

August 28, 2006
Lori Lawrence
Environmental Coordination Services
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive
Suite 280
Auburn, California 95603

Re: English Colony Estates, Community Plan Change from 10 acres to 2.3 acres

Dear Ms. Lawrence,

Due to the location of this project and the proposed significant reduction in parcel size, it is essential that this project be accurately described regarding any proposed limitations or prohibitions that would impinge on the opportunity to keep livestock.

The proposed project is located in a rural area where the opportunity to keep livestock is such an important component of the area that it is addressed directly in the current Community Plan. Many parcels around this project have livestock and none of the parcels, including the English Colony Estates parcel, are prohibited from keeping livestock.

Limitations or prohibition to livestock keeping directly affect the impact analysis of:

- Compatibility with the existing community
- Changes in character of the area
- Consistency with the Community Plan goals and policies
- Creation of conflict with existing neighborhood
- Reduction of agricultural resources and opportunities

Since livestock are currently allowed now, and it is a critical component of the Community Plan and the existing community, it is the *limitation or prohibition* of livestock that must be explicitly identified and assessed so that the public is informed of the real nature of the project and accurate analysis can result in appropriate mitigation measures.

Possible mitigation measures might include internal buffers, denial of the 2.3 acre zoning change, increase in minimum lot size to accommodate livestock (should 2.3 be too small because of other environmental issues) and/or limitations on types and number of livestock but no prohibition of livestock. These measures are then presented in public documents and hearings and incorporated into the conditions of approval. Subsequent private CC&R's cannot conflict with conditions of approval and thus could not impose a blanket livestock prohibition implemented outside the public hearing process and create a very different project that had not been evaluated or disclosed during the approval process.

If the developer fails to identify proposed livestock limitations or prohibitions, then it is presumed livestock are allowed as per current code and a condition should be placed accordingly. The developer should not escape review because a convenient omission. I request full disclosure of his proposal re livestock so that the public properly informed and the evaluation is based on accurately described project.

Thank-you,
Patricia Gibbs