

Sierra Club Lake Group

15995 Lucy Circle, Lower Lake, CA 95457

February 13, 2006

Emily Minton, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
Planning Division
255 N. Forbes St
Lakeport, CA 95453

RE: Plum Flat Subdivision, SD 06-02

Dear Ms. Minton:

Thank you for giving the Lake Group the opportunity to review this proposed subdivision. Although the site seems suitable for eventual residential development, we have several serious reservations about the current proposal.

First, and most significantly, the densities proposed conform to neither the old nor the new General Plan, being drastically out of line with current Rural Lands designation calling for a maximum density of one unit per 20 acres, and also non-compliant with maximum densities of the Suburban Residential Reserve designation in the new Plan by a factor of nearly two to one. For this reason alone this proposal should be rejected immediately, before the developer wastes any more money or the Community Development Department wastes any more time. If the applicant prefers to revise his plans to conform with expected requirements under the new General Plan (which is virtually certain to be operative before Plum Flat reaches final approval stage), we strongly favor that the reduced density requirement be met by the preservation of a larger proportion of the site as natural open space, rather than by increasing the size of individual lots.

Second, the proposal to dispose of sewage on site seems entirely inappropriate for a project of this size, density, and proximity to Clear Lake, and we suggest that residential development of the site should be delayed until connections to a modern sewage treatment facility are available. Furthermore, we think that the county should manage provision for domestic water supply in a coordinated fashion, and should discourage the proliferation of private water systems, as proposed for this project.

Third, because the park area in the center of the project is designed to be entirely surrounded by houses, this open space will provide habitat for none but the smallest and most common wildlife species. As laid out, the subdivision lacks any provision for a wildlife corridor, and will therefore fragment surrounding ecosystem and thus magnify its destructive impacts beyond those to the site itself.

Fourth, the destruction of so much oak woodland habitat is deplorable, and should in itself trigger the requirement of an Environmental Impact Report. Please do not let this proposal proceed without that essential safeguard.

Sincerely,

Victoria Brandon

Sierra Club Lake Group Chair