

(2 pages)



Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Fwd: TR-TAC letter

1 message

Sandy Sloan <sandy.sloan@gmail.com>
 To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 7:24 AM

Julie—

Please forward these comments to TR-TAC
 Thank you.

Dear Members of TR-TAC:

I am writing to object to the proposed parking lot on the school site at Kirkwood. My objections can be summarized as follows:

1. There is no need for these parking spaces. As the annual parking reports indicate, Kirkwood has a surplus of parking. If more parking is needed, it should be demonstrated why and the Master Parking Plan (which is incorporated into the Kirkwood Specific Plan) should be updated. After the last TR-TAC meeting, the PUD set up an ad-hoc parking committee to discuss an overall parking plan—one that would work for all stakeholders. This committee consists of three members of the community (Allan Sapp, Geoff Smith and myself), Nate Whaley representing Kirkwood Capital Partners, Casey Blann representing the Resort and Michael Sharp from the PUD. At our one meeting, Nate Whaley and Casey Blann criticized the existence of such a committee and did not want to engage in a discussion of parking in general. Such a discussion needs to take place and needs to involve the entire community before a piecemeal approach proceeds.

2. This application is taking a piecemeal approach in two ways. First, an overall plan for parking needs to be studied. We know that this application and Vail's application for parking along Kirkwood Drive have both been submitted. Both require Specific Plan amendments.

Second, a project may not be divided into its known components. In this case, the details of the proposed parking lot must be studied at the same time as the Specific Plan application is studied, otherwise the project is being piecemealed. What are the plans for grading, for control of run-off, for exact tree removal etc. It is not appropriate for the details of the proposal to be put off for another day while a Specific Plan application is processed.

3. This proposal is inconsistent with the Specific Plan as my previous letter pointed out. Specific Plans must be internally consistent, just as General Plans must. Kirkwood is currently out of compliance with the Specific Plan with regard to parking, since the parking lots below Timber Creek are not paved. Appendix 4 of the Specific Plan (Section M) calls for all parking lots to be paved. If these lots were paved, undoubtedly more spaces could be fit in and traffic would flow more safely. Furthermore, an amendment to the Specific Plan is not justifiable now, as the Specific Plan needs to be consistent with the General Plans. Amador County has no legal General Plan now—it is only now in the process of bringing its General Plan into compliance with State law.

4. The proposed parking lot would be visually disastrous to those in the East Meadows and all those that use the meadow. To replace a heavily forested area with a surface parking lot would be a disgrace. Not only would many mature trees be removed, but also the surface water from the parking lot would affect the quality of the creeks in the meadow.

5. The parking lot would have a negative impact on safety—conflicting with fire trucks and other heavy vehicles

5/5/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: TR-TAC letter

operated by the PUD that are essential to the safety and welfare of the community.

I urge you to determine that this application to amend the Kirkwood Specific Plan is not appropriate.

Thank you,
Sandy Sloan

5/5/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Proposed parking lot



(1 page)

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Proposed parking lot

1 message

Pat Patterson <pat@mackenziecapital.com>
To: "Julie.saylor@edcgov.us" <Julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 8:45 AM

We strongly support opposition to this change in long range plans and believe that additional parking ought to be in those areas where there are no trees.

C E Pat Patterson
Chairman
MacKenzie Capital Management, LP
Sent from my iPhone



(1 page)

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Kirkwood: Proposed Parking Lot

1 message

Frederick Crews <fredc@berkeley.edu>
To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:23 AM

Dear Ms. Saylor,

As Kirkwood homeowners since 1994, we are concerned about the issues raised with TR-TAC by Kirkwood's PUD on April 27, 2015. As cross-country skiers, we would greatly regret the loss of the meadow's only challenging segment of trail. The likely degradation of water quality in the meadow is also regrettable in view of the advancing drought. Most urgently, though, it is essential that fire trucks have a clear and speedy path up Loop Road.

Now that Kirkwood has removed a large parking lot situated at the elevation of Chairs 7 and 9, nearly everyone who wants to start the day at one of those chairs has to take a substantial uphill hike, carrying skis or a snowboard. The proposed new lot would redouble this inconvenience. It would seem to be time for Kirkwood to commit itself to a multi-level parking structure, either "downtown" or across Rte. 88, with frequent shuttle service to chairs 1-10-11, 5, 6, 7, and 9.

Sincerely,

Frederick Crews
Elizabeth Crews
243 Larkspur, Kirkwood



(3 pages)

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

KCP Parking Lot Proposal

1 message

Karin Beumer <karinbeumer@sbcglobal.net>
To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us
Cc: michaelbbrowner@comcast.net, karinbeumer@sbcglobal.net

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:28 AM

May 5, 2015

279 Larkspur Drive

Kirkwood, CA 95646

Tri-County Technical Advisory Committee (TR-TAC)

Dear Julie Saylor:

My husband and I have been owners and residents in Kirkwood within the East Meadows subdivision for over 20 years. We have reviewed the KCP proposal to develop a 193 space parking lot and we understand that another meeting to discuss this proposal will be held on May 8, 2015. We are unable to attend given our travel schedule, but we wanted to weigh in. This proposal to create a parking lot is a serious matter that we think is far from appropriate for our valley. I believe a number of reasons have been brought to TR-TAC's attention already. We agree with the ones we are aware of fully.

These include the fact that creating a parking lot involves the removal of so many trees in this area. The west side area which contains other areas for parking and storage is already so unsightly. Taking down more trees degrades the natural beauty of Kirkwood Valley already threatened by further expansion and development. Our recollection of the Specific Plan includes an encouragement for multi-level parking as an alternative to parking lot sprawl. We think that this makes so much sense. Fewer trees get taken down, the natural areas impacted are reduced, and far less time and equipment is required to keep the parking clear of snow in winter months. We are also aware that a section of the outer loop cross country ski trail will be destroyed. We ski this outer loop almost daily when we are at home in Kirkwood during the winter. We love this portion of the trail and would really be disappointed if this destruction were allowed to go forward.

We thank you for having these meetings and for the opportunity to register our arguments against this proposal. Again, this is a serious matter and we do not mean to be taken lightly

when we are reminded of a song by Joni Mitchell.

Big Yellow Taxi

by Joni Mitchell 

They paved paradise
And put up a parking lot
With a pink hotel *, a boutique
And a swinging hot spot

Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you've got
Till it's gone
They paved paradise
And put up a parking lot

They took all the trees
Put 'em in a tree museum *
And they charged the people
A dollar and a half just to see 'em

Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you've got
Till it's gone
They paved paradise
And put up a parking lot

Hey farmer farmer
Put away that DDT * now
Give me spots on my apples
But leave me the birds and the bees
Please!

Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you've got
Till it's gone
They paved paradise
And put up a parking lot

Late last night
I heard the screen door slam
And a big yellow taxi
Took away my old man

Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you've got
Till it's gone
They paved paradise
And put up a parking lot

They paved paradise
And put up a parking lot

Sincerely and seriously,

Karin & Michael Beumer-Browner



(1 page)

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Kirkwood School Site Parking Lot Opposition

1 message

Bruce Lawler <brucelawler@gmail.com>
To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 11:34 AM

I live directly across the meadow from the proposed parking lot site. I was able to attend the April 10th TR-TAC meeting and state my opposition in person. I will not be able to attend the May 8th meeting.

I would like to reiterate my concern that the deforestation of that area will significantly impact my and my neighbors' view. Since a parking lot was not in the plan when I purchased my lot, I do not support the rezoning.

Currently, the PUD and Kirkwood maintenance buildings are visible as excess clearing was allowed when they were built. The PUD planted trees almost 15 years ago to try to screen their buildings. Even though they watered the trees, few of those trees survived and the ones that did have shown little growth. Reforestation at this altitude is not possible in a reasonable period of time.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bruce and Lisa Lawler
378 E. Meadows Dr.
Kirkwood, CA 95646
(209) 258-4503



(1 page)

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

objection to kirkwood capital partner's application for zone change for loop road north parking area, kirkwood, calif.

1 message

Don Nomura <dnomura@laxalt-nomura.com>
To: "julie.saylor@edcgov.us" <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>
Cc: "kdak4@aol.com" <kdak4@aol.com>

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:42 PM

Dear ms saylor: I am a homeowner in the east meadows section of Kirkwood (152 east meadows), and would like to register an objection to the above described zone change application. I would initially join in those objections lodged by others. This proposed change violates the Specific Plan which was years in the making, representing a consensus appropriate agreement on valley development. No new factor exists to alter the Plan. The proposed change has significant environmental impact requiring removal of significant mature old growth trees. Not only environmentally sensitive, the trees have an understood aesthetic value as a sight buffer to the current contemplated use of the land. There would also be an alteration of water drainage and concomitant impact on water quality in the meadow. The cross country loop trail would be negatively compromised. There is no study justifying aneed for the additional parking generally, and certainly not to a level significant enough to authorize the above described negative impact. Thank you for consideration of this objection. Don Nomura. 775-742-0643

Don Nomura

Laxalt & Nomura Ltd.

9600 Gateway Drive

Reno, NV 89521

Office: (775) 322-1170

Fax: (775) 322-1865

Notice: The information in this transmittal is confidential and may be attorney privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information. Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defect that might affect any computer into which it is received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure it is virus free, and no responsibility is accepted by Laxalt & Nomura, Ltd. for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender at 775-322-1170 or by electronic mail (dnomura@laxalt-nomura.com). Thank You.

5/5/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - parking lot

(1 page)



Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

parking lot

1 message

Hilary Hannon <hilaryhannon@earthlink.net>

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:40 PM

To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us

Cc: Sandy Sloan <sandy.sloan@gmail.com>

Julie: I would like to second the letter of May 4th from Sandy Sloan to you re the proposed parking lot. -- Hilary Hannon