

ITEM 2 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENTS 051

From: [martha.scheetz](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: BLOSSOM RIDGE SUBDIVISION 6331 FILBERT AVE
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 3:20:04 PM

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

PLNP2020-00104 CPAC 4-6-21 AT 6:30

FROM;
HAROLD AND MARTHA SCHEETZ
6300 FILBERT AVE
O.V. CA 05662

WE OPPOSE THIS PLAN TO REZONE

WE MOVED TO 6300 FILBERT 9 YEARS AGO, WE GREW UP IN ORANGEVALE
AND HAD OUR BUSINESS AT GREENBACK AND MADISON FOR OVER 55 YEARS

WE HAVE 3.17 ACRES FARM LAND WE LOVE TO WORK. WE CAME BACK TO
RETIRE HERE

FOR THE COUNTY LIFE LIKE WE HAD AS KIDS HEAR.

SO MUCH LAND HAS BEEN DEVELOPED IN ORANGEVALE--- WHEN IS IT ENOUGH.

IF WE HAVE 54 NEW HOMES HOW WILL ALL THERE WATER DRAIN?

WE HAVE SO MUCH WATER DRAINING ACROSS

OUR PROPERTY NOW . WE HAVE NO SIDE WALKS- OUR TRAFFIC IS BAD DO TO

ALL THE SCHOOLS-AND OUR ROADS ARE SMALL - OUR SEWER SYSTEM IS VERY
OLD

THIS IS FAMILY LAND WE HOPE TO PASS ON TO OUR CHILDREN AND

GRANDCHILDREN A LITTLE PIECE OF HEAVEN IN THE COUNTY,

ORANGVILE HAS ALWAYS BEEN KNOWN FOR.

RESPECTFULLY,

HAROLD AND MARTHA SCHEETZ

6300 FILBERT AVE.

ORANGEVALE

916 988-2586 HOME

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

ITEM 2 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENTS 052

From: [John Lord](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [Holsworth, Meredith](#); [Frost, Supervisor](#)
Cc: ilona.ozeruga@gmail.com
Subject: PLNP2020-00104 Blossom Ridge Subdivision
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 4:06:27 PM

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

Regarding: PLNP2020-00104, Blossom Ridge Subdivision, a rezoning and subdivision on a 9.58 acre, AR-2 zoned property located at 6331 Filbert Ave. in the Orangevale Community. Please include in the CPAC meeting April 6th at 6:30PM.

Hello,

We are fellow neighbors John and Aimee Lord at 9108 Orangevale Avenue and would like to voice our concerns regarding the proposed Blossom Ridge subdivision. We have lived in this community for 13 years and one of the primary reasons for moving here is the rural and country environment. It is sad to see the Tomich orchard go, and although we understand that a new subdivision is being proposed, we were shocked to see the number of homes in the plans. The number of homes in the proposal does not fit in with the surrounding environment and would permanently sacrifice the local area's ruralness to increase the profit for a developer. We also have two small children and we are very concerned that the significant increased traffic would place risk on our children walking down or across the country road. We have other concerns about impact on local infrastructure such as the existing aging sewer lines that the proposal does not address from what we can see. We are not opposed to building, but would like to see the lot size limited to .5 acre per household which is consistent with the adjacent neighborhoods down Filbert. Please do not sacrifice our area to maximize developer profit. This would permanently and negatively impact the rural identity of Orangevale and set a precedent for further erosion of the country lifestyle in future developments.

Orangevale neighbors,
John & Aimee Lord
9108 Orangevale Ave.

ITEM 2 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENTS 053

From: [Mark Biddlecomb](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [CPAC-Orangevale](#); [Frost. Supervisor](#)
Cc: [Jodie Biddlecomb](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00104 Blossom Ridge/Orangevale CPAC meeting April 6, 2021
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 3:20:11 PM

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

REF: PLNP2020 Blossom Ridge proposed rezone, Agenda Item #2 for Orangevale CPAC meeting, April 6, 2021

Hello,

I am a resident of Orangevale. My address is 6345 Filbert Avenue. I am a homeowner adjacent to the subject property that has been proposed to be rezoned from AR-2 to a mix of RD-3 and RD-5.

Although I would prefer this property to stay as AR-2, an orchard, I fully understand that is not the highest and best use of the land. Therefore, I am not opposed to the overall idea of the property being rezoned. However, I am opposed to so much of the property being designated as RD-5. An RD-5 designation results in relatively small individual lots and therefore necessitates the subsequent houses built there to be two-story. Two-story homes will change the character of the neighborhood and be an invasion of privacy to those of us that now live here and are adjacent to the subject property. It would seem designating the entire 9.4 acre parcel as RD-3 would make the most sense. This would reduce the impacts that the current proposed rezoning would cause in regards to increased traffic on Filbert, increased vehicle parking on the street (both inside the development and on Filbert Avenue), increased noise pollution, increased air pollution and other negative impacts to our neighborhood.

However, if the entire area is not restricted to an RD-3 designation, I have a specific concern as follows:

Specifically, the proposed parcels designated as #30 and #31 on the Tentative Subdivision Map, located directly behind (west) of the existing Tomich residence (a single story home) are part of the RD-5 area and are too small for single story homes. If two-story homes are built there, I will have no privacy whatsoever as they would have a direct line of sight into our backyard and our single story home, even with a high solid fence. I respectfully request parcels #30 and #31 be combined and that all homes built on that resulting parcel and all parcels adjoining my and any other existing single story homes (which are all of them on Filbert Avenue and in the Cape Wyndham subdivision) be restricted to single story home construction. Such a designation/restriction to single story construction would preserve the character of our neighborhood, preserve our and our neighbors privacy and alleviate much of the concern I have for this rezoning/development plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope these concerns can be resolved and I look forward to continued conversations and progress in keeping our Orangevale neighborhood a vibrant and wonderful place to live.

Mark Biddlecomb

From: jenaynj@aol.com
To: [CPAC-Orangevale](#)
Cc: [Crawford, Bob \(MSA\)](#); sue@suefrost.net; [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Blossom Ridge Proposal by Tom Tomich PLNP2020-00104 Agenda Item 2
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 5:37:39 PM

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

Dear Orangevale CPAC Members,

As you know, tomorrow's (4/6/21) meeting at 6:30pm will have a Workshop to discuss the Blossom Ridge project.

My husband and I have lived in Orangevale since 1983 in the AR-2 area, raised our children and plenty of farm animals and wonderful pets. There's no place quite like AR-2 in Orangevale. We also always enjoyed stopping by the Tomiches Silvergreen Farm for delicious fresh fruit and were saddened to hear of their family's patriarch's passing. Back in the 60's when Salle Bros and the Tomiches were starting their farm operations, a group of concerned citizen's created the Orangevale Community Plan to make sure their farm operations were zoned AR-2 to help them keep their properties to pressure from those who would rather see subdivisions than peach, plum and pear trees. Their orchards were a real asset to our community :)

Fast forward: Now we are faced with the proposal from Mr. Tomich's son to put in a 43 home subdivision on his 9.4 acre AR-2 parcel--that's roughly eight times the allowed amount of homes for a parcel of that size in AR-2. The existing neighboring parcels are mostly RD-2 half acre lots. That seems much more reasonable to me for an infill project of this size--I'd imagine he could put 18 or 19 homes in there and keep the more rural setting that those residents have come to love and still make a handsome profit on his project.

We who live here have to constantly worry about developers setting precedents for others who would take advantage of our affordable lots to increase their profits at the cost of OUR lifestyle. I am also VERY concerned about where the water is going to come from, as California is getting less and less precipitation and snow EVERY year. Anyone else been noticing how many lizards are moving in???

Please DO NOT encourage this project as proposed.

Jenny Derich
Preserve Orangevale's Country Life

From: [Carol White](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Re-zoning of 6331 Filbert Avenue, Orangevale
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 5:49:14 PM

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

If I were able to vote on the proposal to amend the Orangevale General Plan, I would vote No, and I urge all of the Orangevale Community Planning Advisory Council members to do the same. Orangevale is still a rural community and a development with the density of houses proposed for this property is completely out of character. Residents live here for the open space and rural nature of the area as well as to have livestock and large gardens. The quantity of homes proposed for this property precludes that. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of open space / agricultural land will degrade the quality of life for many, many residents. There are flooding issues in the immediate area that will be exacerbated and with the lack of sidewalks and increased traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists will be impacted.

Additionally, the increased demand for water from a project of this size will put additional pressure on our limited water reserves. California had another very dry winter this year with, no doubt, more to come.

The applicant who wishes to have the zoning changed no longer lives in Orangevale, or even in the area. He will not be affected by the negative impact if this change is made. He just wants to make a lot of money, and not give us a thought. We shouldn't have to put up with a degraded way of life so that he can get rich and forget about us.

Let's not become another Citrus Heights or Roseville. Let's keep our beloved Orangevale rural and low density. Once it is changed, it is changed forever. So, please, vote no on changing the zoning for the parcel at 6331 Filbert Avenue.

Thank you for your time.

Carol White
9274 Jan Dra Ct, Orangevale, CA 95662
Henrycarolwhite@yahoo.com

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Tina Weinmeister](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [Frost. Supervisor](#); [Hedges. Matt](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00104 BLOSSOM RIDGE Opposition Letter
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 6:32:59 PM

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

Hello,

I hope this message makes it way in time for the CPAC meeting tomorrow. I am a long-term resident of Orangevale, my father purchased the home that my mother still lives in, in the 1960's. I attended elementary through high school in Orangevale and have lived at my residence at 7036 Filbert Avenue for two decades. I cannot believe what I am hearing regarding the proposal of rezoning to allow mass development. I grew up going to Tom Tomich's fruit stand and I cannot believe what is being proposed. Orangevale is special because there are actual open spaces so to put this many homes in that space goes against everything we live her for. To rezone to away from Agricultural-Residential 2 – acres per unit is devastating. In a perfect world this wonderful orchard of trees would remain, and we would enjoy the rural open space and wildlife that comes with it. But understanding this is not practical then let's at least stick to keeping this unincorporated oasis we call OV somewhat intact and stay with the current zoning. Once it's done it's done. Once it's gone it's forever. Opinion's and nostalgia aside, let me voice my biggest and most practical concern relative to this matter. I live on the northern direction of Filbert from this proposal and I cannot image how this amount of housing will impact traffic. Filbert is a narrow, hilly road. There are 4 schools and a massive park and horse arena accessed via Filbert Avenue. If all these new residents are trying to reach Oak via Filbert I absolutely and truly fear for the school children walking, people riding bikes, horses and those pushing strollers and walking dogs on our little rural road. This is what I see on a daily basis go by window. We are not Roseville or Folsom; we do not have the infrastructure for this type of mass development. Please if anything consider this one point. I have in the past and I am willing to again represent this community, this neighborhood and this road in any capacity that might be needed.

Thank you for your time.

Tina Weinmeister
7036 Filbert Avenue
Weinmeister@sbcglobal.net
916-765-8462

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone and immediately delete this email.

From: [Shirley Greene-Kechriotis](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [Holsworth, Meredith](#); [Frost, Supervisor](#); [CPAC-Orangevale](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00104, Blossom Ridge Subdivision, Item #2 on Orangevale CPAC meeting, April 6, 2021, 6:30
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 6:43:44 PM

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

Hello All,

My husband and I have been Orangevale residents for over 22 years. We reside at 6416 Filbert Ave. It is rare these days to know your neighbors. We look out for each other, we laugh and cry, we share life. It is very comforting to have this support system. People come to settle here for many reasons but I bet you the most popular is lot size. Orangevale is distinctive and desirable. Those fortunate to move here can breathe and spread their arms out wide. You have a sense of privacy. You can grow one hell of a garden too! I call this the Spirit of Orangevale.

We oppose the project known as Blossom Ridge. To rezone the existing AR-2 to the proposed RD-3 and RD-5 mix would bring chaos to our community. Increased traffic and noise, strong possibility of overflow vehicles parking on Filbert Ave and invading the church parking lot, less privacy to existing homeowners that butt up to the new project and the wildlife around us would slowly disappear.

Please go back to the drawing board and at least match the density of surrounding neighborhoods such as Cape Windham Place.

One last thought. My husband and I were fortunate to chat with Tom Tomich (Senior) at his fruit stand on many occasions. We are confident that the legacy he wanted to leave behind was not 43 lots on 9.4 acres. Do not kill the Spirit of Orangevale.

Thanks for your time,

Shirley Greene-Kechriotis and Stephen Kechriotis

From: [Sue Frost](#)
To: jenaynjl@aol.com
Cc: [CPAC-Orangevale](#); [Crawford, Bob \(MSA; Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Re: Blossom Ridge Proposal by Tom Tomich PLNP2020-00104 Agenda Item 2
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 6:47:50 PM

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

Thank you for the heads up and for your input Jenny. I'm not always in the know as to what projects are coming before the CPAC so I don't always hear about those things until a later time.

Sincerely,
Sue

Sent from Sue Frost's iPhone

On Apr 5, 2021, at 5:37 PM, jenaynjl@aol.com wrote:

Dear Orangevale CPAC Members,

As you know, tomorrow's (4/6/21) meeting at 6:30pm will have a Workshop to discuss the Blossom Ridge project.

My husband and I have lived in Orangevale since 1983 in the AR-2 area, raised our children and plenty of farm animals and wonderful pets. There's no place quite like AR-2 in Orangevale. We also always enjoyed stopping by the Tomiches Silvergreen Farm for delicious fresh fruit and were saddened to hear of their family's patriarch's passing. Back in the 60's when Salle Bros and the Tomiches were starting their farm operations, a group of concerned citizen's created the Orangevale Community Plan to make sure their farm operations were zoned AR-2 to help them keep their properties to pressure from those who would rather see subdivisions than peach, plum and pear trees. Their orchards were a real asset to our community :)

Fast forward: Now we are faced with the proposal from Mr. Tomich's son to put in a 43 home subdivision on his 9.4 acre AR-2 parcel--that's roughly eight times the allowed amount of homes for a parcel of that size in AR-2. The existing neighboring parcels are mostly RD-2 half acre lots. That seems much more reasonable to me for an infill project of this size--I'd imagine he could put 18 or 19 homes in there and keep the more rural setting that those residents have come to love and still make a handsome profit on his project.

We who live here have to constantly worry about developers setting precedents for others who would take advantage of our affordable lots to increase their profits at the cost of OUR lifestyle. I am also VERY concerned about

where the water is going to come from, as California is getting less and less precipitation and snow EVERY year. Anyone else been noticing how many lizards are moving in???

Please DO NOT encourage this project as proposed.

Jenny Derich
Preserve Orangevale's Country Life

From: [Lucinda](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Blossom Ridge Proposal
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 7:35:02 PM

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

Please do not approve the Blossom Ridge Proposal on the Orangevale April 6, 2021 Meeting Agenda. I would like to see the rural character of Orangevale preserved. Forty-three homes on a 9.4 acre parcel is excessively dense as compared to the surrounding neighborhood which are predominately family homes on 1/2 acre parcels. The maximum number of units on this parcel should be 18.

I have been an Orangevale resident for 35 years and currently live on Golden Gate Avenue in Orangevale and would like to see the community remain rural.

Sincerely,
Lucinda Hall

From: [Paul Goodwin](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [Holsworth, Meredith](#); [Frost, Supervisor](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00104 Blossom Ridge Proposal, Orangevale CPAC April 6 at 6:30 P.M
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 7:43:03 PM

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

Regarding proposed rezoning and subdivision of 9.58 acre lot at 6331 Filbert Avenue, Orangevale, CA 95662 I'd like to know the reasoning behind changing zoning for lot so dramatically. It is now an agricultural/residential lot which is typical of Orangevale and a reason many families chose to live in this town.

I'm not apposed to rezoning the property for residential purposes, but I am apposed to creating a "condominium like environment". The rural setting most of us enjoy in Orangevale will be compromised by the proposed subdivision.

I'd like to think we can temper maximizing profit against planning for the future of our children and grandchildren. Allowing the current owners of 6331 Filbert Avenue to realize a reasonable profit, but at the same time support the surrounding community seems to be the correct way forward.

Allow rezoning, but take into consideration the adjacent homes and families. Rezone according to surrounding area and spirit of the local community. One third acre lots would be nice, but a minimum one quarter acre lots should be enforced.

Paul Goodwin
prgoodwin@hotmail.com

From: [Desirae Callaway](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Frost, Supervisor](#)
Subject: PLNP2020-00104 Blossom Ridge - Orangevale CPAC April 6th
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:17:27 PM

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

To the CPAC Board Members,

As you meet on April 6th - please do NOT approve the PLNP2020-00104 Blossom Ridge development at the Tomich Ranch as proposed. 43 houses on 9.5 acres is too many for that size property. Orangevale needs to keep the larger lots it's known for and keep property values up.

We moved to Orangevale 5 years ago because of the bigger lot size and the country feel - we know things have changed, but we don't feel that it's necessary to cram that many houses on less than 10 acres. We are now living in the Cape Windham neighborhoods - so this will directly affect us.

We are fairly certain that many houses in a small area will also impact roads, and traffic negatively - Divine Savior Church is next door and the traffic will become even more impacted with that many more people living close by. It is especially bad for those who have backyards that back up to this development - two story houses should not be allowed next to the wall/fence where they will be able to look into the back yards of established neighborhoods. The new development on Kenneth - Gum Ranch made the decision that any houses built next to the wall were not allowed to be two- story. So we know that can be done.

We hope you'll take these things into consideration as you look to approve developing this property. We are not against developing the orchard - we would just like to see fewer houses - please approve - ONLY if the lot sizes are bigger and DO NOT allow two-story houses next to the wall where established neighbors are. It will be nicer for everyone concerned. We appreciate your time and consideration in this matter. Please think of everyone involved and how it will impact ALL the neighbors in the area. Thank you.

**Calvin & Desirae Callaway
8961 Cape Windham Pl
Orangevale, CA 95662
916-988-7630**



Virus-free. www.avast.com

ITEM 2 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENTS 062

From: [Sarah VonderOhe](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: Comment - Orangevale CPAC 6 April 2021 Blossom Ridge Subdivision (Item 2)
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:26:50 PM

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

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to express concern about the currently designed density of this subdivision, which does not comply with the Orangevale Community Plan. We have purchased property in Orangevale because of the rural and agricultural premise of the community as specifically expressed by the community plan. We ask you to require that the development comply with the community plan. Does the current plan meet any of the objectives of the plan? Protect and enhance high-quality rural lifestyle? Provide an opportunity for agricultural pursuits? To protect and enhance the quality of residential areas (in areas with lot sizes of 0.25 acre or less)?

We deserve to live in the agricultural community that Orangevale was planned to be. This property is prime farmland when irrigated. That is why we purchased our home/property in Orangevale. We also understand that landowners should be able to develop their property in compliance with the applicable laws and regulations.

We ask that the developer be required to lower the densities and follow the community plan.

ITEM 2 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENTS 063

From: [Nicole Azocar](#)
To: [De Bord. Elisia](#); [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [CPAC-Orangevale](#); [Holsworth. Meredith](#)
Cc: [Frost. Supervisor](#); [Townsend. Stephanie](#); [Sac.Plan](#); [Special Districts](#); [E-SIPS](#); [DSSurveysWEB](#); [DSSTechResWEB](#); [DSSWEB](#); [County Executive](#); [SacPIO](#); [Drane \(Karl\). Natasha](#); [Desmond. Rich](#); [Hedges. Matt](#)
Subject: LEGAL OWNERSHIP MATTER REGARDING THE 4/6/2021 ORANGEVALE CPAC AGENDA ITEM: PLNP2020-00104 APN:223-0091-0020
Date: Monday, April 5, 2021 11:34:39 PM

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

Due to the following legal OWNERSHIP AND APPLICATION SIGNATURE LEGAL MATTERS related to the AGENDA ITEM 2 the Orangevale CPAC April 6, 2021 6:30 pm meeting regarding PLNP2020-00104 Located at 6331 Filbert Avenue, Orangevale, CA 95662 MUST BE POSTPONED.

It has become blatantly clear that the any and all INVESTIGATING AND REPORTING PROCEDURES regarding the REQUIRED LEGAL SIGNATURES on APPLICATIONS related to this PROPOSAL have been completely IGNORED and unverified! Furthermore, the FOLLOWING documents HAVE BEEN REMOVED from the PUBLIC RECORD related to the following issues surrounding the project:

- Letter dated 4/22/2020 NCIC File No.: SAC-20-64 regarding Historic/Cultural and Native American Tribal (Nisenan/Southern Maidu) evidence related to the project area. As a Native American I find this EXTREMELY OFFENSIVE, DISRESPECTFUL and INSULTING. This property dates back to 1897 a time when several California Native American tribes lived in the area.
- The letter from California Tree and Landscape Consulting dated May 1, 2020. This letter IGNORES the Sacramento County Tree Code Title 19 regarding the public ownership of ALL TREES on public utility easements. The recommendation is for removal of the Olive trees along Filbert Avenue. These are LEGACY TREES and are OWNED BY THE PUBLIC.
- Sacramento County Public Works & Infrastructure letter dated June 4, 2020 by Mark Rains, Special Districts, County Engineering Division. Despite the fact that this development proposal falls immediately within the Orangevale G.L.O.V.E. Special District Section this document whether intentional or not it fails to address the DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTIONS/REQUIREMENTS ADJACENT TO THIS Special District Section.
- Finally, the Sacramento County Department Transportation letter dated July 16, 2020 by Tony Do, PE. His letter lists specific revisions to the tentative subdivision map necessary for compliance.

The FIRST ISSUE is the small matter of LEGAL OWNERSHIP of 6331 Filbert Avenue, Orangevale, CA 95662 APN:223-0091-002. According to the email from the Sacramento County Assessors office dated 4/1/2021 the LEGAL Owner is the "Lillian O Tomich Revocable Trust".

Thomas P. Tomich is shown ONLY as "Care of".

THE SECOND ISSUE is the COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL (CPAC) EARLY WORKSHOP REQUEST FORM (Stamped in red and blue) "PLNR2020-00119 received May 22, 2020" has been signed by Thomas P. Tomich and dated 6 May 2020". The LEGAL ISSUE is that the "APPLICANT INFORMATION" is shown as "CNA Engineering"

The "PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION" Incorrectly mis-spells the completed owner as "Tomich Lilian O Trust" and NOT the LEGAL property owner "Lillian O Tomich

Revocable Trust".

This brings us to the THIRD ISSUE, The General Application.

The first glaring LEGAL ISSUE is that Page 3 of 8 of the application is signed by "Print Name STEPHEN J. NORMAN" and dated

4-1-20. Page 3 of 8 of the General Application also VIOLATES Section 66452 of the Subdivision Map Act. The last item in the Tentative Maps Application Material states in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS "FOR VESTING TENTATIVE MAPS ONLY: Pursuant to Section 66452 of the Subdivision Map Act, the words "Vesting Tentative Map" shall be printed conspicuously on the face of the map" these words appear NOWHERE on the map emblazoned with the words bolded and in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS "TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FOR BLOSSOM RIDGE".

THE FOURTH ISSUE is on Page 4/8 of the General Application. This page states the "Applicant" is "Thomas Tomich" and states this time "Property Owner or Agent AGAIN MIS-SPELLED as "Tomich Lilian O Trust" instead of the LEGAL OWNER Lillian O Tomich Revocable Trust.

The FIFTH LEGAL ISSUE occurs on Page 5/8 and 6/8. The "Legal Authority and Consent to File Application" on Page 5/8 is initialed "TPT". Page 6/8 states in BOLDED ALL CAPITAL LETTERS " APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT SIGNATURES OF LEGAL PROPERTY OWNERSHIP OR OFFICIAL AGENT/AUTHORITY TO FILE". Page 6/8 is signed Owners/Agents* Name by "Thomas P. Tomich" and dated 29 April 2020. DESPITE THE FACT that the words "**Must Attach Evidence" APPEAR IN TWO PLACES both above and below the signature line NO EVIDENCE IS ATTACHED!

The SIXTH LEGAL ISSUE is that NONE of the property owners within the 500' radius Neighborhood Outreach Plan area have received any correspondence listed on Page 8/9 as "Owner will mail a letter to surrounding property owners." This is because the General Application FAILS TO CORRECTLY IDENTIFY THE LEGAL OWNERSHIP OF THE PROPERTY.

Sacramento County Planning and Environmental Office, the Orangevale CPAC, nor the Sacramento County Board Clerk has provided NO EVIDENCE IS PART OF THE LEGAL PUBLIC RECORDS

which states in BOLDED ALL CAPITAL LETTERS "APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT SIGNATURE(S) OF LEGAL PROPERTY OWNERSHIP OR OFFICIAL AGENT/AUTHORITY TO FILE".

As an Orangevale resident it is clear that efforts are being made to proceed on this project without oversight. Sacramento County is attempting to invalidate the Orangevale Community Plan of 1976 via this PROPOSED development. These applications fail to comply with either Federal or California State Contract laws and cannot be are accepted as legal applications for the proposed Blossom Ridge Development. Approval of this development plan without any further investigation or FORMAL AUDIT of the Sacramento County Best Practices will be forwarded to the appropriate California State office for legal action.

Thank you,
Nicole Azocar-Newlove

Orangevale Resident
April 5, 2021
11:53 PM PST

From: [Yelena Popova](#)
To: [Holsworth, Meredith](#); [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [Frost, Supervisor](#)
Cc: ilona.ozeruga@gmail.com
Subject: PLNR2020-00104
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 12:30:11 AM

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

Hello!

I am writing this email on behalf of my family .

We moved from Rocklin 5 years ago and fell in love with our neighborhood and rural environment of Orangevale, historical farms, stables and orchards.

Building a 43 houses development in place of Tomich orchard will definitely destroy rural roots and agricultural history of the place.

Our house is in adjacent neighborhood of Cape Windham Place. Average size of lots in our community is 0.5 acres, large enough to provide that feeling of rural environment that we were looking for. Another similar neighborhood with at least 0.5 acres lots would make a lot of families happy.

Building a high density neighborhood will change the face of our community for the sake of profit.

Please hear Orangevale residents' voices, don't let that happen.

We want to preserve environment that we have.

Sincerely,
Yelena Popova

(916)276-7010

8945 Cape Windham Place
Orangevale, CA 95662

From: [Holsworth, Meredith](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Subject: FW: Blossom ridge development
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 7:20:01 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Meredith Holsworth, Associate Planner

Office of Planning and Environmental Review
827 7th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 | (916) 874-5835
www.per.saccounty.net



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: Doug Elliot <dougelliot1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 5:50 PM
To: Holsworth, Meredith <HolsworthM@saccounty.net>
Subject: Blossom ridge development

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

This is in reference to PLNP2020-00104, Blossom Ridge Subdivision, a rezoning and subdivision on a 9.58 acre, AR-2 zoned property located at [6331 Filbert Avenue](#) in the Orangevale Community.

Orangevale has been our home for almost 24 years. One of the reasons we moved here was because of the larger lot sizes and the rural environment even though it's surrounded by several cities. The above proposed housing development, which borders our subdivision, does not fit into Orangevale's vision. Most developers are putting two story, very large homes on postage stamp lots to maximize their profits. We don't think that our community should be held captive by profit-making developers and that instead the developers should respect the community and keep within the same vision – minimum lot size of 0.5 acre with single story homes.

For the majority of Americans, our home is our biggest investment, but now to have this new subdivision built with homes piled on top of each other after enjoying a fruitful orchard that has existed for more than 120 years - is frightening. This land has been producing freshly picked peaches, nectarines, plums, pluots, apricots, figs, and other fruit since 1897. With the increased housing, it will put an extra drain on our natural resources. It will increase the amount of traffic on our country road, add the potential for crime, more foot traffic, noise, cars parked on the street, etc.

We implore you as a longtime resident of Orangevale and for the sake of our community that you consider the concerns presented to you by the citizens who currently resident in this area. Please oppose the high density residential proposal and support the resident's wishes to maintain a minimum 0.5 acre lot size with single story .

Thank you

Pam and Doug Elliott

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Marc Vanden](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#); [Frost, Supervisor](#)
Subject: Item 2: PLNP2020-00104 – Blossom Ridge CPAC Workshop
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:03:24 AM

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

Good morning, I am writing to voice my opposition to the planned Blossom Ridge development on Filbert Ave. I currently reside at 6630 Filbert Ave, and believe that rezoning the land to the proposed housing density will have a negative impact on the existing homes nearby. I am not opposing any development, just the new proposed density. The property looks like crap now and the current owner obviously doesn't care about it, so cleaning up the eye soar would be welcome, but in the right way that blends into the existing community. My concerns are listed as follows:

1. Has any study been done on existing utilities? There are approximately 100 houses that use Filbert Ave, between Greenback and Hazel, so is adding almost 43% more going to put a strain on the sewer, water, and electrical lines? My main concern is the water supply, which is already limited in drought years, can the existing infrastructure handle that many more houses?
2. Has a traffic study been done on Filbert Ave to determine if traffic safety is a concern? It is already busy on the street with nearby schools, and adding 43 more homes, say with 2 cars each, could have a negative impact on traffic conditions. The roads are already in rough shape, so will the developer pay to have the roads fixed because of the additional traffic?
3. Have any studies been done to see about any potential impacts to the existing catholic church on Filbert and Greenback? Will they be restricted from holding outdoor events or functions now because of close proximities to residences? They were there first, so hoping this is not the case. (i do not attend the church by the way, but don't want people complaining about buying a house near one and then having a problem with the noise.)
4. Is there any master plan in place for Orangevale now that strives to keep the rural sense of community alive? Many people buy in OV for that fact, it's rural and open, and adding 43 houses on less than 10 acres doesn't fit in the overall community plan. If the zoning request change was following Cape Windham Circle with maybe 20 or so houses, it would not be so bad. That I think most residents can live with.

Thank you for your time, I am all for new development and cleaning up the area, but the proposed number of houses will not fit the master plan of Orangevale and will negatively impact the community.

Thank you, Marc Vanden

From: [Laura Eliseo](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Frost, Supervisor](#); [Hedges, Matt](#)
Subject: CPAC Agenda Item #2 PLNP2020-00104 (Oppose)
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 2:51:27 PM

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

Dear Sacramento County Planning Commission - I am writing to make a public comment regarding the April 6, 2021 CPAC Meeting Agenda Item #2: PLNP2020-00104 – Community Plan Amendment and Rezone for APN 223-0091-002 (6331 Filbert Avenue in the Orangevale Community). In short, I oppose the plan as proposed.

I have lived in Orangevale for nearly 50 years. I strongly support AR-2 zoning and the Orangevale Community Plan. I object to replacing agricultural residential use with RD-5 and would like to avoid setting a precedent for other parcels in the area to be allowed an exception for RD-5 instead of agricultural residential use. There will be no shortage of high-density housing in Folsom, south of US 50, so the County has a gigantic new tax base coming. Please don't encourage the applicant to shoehorn in a pocket of high-density housing in this area of Orangevale. Given that most of the lots bordering the proposed project are zoned RD-2, it would be more appropriate to rezone to RD-2. This would yield more than four times the number of homes than the current AR-2 zoning would allow and help our community better maintain the rural setting that we've come to enjoy.

Please preserve the intent of the Orangevale Community Plan and AR-2 zoning in our community by not encouraging this project to move forward at the density proposed.

Thank you,

Laura (Sordillo) Eliseo
7907 Peerless Avenue
Orangevale, CA 95662

From: [Ken Cemo](#)
To: [Clerk of the Board Public Email](#)
Cc: [Frost, Supervisor](#)
Subject: Orangevale CPAC Meeting 4/6/2021
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 4:21:17 PM

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

Please forward this email to all Orangevale CPAC members regarding the Blossom Ridge meeting on 4/6/2021 Reference PLNP2020-00104

Orangevale is a community with an unusual mix of homes, businesses and lifestyles. It is my goal to support this sought after blend which is more important now than ever. Therefore, I am against this proposal to rezone and divide the 9.4 acres of Agricultural Residential property into 43 residential home lots. A reasonable way to integrate that property is to comply with the adjoining home zoning which is primarily RD-2 and RD-3. This will allow the usage of this area to compliment the existing residences and not adversely effect their existing conditions and lifestyle.

Please vote NO on the proposed 43 lots. This can be a viable proposal if the number of lots is reduced to a number consistent with the neighborhood and area.

Ken and Michele Cemo, longtime residents of Cardwell Ave., Orangevale