall Avenue for 17 years. We purchased our property in 2003 because we wanted to live in Carmichael, and the property offered us the semi-rural environment we desired. We knew at the time that the adjacent land would someday be developed; however, we moved forward with the purchase because we were confident the protections outlined in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA for the surrounding neighborhood would be honored and the rural nature of our property preserved.

Over the past 17 years, we have invested a significant amount of money and time improving our property to make it our forever home. We both recently retired, and we want to continue to live in our home and in this Carmichael community. It is important to us that as we continue to "grow old" in this community, our quality of life, our property value, and our neighborhood are preserved. We therefore have a vested interest in the Carmichael Promenade development and ensuring it is designed in such a way that neither we nor our neighborhood are adversely impacted.

Comments:

The following comments are in response to the applicant's June 2020 Carmichael Promenade Project Profile (CPPP) proposal. It is our understanding this proposal replaces the applicant's original 51-lot proposal and will be the one discussed at the June 17, 2020, CPAC meeting. Additional comments may be provided after the CPAC workshop is held.

1. North boundary and west boundary lot size and rear yard setback

CPPP Exhibit D shows nine single story homes to be placed along the north boundary (lots 33-41) and five single story homes to be placed along the west boundary (lots 42-46). Exhibit D also states that the typical lot sizes will be 45 feet by 75 feet (3,375 square feet). Exhibit F shows the rear yard setback for both boundaries will be a minimum of 15 feet, with the west boundary having an additional 24 feet landscape buffer.

Lot size:

The proposed lots on the north and west boundaries do not meet the lot size requirements specified in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA (SPA). Section 505-54(d) states “No structure shall exceed one story, or 20 feet, when located within 100 feet of the west or north boundary of the SPA zone. *Lots within this area shall conform to area and width standards as established for the RD-5 zoning district.*” The Sacramento County Zoning Code specifies that for RD-5 zoning, “*minimum interior lot sizes are 5,200 square feet and corner lots 6,200 square feet,*” and *minimum lot width is “62 square feet.”*

Furthermore, the proposed zero-lot-line single-family structures on the north and west boundaries do not meet the SPA requirements specified in the SPA. Although the SPA allows "cluster" or "zero lot-line" development, Section 505-54(g) specifically excludes the west and north boundaries [505-54(d)]:

Section 505-54(g): Except as otherwise provided in Section 505-54, development shall be of "cluster" or "zero lot-line" type to maximize land utilization. At the same time, this will allow for greater than normal setbacks providing for the protection of the developed property surrounding the SPA and greater landscape buffering along Fair Oaks Boulevard.

We request that the applicant modify the plans so that all lot sizes and structures located on the north and west boundaries conform to SPA Section 505-54(d). Furthermore, we ask the County to ensure that all applicable SPA standards and zoning requirements for these boundaries are met. The Sacramento County Board of Supervisors (BOS) clearly intended to preclude high-density housing on the west and the north boundaries by including Section 505-54(d) in the SPA. As a matter of fact, the BOS makes this clear in Section 505-50 - Intent, in which it recognizes the need for increased housing, but at the same time its duty to “*protect the established adjoining residential development.*” We further believe the BOS’s desire to preserve the “quality” of semi-rural neighborhoods is supported by the Carmichael Community Action Plan (Appendix to the 1975 Carmichael Community Plan), adopted by the BOS in 2006, which specifies that projects within semi-rural neighborhoods should be built using the existing zoning of 1 or 2 homes per acre and *rezones should be discouraged in order to protect the rural character of a neighborhood.*

Currently, the CPPP site plan shows four lots (33-36) plus the Heritage Oak amenity, along the north boundary that is shared with our property. It is our opinion that four zero-lot-line houses along the north boundary across from our home creates a “wall” of buildings with no open space, except for a 15 feet rear yard, which provides

minimal separation from our property. We will be left to contend with the noise, lighting, garbage cans, etc., from four separate lots. Without a doubt, this will negate the semi-rural nature of our property and negatively affect our quality of life as well as our property value. We believe the same would be true for the property owners to the west of us, who will also contend with the same issues along their property lines.

Rear Yard Setback:

It appears that, based on the lot depth of 75 feet currently specified in the CPPP, the applicant's plan to provide a minimum 15 feet rear yard setback is the minimum allowable by zoning codes for an RD-5 zone; however, from our perspective, this is insufficient. It will result in an intrusion upon our privacy and, as stated in the previous comment, impact our quality of life, property value, and the semi-rural nature of our property. We have a narrow lot, and as a result, our home sits within approximately 19 feet of the north boundary of the applicant's property. This means that the distance between our home and any house placed across from ours on the north boundary will be a maximum 34 feet from our living space. We literally would be able to watch the television of the other house from our home.

The CPPP states: "The project design takes into consideration the surrounding residential properties and provides meaningful buffers and transitions between higher density area and lower density areas." We disagree. There are no "meaningful buffers" or "transitions" on the north boundary. **We ask the applicant to either increase the rear yard setback and/or add "meaningful buffers" to the north boundary. The west boundary has been allotted a 24 feet buffer in addition to the 15 feet rear yard setback and we ask the developer to do the same on the north boundary.**

2. Fencing

The CPPP does not address fencing; however, it is our understanding that the applicant has indicated that as of now, it is proposing to keep the existing fencing along the north property line, but is willing to work with the neighbors on fencing details.

The fencing that runs along our property line on the north boundary of the development is *our* fence. It is not a shared fence with the adjacent property. It was never intended to be a shared fence. **We assert that our fence shall not be removed as a result of the CPPP development nor shall the applicant plan to use it as fencing for the CPPP development.** For context, this is an old chain link fence. The fence running along the south boundary of our property (applicant's north boundary) in the front of our property is approximately 4 feet high. The remainder of the fence, which extends from our house to the back of our property, is approximately 5 feet high. This is not a privacy or security fence.

We request the applicant address perimeter fencing in its plan. At a minimum, the applicant should include 6-8 feet high privacy/security fencing, preferably a sound wall of some type, along the entire perimeter of the development. If this is a gated community as the proposal indicates, then it seems even more reasonable that a privacy/security fence should be included for the entire perimeter of the development, to be maintained by the HOA.

3. Drainage

We would like the applicant to meet with us to discuss water drainage from our property to the applicant's property.

Our property has contended with water drainage issues that predate our purchase of the property. Over the years, we have dealt with water drainage issues from the property to the north of us as well as water runoff from Marshall Avenue. We have invested a significant amount of money attempting to alleviate some of the problems. Despite our attempts, our property still takes on a significant amount of water runoff from Marshall Avenue during heavy rains. It runs down our driveway and floods until it overflows onto the applicant's property.

We recognize the applicant has prepared a drainage plan; however, we want to ensure the applicant understands the above drainage problem and takes every reasonable action to mitigate potential issues with water backup on our property and/or flooding of its lot(s).

4. Traffic – Marshall Avenue

The CPPP indicates there will be a resident only access gate on Marshall Avenue for entry to/exit from the Carmichael Promenade community. This gate must be used by tenants who (1) cannot enter the CP community through a right-hand turn from Fair Oaks Boulevard or (2) want to leave the CP community but do not want to make a right-hand turn onto Fair Oaks Boulevard. This will definitely increase traffic congestion on Marshall Avenue, which already contends with heavy traffic for a rural street.

Some of the current traffic issues on Marshall Avenue:

- a. Significant amount of traffic for a rural street,
- b. Street parking exacerbated by the lack of parking available to surrounding apartment tenants (tenants from surrounding apartment complexes park on Marshall Avenue creating significant congestion),
- c. Inability of vehicles travelling in opposite directions to pass due to (1) the narrowing of Marshall Avenue at the point across from the south side of the applicant's Marshall Avenue parcel, and (2) congested street parking,
- d. Street pavement and shoulder conditions,
- e. Speeding cars. The street has only one speed bump between Fair Oaks Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue.

When I spoke with Marshall Avenue neighbors, one of the top concerns was the increase in traffic that would be created by the CP community. Most would prefer there be no access to Marshall Avenue from the CP community.

We ask that the applicant and the County take all necessary actions to mitigate the potential traffic issues on Marshall Avenue.

Closing:

In approximately 2004, a developer presented plans to develop the Carmichael Promenade. The plans did not take into consideration the intent or the zoning ordinances specified in the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA, nor did the plans “respect the rights” of the adjoining properties and neighborhood. The Board of Supervisors ultimately denied the application, which the developer appealed. For two years, neighbors and Carmichael community members “fought” this development for the above reasons. It wasn’t that anyone was against the development; it was that everyone wanted the area to be developed in accordance with the SPA and zoning requirements, and to be done in a thoughtful and respectful way. Eventually, the developer worked with neighbors and Carmichael community members to develop a plan that was acceptable to all and that met, for the most part, the intent and “spirit” of the SPA. This plan was approved in 2006. It is disheartening that we have to go through this again and present the same arguments and facts that were presented from 2004-2006. For context, we ask the new applicant as well as the County and the CPAC to review the historical documents for the Carmichael Promenade (April 26, 2006 Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes, Item 03-SDP-SPP-0087 – Carmichael/Gamel). Here is the link: <http://www.agendanet.saccounty.net/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=3629&doctype=summary&itemid=128074>

Although times have changed, the need for housing hasn’t, which we recognize. But the need to protect existing neighborhoods from crowded, suffocating in-fills that degrade the quality of life and property values of existing neighbors hasn’t changed either. Let’s work together to develop a thoughtful, respectful plan that provides the housing needed but at the same time conforms to the SPA and zoning standards, and preserves and protects this Carmichael neighborhood and adjoining neighbors.

We look forward to working with the County, the applicant, and Carmichael community in the planning of this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 016

From: [Kat Coffey](#)
To: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#); [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade COMMENTS for CPAC 17 June 2020
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 11:31:28 PM

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

To the Members of the Carmichael-Old Foothill Farms Community Planning Advisory Council,

Please consider this my official opposition to item 3 (PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade) as proposed on the June 17, 2020 Carmichael CPAC agenda.

As a Carmichael resident since 1982, and an active community volunteer for more than 10 years, I worked on the land use portion of the Carmichael Community Action Plan and other Carmichael projects, including the original "Carmichael Promenade" proposal from 2006. I was among many members of the community who worked diligently with the developers, County Planning Department, neighbors, including the Sloans and Donna Mayol, to agree on a plan that would work within the confines of the Carmichael Community Action Plan, and the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA.

The current proposed plan does not appear to consider any of the intentions in the Carmichael Community Action Plan or the Marshall-Fair Oaks SPA with regards to lot sizes, gates, and 'fitting in' with the current neighborhood.

Since we do not have the opportunity to appear personally before the CPAC to make comments, and in an effort to not repeat what has already been submitted, please consider this a 'ditto' to the comprehensive comments made by Sue and Dave Sloan.

- In addition, gates were specifically addressed during the creation/update of the Carmichael Community Action Plan.....and the community does NOT want gated communities in Carmichael. Period.
- Having driven down Marshall Avenue twice in the last 2 days....it is absurd to consider there might be an additional 92 vehicles driving on that tiny 2 lane stretch of Marshall between Lincoln and Fair Oaks Blvd.

And while I understand the desire for more housing, let's not sacrifice the semi-rural, eclectic, diverse nature of Carmichael for a few more houses stuck on one of the few large parcels left in Carmichael. Please send this project back to the drawing board. I'm certain there is a plan that is more suitable for Carmichael.

Thank you,

Kat Coffey
Carmichael resident
916-216-2340

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 017

From: [Donna Mayol](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00055 - Carmichael Promenade
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 4:26:59 PM

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

Donna and Robert Mayol 4032 Alex Lane (Brentwood Estates)

We appreciate the opportunity to submit comments regarding the above project as we will most certainly be affected by this project. Our master bedroom is just five feet from the property line. This has never been a problem as we look out into the empty field. This project will change all that so I have the following comments:

- 1) We are on the west boundary (Brentwood) and are relieved to see that the plan calls for a single story home with a 24 ft. landscaped buffer as well as the 15 ft set back to the actual house. However, I do have questions and concerns regarding the buffer. a) will the buffer be owned by the person who purchases the house? b) will it become part of the HOA CCNR's ? c) will the property owner be restricted as to it's use? d) will it always remain a landscaped area and, if so, who is to maintain it?
- 2) We have not read anything about fencing and would like to know the plan for that. We have a 5 ft board fence along our property line which would not be desirable as a good neighbor fence. Will the plans include fencing on the west property line and, if so, what type?
We would like to see a 6 to 8 feet privacy fence on the property line. It would be desirable if the HOA were to be liable for the upkeep of the fence.
- 3) When the previous plan was developed there were concerns about drainage. We have an open drainage ditch on the other side of our fence which goes underground at 4028 Alex Lane. It is our understanding that this has been maintained by the county. I would like to understand the applicant's plans for drainage.
- 4) Traffic will be a problem both for Brentwood and for Carmichael Promenade. For Brentwood residents it is getting more and more dangerous entering and exiting our development at Fair Oaks Blvd. This will only be made more so with traffic from Carmichael Promenade. We face cars coming over the hill at us at a high rate of speed as we wait in the turn lane for the opportunity to turn into our development. Right turns are also concerning. Because of the difficulty making a left turn into our development, I will choose to take Lincoln to Marshall to make a right turn on Fair Oaks and a right turn into Brentwood when convenient. I find it hard to fathom how Marshall can handle the traffic from a 46 unit development. Driving down Marshall from Lincoln I feel like I am traversing a maze. The street is narrow and there are many cars parked along both sides of the street.

We look forward to working with the applicant, the county, and interested community members. Hopefully, we can soon have public meetings to discuss our issues.

Thank you,
Donna and Robert Mayol
4032 Alex Lane
dmayol@comcast.net

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 018

From: [Cindy Storelli](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Gutierrez, Kimber](#); [Mejia, Manuel](#); [Holsworth, Meredith](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00055
Date: Monday, June 15, 2020 7:42:56 AM
Attachments: [carm_prom_commentlt.pdf](#)

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

Please see the attached letter for the Carmichael/Old Foothill Farms CPAC meeting on June 17, 2020

This is for item No. 3 Carmichael Promenade
PLNP2020-00055

Cindy Storelli
916-765-8865

June 15, 2020

Carmichael/Old Foothill Farms Community Planning Advisory Council
c/o BoardClerk@saccounty.net

Re: June 17, 2020 meeting
Item 3
PLNP2020-00055

Dear Council Members:

My name is Cindy Storelli and my husband and I have been Carmichael residents since 1983. We have lived on Marshall Avenue since 1993. And since the backyard fence of my childhood home was on the border of Carmichael, I have a strong connection to the community since 1965. I am also a retired Sacramento County employee, having worked over 30 years in the Planning Department of the County, and was for 10 years the project manager for the Carmichael Community Action Plan, and the Fair Oaks Boulevard Corridor Plan. I have the unique perspective of being both a Planner with the County, and a resident of the community during the preparation and adoption of these plans. I am writing to you to comment on the Carmichael Promenade residential project located at the northwest corner of Fair Oaks Boulevard and Marshall Avenue in Carmichael.

During my 30+ years career at the County, I had the pleasure and fortune of working with many community residents and business owners, including many years of working with the Carmichael/Old Foothill Farms Community Planning Advisory Council (CPAC). I also spent 10 years working on the Carmichael Community Action Plan. If you have not read the plan, which was a collaboration by the community residents, business owners, public safety members, and a multi-departmental County task force, I encourage you to review it before hearing this project. It can be found at the following link:

Carmichael Community Action Plan

<https://planning.saccounty.net/LandUseRegulationDocuments/Documents/Community%20Plans/Carmichael%20CCAP-Final-April-2006-july.pdf>

What struck me, as both a resident and a professional Planner, is that the residents and business owners in Carmichael truly love their community and have a strong desire to work and play and shop in family oriented businesses right here in Carmichael. The Fair Oaks Boulevard/Manzanita Avenue corridor runs through the heart of the community and many people are within walking and/or biking distance of the businesses that line the street. The studies, surveys, and many community meetings held during the 10 years it took to complete the multi-staged plans showed that the community really wanted to see a change to this main corridor. The street improvements, including additional landscaping, the design of the newer businesses and the popular dining venues in the Milagro Centre have begun the process of bringing the adopted plans to life.

It was clear from the intent of the plan that increased density in the community should occur along Fair Oaks Boulevard so this project achieves that goal. One policy in the plan is to disallow gated subdivisions, however, given the location, I do not have any issues with the gated entrances. We are most concerned with the increase in the traffic on Marshall. The traffic signal that was installed definitely increased the traffic that cuts through the neighborhood, especially before and after school as folks literally race down Marshall towards Mapel Lane to take their children to Del Campo High School, Barrett Middle School or Schweitzer Elementary school. The access on Marshall Avenue is identified as a secondary access but if I lived in the subdivision, it would be my primary access as the traffic on Fair Oaks Boulevard makes the other access harder to use, especially if trying to go east, or left out of the project site. If this project is approved, we will see 51 more families travelling on our streets.

We love our neighborhood of rural type streets without sidewalks but that also means that we walk, push strollers, and bike ride on the edge of the streets. And we are neighborhood of walkers. I pass dozens of people everyday on my daily walks. Although the stop sign that was recently installed at Marshall and Mapel will have some impact on slowing the traffic, the speed that cars travel on Marshall, Prospect, and Mapel is excessive. The CPAC should request that the County consider adding additional stop signs, especially at the Prospect and Marshall

intersection to further slow traffic on Marshall. There is a speed table on Marshall, between Fair Oaks Boulevard and Lincoln, however I don't see that bump in the road slowing traffic much. I don't want Marshall to be like Lincoln with speed tables in every block. I believe that a few strategically placed stop signs will add significant assistance to slowing the traffic.

The other issue is the deplorable condition of the roadway network in our neighborhood. The asphalt on our streets is crumbling away - with only minor pothole patches, that break apart almost as quickly as they are repaired, having occurred during the 27 years we have lived in our home). We need to see the entire neighborhood network of streets repaved - not just in front of the project -including all of Marshall Avenue between Fair Oaks Bland Mapel Lane, all of Prospect Drive, and all of Mapel Lane.

I am asking that the CPAC support this project but with a strong recommendation that our neighborhood street network be upgraded with new asphalt and some new stop signs. I would be happy to discuss this further with any member of the CPAC and/or member of the County Office of Planning and Environmental Review.

I can be reached by email or phone.

Cindy Storelli
cindystorelli@gmail.com
916-765-8865

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 019

From: [Michael OBrien](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Michael OBrien](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00055- Carmichael Promenade Comment
Date: Friday, June 12, 2020 12:34:45 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Mike O'Brien, I own the property at 4310 Prospect Drive near the corner of Prospect and Marshall. I have reviewed the plan for the Carmichael Promenade and would like to express my concern with respect to traffic patterns and safety. My concerns are as follows:

1. The current condition of Marshall (from Prospect to Fair Oaks) is narrow and dangerous for both pedestrians and vehicle traffic. The condition worsens closer to Fair Oaks as the road narrows and the homes near Fair Oaks use that section of Marshall for parking.
 - a. For vehicle traffic, the road becomes so narrow that vehicles are required to stop in one direction to let vehicles traveling in the other direction pass. This is due to both the width of the road and the volume of parking on the street. This condition, already unsafe, will be significantly degraded if this project is developed as indicated in the plan with resident ingress & egress from Marshall.
 - b. For pedestrians, there are many children that use Marshall in the mornings and afternoons (either by foot or on bicycle) to access Prospect and/or Lincoln in order to get to Barrett Middle School in the morning and then back home. To make matters worse, during the winter it is dark before and after school and the lighting is poor on Marshall which also increases the risk to the children. In general, vehicles need to stop and let others pass due to children being in the road with no shoulder or safe zone for them to walk within. Adding access on Marshall for 51 homes, most with multiple vehicles, will dramatically increase traffic volume and increase the risk to the children.
2. The overall road conditions in this entire neighborhood are horrible. I have owned this property for 18 years and the roads have received little to no attention during that time. There are pot-holes, worn shoulders, jigsaw puzzle-like sections of asphalt which reflect years of neglect by the county. The project will significantly increase the volume of traffic on all of these road and further deteriorate their condition.
3. The back neighborhoods, such as Mapel Grove, are already used by many drivers to "cut over" from Winding Way to Fair Oaks. Adding 51 homes in this project will significantly increase that practice and increase the traffic volumes within these nice, quiet, older neighborhoods of Carmichael.

Overall, the project will present significant safety and traffic concerns for the surrounding neighborhood. I have the following recommendations for the CPAC and the developer to

consider:

1. Eliminate the access to and from the Marshall side of the development. This will not solve all of the problems but it will direct the traffic from the development out to Fair Oaks and minimize the safety issues on Marshall.
2. In addition to eliminating access to Marshall, increase the width of Marshall to accommodate existing and future increased traffic patterns.
3. Add stop-signs and / or speed bumps in the surrounding neighborhoods (such as Maple Grove) to reduce or at least slow-down the traffic that will undoubtedly be created by the existence of 15 additional units.

My final recommendation is that each member of the CPAC take the time to drive their vehicles down Marshall (from Fair Oaks to Lincoln) and personally inspect the conditions of the road, volume of parking, and width of the road. Everything I stated previously will become crystal clear once you do that.

Please confirm that you have received this correspondence.

Respectfully,

Mike

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 020

From: [CINDY DUARTE](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00055 Carmichael Promenade, item # 3 on agenda for 6/17/20
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 11:51:52 AM

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

PLNP2020-00055 Carmichael Promenade 6-1/2 acres with 51 single family lots

We consider this a lot of homes in a very small area. It will impact our neighborhood with more traffic.

If this project is allowed, we would expect the roads in the impacted neighborhood to be repaved (i.e..Marshall, Prospect, and Maple). We also would expect a 4-way stop be put in at Marshall and Prospect to slow down traffic on Marshall Avenue.

Sincerely,

Don and Cindy Duarte
4301 Marshall Avenue

ITEM 3 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 021

From: [Cecilia Kelley](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Subject: PLNP2020-00055 Project Name Carmichael Promenade
Date: Sunday, June 14, 2020 5:52:53 PM

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

I would like to oppose this project. The street, Marshall Ave is not wide enough for two cars passing each other. The increased traffic will create a safety issue for the students walking to the Elementary, Middle and High School in the area. The residence currently have safety issues already in getting in and out of their driveways due to the current traffic.

Sincerely

Robert and Cecilia Kaestner
4134 Marshall Ave.
Carmichael, CA 95608
(916) 944-8143

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10