

OLBERDING ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Wetland Regulation and Permitting

September 7, 2022

Damien Curry
Alameda County Planning Department
399 Elmhurst St #140
Hayward, CA 94544

SUBJECT: Response to Comments on the IS/MND for the Blessing Drive Rai Residence Project located in Alameda County, California

Dear Mr. Curry,

On behalf of Rajeev Rai (Applicant), Olberding Environmental, Inc. is submitting the enclosed responses to comments and requested supplemental materials received for the Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Blessing Drive Rai Residence Project.

The listed supporting information is provided as attachments to this letter:

Attachment 1 – City of Pleasanton Comment Letter;

Attachment 2 – East Bay Regional Park District Comment Letter;

Attachment 3 – Bart Hughs Comment Letter;

Attachment 4 – Dave Selinger Comment Letter;

Attachment 5 – Alameda County Fire Department Fire Prevention Bureau Response to Comments;

Attachment 6 – Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group Emergency Response Maps;

Attachment 7 – Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group Visual Simulation Figure;

Attachment 8 – Louie Leu Architect, AIA Response to City of Pleasanton Comments;

Attachment 9 – Louie Leu Architect, AIA Response to East Bay Regional Park District Comments.

Attachment 10 – Updated Improvement Plans

Attachment 11 – HOA Board letter to Alameda County

Attachment 12 – HOA Board letter to Alameda County County Response

If you require additional information or have any questions, please contact me at your earliest convenience by telephone at 916-985-1188 or email jeff@olberdingenv.com.


Sincerely,



Jeff Olberding
Regulatory Permitting Specialist

Attachment 1

City of Pleasanton Comment Letter



Via Email:

Damien.Curry@acgov.org

July 1, 2022

Damien Curry
Alameda County Community Development Agency
Development Planning Division
224 West Winton Avenue, Room 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Re: Case No. PLN2018-00227, Site Development Review at 9480 Blessing Drive, Rai Residence

Dear Mr. Curry:

Thank you for the opportunity to attend the virtual public hearing held via Zoom on June 21, 2022 and the opportunity to speak at the meeting. This letter summarizes the City of Pleasanton's (the City) comments concerning the proposed development at 9480 Blessing Drive and the IS/MND prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc. for the proposed development dated May 2022.

1. **Land Use** - The subject site, though located in unincorporated Alameda County, immediately abuts the City limits, and is within the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and planning area boundary. The City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line splits the existing site into two General Plan Land Uses: most is Open Space – Agriculture and Grazing with an approximately 21.5 acres of Rural Density Residential. The City's 2005-2025 General Plan lists uses allowed within Open Space - Agriculture and Grazing land use designation area including "Land or buildings used for the production of agriculture or the grazing of animals." (Pages 2-24). In 1996, Pleasanton voters approved Measure FF concerning the UGB line. Measure FF states no urban development shall be permitted beyond the UGB line. Please see City's [Land Use Map](#) and [UGB Measure FF 1996](#) for further reference.

The site plan included in the MND shows the proposed development would be located outside the UGB line which is prohibited by Pleasanton's Measure FF and is inconsistent with the land use allowed in the Open Space - Agriculture and Grazing area.

Furthermore, the City's General Plan has many policies and programs pertaining to Ridgeland Plan, environmental constraints, etc. that apply to the proposed development. These policies and programs include but are not limited to the following:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

P. O. BOX 520, Pleasanton, CA 94566-0802

Planning

200 Old Bernal Ave.
(925) 931-5600
Fax: 931-5483

Building & Safety

200 Old Bernal Ave.
(925) 931-5300
Fax: 931-5478

Traffic

200 Old Bernal Ave.
(925) 931-5677
Fax: 931-5487

- Policy 2 - Encourage the retention of agricultural opens space uses, such as grazing, within the Plan Area.
- Program 3.2 – New development adjacent to or within the Plan Area should provide pedestrian access and/or staging area(s) to enable present or future connections to the Pleasanton Ridgeland Park.
- Policy 4 – Encourage the establishment of permanent protection for open space uses through the use of fee purchase, agricultural/open space easements, subdivision exactions, or other means.

The MND does not analyze the project's conformance to Pleasanton's land use, policies or programs.

2. Utilities - The proposal does not specify how the future residence would receive water and sanitary sewer services. The MND states the septic tank for domestic purposes would be designed to provide adequate capacity to serve the proposed Project, and that the approximate locations of the septic system and wastewater treatment facilities are shown on the Project site plans. The plans included in the MND made no notation or reference to such facilities.

The MND also states the water for dust control during Project construction would utilize the existing municipal water service on site, and the long-term occupancy of the home does not require groundwater withdrawal. The City has no records showing the site receives municipal water services. The proposal does not include any existing or proposed well for water. Hence, the analysis regarding water services is incorrect.

As the proposed residence would be located outside the City's UGB line and in the area where the land use designation does not allow the proposed residential use, city staff will not recommend to the City Council to allow the site to be connected to the City's water and sanitary sewer systems should a request be made by the property owner on a later date.

As for other utilities such as electricity, gas, etc., the City requests that all utilities be installed underground and they be located to prevent impacts to existing trees.

3. Viewshed Impacts - The City has a Master Trails Plan which includes existing and proposed trails throughout the City. The MND analysis concerning visibility and view impacts of the Project do not reference any existing trails in the vicinity. The proposed residence may be visible from public roads, trails, parks, and other public viewpoints from Pleasanton. Please see the City's [Master Trails Plan](#) for reference.

4. Grading - The proposed civil plans state the amount of cut is greater than the amount of fill by 800 cubic yards. The MND did not analyze how the 800 cubic yards of fill would be imported to the site, including number of truck loads and the amount of GHG emission as a result of the proposed grading. Significant grading is proposed to create dual driveways and an auto court. The City is concerned on the amount of grading in this area and therefore questions the necessity from an environmental point of view.
5. Fire Hazards - The MND stated the Project area is not located within a high fire hazard severity area as designated CAL FIRE, and as such, wildland fire risks associated with the Project would be considered less than significant. The MND did not address the project site is located in Pleasanton Special Fire Protection Area. With the current severe drought situation, the MND should address fire protection measures.
6. Hydrology and Water Quality - While there is no existing municipal water available on site, the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the MND may need to be revisited as the proposed project will rely on groundwater on a daily basis. Hence, the impacts to these areas may be more significant than originally analyzed.
7. Other – The following should be included in the MND analysis:
 - It is not clear if any of the existing trees would be removed. Removal of these trees will make the proposed residence and road more visible.
 - The project site is adjacent to East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). There are future trails planned by EBRPD to link the various parklands in the Ridgeland Area. The project should be designed while considering future trail connection(s).
 - Residence Height – Please indicate the height of the residence as measured from the lowest grade adjacent to the structure to the highest roof ridge.

In addition to the above comments associated with Pleasanton's General Plan, policies and programs, the site is located in the Ridgeland Area as approved by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Alameda County, the City of Pleasanton, and the City of Hayward in 1993. The MND analysis should take the MOU covering the Ridgeland Area and Alameda County's General Plan (East County Area Plan) policies into consideration. City staff is particularly concerned about the proposed development in relation to the following policies:

- Preserving ridgelines and open space;
- Minimizing disturbance to mature and healthy trees;
- Not allow any structures to exceed the height of the tree canopy in woodland areas;
- Minimizing visual impact of development;
- Maximizing development's conformity to natural landforms;
- Minimizing grading;

- Undergrounding utility lines;
- Conforming to UGB;
- Preserving oak woodland plant communities; and
- Providing hiking trails and access to Ridgeland Park.

Furthermore, the MND needs to address the following safety and public services items:

- Police, fire and ambulance response times from nearest Alameda County sheriff's substation / Alameda County fire station to the project site; and
- Routes of travel for first responders given existing and cumulative traffic.

The City appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed site development and MND. If you have any questions regarding the comments in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Jenny Soo, Associate Planner, at: jsoo@cityofpleasantonca.gov

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Melinda Denis', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Melinda Denis
Planning and Permit Center Manager,
Deputy Director of Community Development

Attachment 2

East Bay Regional Park District Comment Letter



2950 PERALTA OAKS COURT • OAKLAND • CALIFORNIA • 94605-0381 • T: 1-888-EBPARKS • F: 510-569-4319 • TRS RELAY: 711 • EBPARKS.ORG

July 7, 2022

Damien Curry, Planner
Alameda County Planning Department
224 West Winton Avenue, Suite 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Sent via e-mail to: Damien.Curry@acgov.org

RE: PLN2018-00227 – Rai Residence Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to adopt IS/MND

Dear Mr. Curry,

The East Bay Regional Park District (Park District) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Rai Residence (Project or Property), located at 9480 Blessing Drive at the southern terminus of Blessing Drive in unincorporated Alameda County. The Project proposes the building of a 10,656 square foot single-family residence, 540 square foot garage, and 800 square foot accessory dwelling unit across approximately 2 acres of the overall 193-acre Property. The Park District owns and operates Pleasanton Ridge Regional Park (Regional Park) adjacent to the proposed development, with the Regional Park bordering three of the four sides of the subject property.

The IS/MND addresses the Park District's concern about potential visual impacts of the Project from adjacent parkland, as was requested in a comment letter dated December 13, 2018. The Park District appreciates the inclusion of a visual simulation of the Project from the nearby Regional Park in Attachment 3 of the IS/MND to help with the review of this Project.

However, the Park District still has remaining concerns about potential visual impacts to the adjacent parkland as well as possible public safety impacts. To address those concerns, the Park District makes the following comments and requests related to the Project and Property:

- **EVMA Easement** – The Park District would like to work with the Project applicant and Alameda County to obtain an Emergency Vehicle and Maintenance Access (EVMA) easement along existing ranch roads through the Property to connect to Blessing Drive. Most of the Property south of the Project area, as well as in surrounding open space lands including the Regional Park, is heavily wooded and is in a California state responsibility High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Access to and from the Regional Park, for either an emergency or to perform preventative fire maintenance activities, would mutually benefit the Property owner and the Park District as it could help prevent and/or mitigate a wildfire disaster. Wildland fires in the area have become more frequent in recent years due to increased population, drought, and climate change. Having an appropriate EVMA would be critical for this area.
- **Protective Mechanism (Open Space or Scenic Easement)** – The Park District requests that Alameda County establishes a protective mechanism, such as a scenic or open space easement, over the remainder of the Property that is not part of the Project to ensure that the areas not currently proposed for development are protected as open space in perpetuity. Most of the property is zoned “A” (agriculture) in the county General Plan which allows “by right” uses such as tree farms, olive oil mills, and microbreweries. A protective mechanism would uphold the intent of Alameda County's Measure D to prevent urban sprawl and the loss of open space in

Board of Directors

Colin Coffey
President
Ward 7

Beverly Lane
Vice-President
Ward 6

Dennis Waespi
Treasurer
Ward 3

Elizabeth Echols
Secretary
Ward 1

Dee Rosario
Ward 2

Ellen Corbett
Ward 4

Ayn Wieskamp
Ward 5

Sabrina B. Landreth
General Manager

unincorporated County lands and preserve wildlife habitat between the Regional Park, Property, and other nearby open space.

It would also support the “community character” element of the City of Pleasanton General Plan, which seeks to preserve the open space character along the edges of the City, including Pleasanton Ridge. Some specific elements of the General Plan include:

- Policy 20: Preserve scenic hillside and ridge views, and other natural features in the hills.
- Program 20.2: In new developments, preserve scenic hillsides and other hillside features including ridges, plants, streams, and wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Rai Residence Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to adopt IS/MND. The Park District looks forward to working with the County as the Project moves forward. Please feel free to contact me at (510) 544-2621, or by email at ewillis@ebparks.org should you have any questions.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'E. Willis', is positioned above the printed name.

Edward Willis, Planner

CC: Kim Thai, Senior Planner
Devan Reiff, Principal Planner
Brian Holt, Chief of Planning, Trails and GIS

Attachment 3

Bart Hughes Comment Letter

9480 Blessing Drive project

Bart Hughes <bart_hughes@yahoo.com>

Tue 6/28/2022 3:36 PM

To:

- Curry, Damien, CDA <damien.curry@acgov.org>

Cc:

- Curry, Damien, CDA <damien.curry@acgov.org>;
- Bart Hughes <bart_hughes@yahoo.com>

Hi Damien,

Per our preliminary conversation, here are my questions and concerns regarding the 9480 Blessing Drive project:

- Wildlife impact - current study seems to provide inadequate consideration of impact to the environment
 - Existing pond residents - e.g. observed newts, waterfowl, etc.
 - Open space for mammals, fowl, etc. - current project excavation plans would significantly destroy the natural flow of the area
- Access to County park open space - approval of this project as envisioned would block future access to East Bay Regional Park/County land to the west. The Preserve community was required to provide an easement for East Bay/County parks, therefore, it makes sense that this property provide an easement to allow access to the public spaces.
- Current Agriculture Zoning and the intent and spirit of the project
 - There is already one modest structure (limit per zoning) that is keeping with Agriculture Zoning
 - A 10K+ square foot house plus garage seems well beyond the spirit of Agriculture Zoning
 - Planned tennis court (and likely lighting request) will have significant impact for nearby residences in terms of light noise and grading, etc. There are no bright lights in the area - tennis court lighting would bring significant evening light noise.
- Water requirements - If there is a well on the property, does it have the capacity to handle both the construction project needs and ongoing home/landscape operational needs. This is significant consideration given the current drought. Is there actually a well on the property? If not, how would the property get access to county/city water.
- Visual impact - Pleasanton has been protective of hillside development to the benefit all citizens. Yes, this property is outside city limits, however there is potential material negative visual impact from vantage of existing nature trails, immediate neighborhoods, and Pleasanton broadly.

Thanks for considering my comments and reflecting on my questions.

Bart Hughes

**** This email was sent from an external source. If you do not know the sender, do not click on links or attachments.**

**

Attachment 4

Dave Selinger Comment Letter

APN 941-2500-1

Dave Selinger <selly@cs.stanford.edu>

Wed 7/6/2022 8:02 PM

To: Curry, Damien, CDA <damien.curry@acgov.org>

Mr. Curry,


In relation to the application for developing a single family home at the end of Blessing Drive in Pleasanton, I wanted to write a brief letter in support of this development proposal. I am a neighbor living at 9616 Crosby Drive in Pleasanton.

I know Mr. Raj Rai and his wife Mrs. Sonia Rai for two reasons. First, I love to mountain bike and I've requested of the Rai family that they allow me to bike through their property to access some trails. They have graciously allowed this for the past 5 years.

More importantly, however, the Rai's have been a constructive part of our community to the best of their capacity. Last year during the search for Philip Kreycik, the Rai's opened their property to the search and rescue teams day after day after day--consistently inviting our search and encouraging us to scour their property, use their resources (even offering ATV's and vehicles) and offering to support the effort in any way they could. I contacted them on the day that Philip was initially lost and even though they were out of the country, the Rai's provided access and allowed me to open their property to official/police/and community volunteer searchers.

This contribution turned out to be very important.

As you can see from this story in the Chronicle (<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Missing-runner-case-Smartwatch-recovered-with-16364537.php>), Philip's body was found very near to the Rai's property:



These photos are of the driveway to the property in question, and, in fact with the support provided by the Rai's, much of our searching was done on or around their property. While the outcome was not what any of us desired, without the Rai's support, this search effort would have taken much longer and could possibly still be unsolved today.

I am happy to answer any questions or provide any additional insight.

Thank you,
David

**** This email was sent from an external source. If you do not know the sender, do not click on links or attachments. ****

Attachment 5

Alameda County Fire Department Fire Prevention Bureau Response to Comments



Alameda County Fire Department

Fire Prevention Bureau

Plan Review Comments

6363 Clark Ave, Dublin California 94568 Phone (925) 833-3473 Fax (925) 875-9387

May 13, 2021

Alameda County
Community Development Agency
Planning Department
224 West Winton Ave., Room 111
Hayward, California 94544

To	Damien Curry	PLN #	2018-00227
Address	9480 Blessings Drive		
Job Description	Single Family Home, ADU, Barns and Improvements		
Reviewed By	Bonnie S. Terra, Division Chief	Review #3	

Review of Planning referrals are usually based on information and plans that lacking details for specific comments. The primary focus of our review is to assure fire access to the site. Specific fire and building code issues will be addressed during the regular building permit submittal and review process.


Conditions of Approval

The following conditions shall be met prior the issuance of a building permit and fire clearance for occupancy.

1. All structures must comply with the adopted Building and Fire Code requirements in effect at time of building permit submittal.
2. Project is in SRA and will need to comply with requirements set forth in Title 14.
3. Project is will need to comply with all wildland requirements for structure resistance and defensible space.

Attachment 6


Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group Emergency Response Maps



Alameda County Firestations #7 and #16 are closest to 9480 Blessing Drive



9480 Blessing Drive is within CalFire (SCU) Jurisdiction



CalFire (SCU) route to 9480 Blessing Drive. Response time approximately 50-60 minutes.




Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group
Landscape Architecture • Site Planning • Environmental Design
61 East Main Street, Suite C
Los Gatos, CA 95030
(408) 356-5980
www.kkdesigngroup.com

EMERGENCY RESPONSE
CALFIRE (SCU) MAP

9480 Blessing Drive, Pleasanton


July 27, 2022



Firestation #7 route to 9480 Blessing Drive. Response time approximately 14-17 minutes.




Firestation #16 route to 9480 Blessing Drive. Response time approximately 9-12 minutes.



Pleasanton Police Department Station route to 9480 Blessing Drive. Response time approximately 10-13 minutes.

Attachment 7

Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group Visual Simulation Figure



Enlarged View with location of proposed structure depicted (outline). Note that structure will be obscured by existing hill when viewed from vantage point.




Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group
 Landscape Architecture • Site Planning • Environmental Design
 61 East Main Street, Suite C
 Los Gatos, CA 95030
 (408) 356-5980
www.kkdesigngroup.com

VISUAL SIMULATION

9480 Blessing Drive, Pleasanton

July 21, 2022



Enlarged View with location of proposed structure depicted. Note that structure will be obscured by existing hill when viewed from vantage point.



Kikuchi + Kankel Design Group

Landscape Architecture • Site Planning • Environmental Design

61 East Main Street, Suite C
Los Gatos, CA 95030
(408) 356-5980
www.kkdesigngroup.com

VISUAL SIMULATION


9480 Blessing Drive, Pleasanton

July 21, 2022



Attachment 8

Louie Leu Architect, AIA Response to City of Pleasanton Comments



Via Email:

Damien.Curry@acgov.org

July 1, 2022

Damien Curry
Alameda County Community Development Agency
Development Planning Division
224 West Winton Avenue, Room 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Re: Case No. PLN2018-00227, Site Development Review at 9480 Blessing Drive, Rai Residence

Dear Mr. Curry:

Thank you for the opportunity to attend the virtual public hearing held via Zoom on June 21, 2022 and the opportunity to speak at the meeting. This letter summarizes the City of Pleasanton's (the City) comments concerning the proposed development at 9480 Blessing Drive and the IS/MND prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc. for the proposed development dated May 2022.

1. **Land Use** - The subject site, though located in unincorporated Alameda County, immediately abuts the City limits, and is within the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and planning area boundary. The City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line splits the existing site into two General Plan Land Uses: most is Open Space – Agriculture and Grazing with an approximately 21.5 acres of Rural Density Residential. The City's 2005-2025 General Plan lists uses allowed within Open Space - Agriculture and Grazing land use designation area including "Land or buildings used for the production of agriculture or the grazing of animals." (Pages 2-24). In 1996, Pleasanton voters approved Measure FF concerning the UGB line. Measure FF states no urban development shall be permitted beyond the UGB line. Please see City's [Land Use Map](#) and [UGB Measure FF 1996](#) for further reference.

The site plan included in the MND shows the proposed development would be located outside the UGB line which is prohibited by Pleasanton's Measure FF and is inconsistent with the land use allowed in the Open Space - Agriculture and Grazing area.

Furthermore, the City's General Plan has many policies and programs pertaining to Ridgeland Plan, environmental constraints, etc. that apply to the proposed development. These policies and programs include but are not limited to the following:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

P. O. BOX 520, Pleasanton, CA 94566-0802

Planning

200 Old Bernal Ave.
(925) 931-5600
Fax: 931-5483

Building & Safety

200 Old Bernal Ave.
(925) 931-5300
Fax: 931-5478

Traffic

200 Old Bernal Ave.
(925) 931-5677
Fax: 931-5487

- Policy 2 - Encourage the retention of agricultural opens space uses, such as grazing, within the Plan Area.
- Program 3.2 – New development adjacent to or within the Plan Area should provide pedestrian access and/or staging area(s) to enable present or future connections to the Pleasanton Ridgeland Park.
- Policy 4 – Encourage the establishment of permanent protection for open space uses through the use of fee purchase, agricultural/open space easements, subdivision exactions, or other means.

The MND does not analyze the project's conformance to Pleasanton's land use, policies or programs.

RESPONSE- The project does not conform Pleasanton's land use policies or programs. Development is limited by the East Area County Plan

2. Utilities - The proposal does not specify how the future residence would receive water and sanitary sewer services. The MND states the septic tank for domestic purposes would be designed to provide adequate capacity to serve the proposed Project, and that the approximate locations of the septic system and wastewater treatment facilities are shown on the Project site plans. The plans included in the MND made no notation or reference to such facilities.

RESPONSE- Septic evaluation has been submitted to ACHED for plan review. water will be supplied by a well (already on site)

The MND also states the water for dust control during Project construction would utilize the existing municipal water service on site, and the long-term occupancy of the home does not require groundwater withdrawal. The City has no records showing the site receives municipal water services. The proposal does not include any existing or proposed well for water. Hence, the analysis regarding water services is incorrect.

RESPONSE- There is an existing well which serves the property and will continue to serve the new development.

As the proposed residence would be located outside the City's UGB line and in the area where the land use designation does not allow the proposed residential use, city staff will not recommend to the City Council to allow the site to be connected to the City's water and sanitary sewer systems should a request be made by the property owner on a later date.

RESPONSE- a septic system will be used for the development, plans have been submitted to ACHED .

As for other utilities such as electricity, gas, etc., the City requests that all utilities be installed underground and they be located to prevent impacts to existing trees.

RESPONSE- all utilities will be installed underground

3. Viewshed Impacts - The City has a Master Trails Plan which includes existing and proposed trails throughout the City. The MND analysis concerning visibility and view impacts of the Project do not reference any existing trails in the vicinity. The proposed residence may be visible from public roads, trails, parks, and other public viewpoints from Pleasanton. Please see the City's [Master Trails Plan](#) for reference.

RESPONSE- Additional visual study point has been identified by City planner, and the Visual study is updated to include this study point.

4. Grading - The proposed civil plans state the amount of cut is greater than the amount of fill by 800 cubic yards. The MND did not analyze how the 800 cubic yards of fill would be imported to the site, including number of truck loads and the amount of GHG emission as a result of the proposed grading. Significant grading is proposed to create dual driveways and an auto court. The City is concerned on the amount of grading in this area and therefore questions the necessity from an environmental point of view.

RESPONSE- Civil plans are revised to show balanced cut and fill (by Darrel Alexander)

5. Fire Hazards - The MND stated the Project area is not located within a high fire hazard severity area as designated CAL FIRE, and as such, wildland fire risks associated with the Project would be considered less than significant. The MND did not address the project site is located in Pleasanton Special Fire Protection Area. With the current severe drought situation, the MND should address fire protection measures.

RESPONSE- Alameda County Fire has reviewed the project. (Their review letter is attached)

6. Hydrology and Water Quality - While there is no existing municipal water available on site, the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the MND may need to be revisited as the proposed project will rely on groundwater on a daily basis. Hence, the impacts to these areas may be

RESPONSE- there is an existing well which serves the property and will continue to serve the new development. Analysis will be done to confirm capacity or if a new well is needed.

7. Other – The following should be included in the MND analysis:

- It is not clear if any of the existing trees would be removed. Removal of these trees will make the proposed residence and road more visible. RESPONSE- No trees are proposed to be removed
- The project site is adjacent to East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). There are future trails planned by EBRPD to link the various parklands in the Ridgeland Area. The project should be designed while considering future trail connection(s). RESPONSE- The project will not provide public trail connections
- Residence Height – Please indicate the height of the residence as measured from the lowest grade adjacent to the structure to the highest roof ridge. RESPONSE- 33'-3"

In addition to the above comments associated with Pleasanton's General Plan, policies and programs, the site is located in the Ridgeland Area as approved by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Alameda County, the City of Pleasanton, and the City of Hayward in 1993. The MND analysis should take the MOU covering the Ridgeland Area and Alameda County's General Plan (East County Area Plan) policies into consideration. City staff is particularly concerned about the proposed development in relation to the following policies:

- Preserving ridgelines and open space;
- Minimizing disturbance to mature and healthy trees; RESPONSE- No existing trees are disturbed or impacted
- Not allow any structures to exceed the height of the tree canopy in woodland areas;
- Minimizing visual impact of development; RESPONSE- the proposed structure is not located within any tree canopy
- Maximizing development's conformity to natural landforms; RESPONSE- additional landscape trees will be provided to minimize visual impact
- Minimizing grading; RESPONSE- natural landforms are preserved to the extent possible
RESPONSE- grading is balanced

- Undergrounding utility lines; RESPONSE- utilities will be underground
- Conforming to UGB; RESPONSE- does not conform
- Preserving oak woodland plant communities; and
- Providing hiking trails and access to Ridgeland Park. RESPONSE- The project will not provide public trail connections

Furthermore, the MND needs to address the following safety and public services items:

- Police, fire and ambulance response times from nearest Alameda County sheriff's substation / Alameda County fire station to the project site; and
- Routes of travel for first responders given existing and cumulative traffic.

RESPONSE- A map showing locations of fire stations and response times is attached

The City appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed site development and MND. If you have any questions regarding the comments in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Jenny Soo, Associate Planner, at: jsoo@cityofpleasantonca.gov

Sincerely,



Melinda Denis
Planning and Permit Center Manager,
Deputy Director of Community Development

Attachment 9

Louie Leu Architect, AIA Response to East Bay Regional Park District Comments

July 7, 2022

Damien Curry, Planner
Alameda County Planning Department
224 West Winton Avenue, Suite 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Sent via e-mail to: Damien.Curry@acgov.org

RE: PLN2018-00227 – Rai Residence Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to adopt IS/MND

Dear Mr. Curry,

The East Bay Regional Park District (Park District) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Rai Residence (Project or Property), located at 9480 Blessing Drive at the southern terminus of Blessing Drive in unincorporated Alameda County. The Project proposes the building of a 10,656 square foot single-family residence, 540 square foot garage, and 800 square foot accessory dwelling unit across approximately 2 acres of the overall 193-acre Property. The Park District owns and operates Pleasanton Ridge Regional Park (Regional Park) adjacent to the proposed development, with the Regional Park bordering three of the four sides of the subject property.

The IS/MND addresses the Park District's concern about potential visual impacts of the Project from adjacent parkland, as was requested in a comment letter dated December 13, 2018. The Park District appreciates the inclusion of a visual simulation of the Project from the nearby Regional Park in Attachment 3 of the IS/MND to help with the review of this Project.

However, the Park District still has remaining concerns about potential visual impacts to the adjacent parkland as well as possible public safety impacts. To address those concerns, the Park District makes the following comments and requests related to the Project and Property:

- **EVMA Easement** – The Park District would like to work with the Project applicant and Alameda County to obtain an Emergency Vehicle and Maintenance Access (EVMA) easement along existing ranch roads through the Property to connect to Blessing Drive. Most of the Property south of the Project area, as well as in surrounding open space lands including the Regional Park, is heavily wooded and is in a California state responsibility High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Access to and from the Regional Park, for either an emergency or to perform preventative fire maintenance activities, would mutually benefit the Property owner and the Park District as it could help prevent and/or mitigate a wildfire disaster. Wildland fires in the area have become more frequent in recent years due to increased population, drought, and climate change. Having an appropriate EVMA would be critical for this area. Discussion with Park District is ongoing. Park District will provide a proposed language for an agreement for emergency access
- **Protective Mechanism (Open Space or Scenic Easement)** – The Park District requests that Alameda County establishes a protective mechanism, such as a scenic or open space easement, over the remainder of the Property that is not part of the Project to ensure that the areas not currently proposed for development are protected as open space in perpetuity. Most of the property is zoned “A” (agriculture) in the county General Plan which allows “by right” uses such as tree farms, olive oil mills, and microbreweries. A protective mechanism would uphold the intent of Alameda County's Measure D to prevent urban sprawl and the loss of open space in

Board of Directors

Colin Coffey
President
Ward 7

Beverly Lane
Vice-President
Ward 6

Dennis Waespi
Treasurer
Ward 3

Elizabeth Echols
Secretary
Ward 1

Dee Rosario
Ward 2

Ellen Corbett
Ward 4

Ayn Wieskamp
Ward 5

Sabrina B. Landreth
General Manager

unincorporated County lands and preserve wildlife habitat between the Regional Park, Property, and other nearby open space.

It would also support the “community character” element of the City of Pleasanton General Plan, which seeks to preserve the open space character along the edges of the City, including Pleasanton Ridge. Some specific elements of the General Plan include:

- Policy 20: Preserve scenic hillside and ridge views, and other natural features in the hills.
- Program 20.2: In new developments, preserve scenic hillsides and other hillside features including ridges, plants, streams, and wildlife.

After meeting with the Park District, the Park District has concluded that neither a scenic easement nor limits on the type of agricultural use, are necessary at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Rai Residence Notice of Availability and Notice of Intent to adopt IS/MND. The Park District looks forward to working with the County as the Project moves forward. Please feel free to contact me at (510) 544-2621, or by email at ewillis@ebparks.org should you have any questions.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'E. Willis', with a stylized, flowing script.


Edward Willis, Planner

CC: Kim Thai, Senior Planner
Devan Reiff, Principal Planner
Brian Holt, Chief of Planning, Trails and GIS


Attachment 10

Updated Improvement Plans

IMPROVEMENTS FOR
9480 BLESSINGS DRIVE
PLEASANTON



VICINITY MAP
NTS



SHEET INDEX

- 1 COVER SHEET
- 2 GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
- 3 GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
- 4 NOTES AND DETAILS

GRADING QUANTITIES
CUT 8,640 CU YDS
FILL 8,640 CU YDS

LOT AREA
183.34 AC
DISTURBED AREA
3.48 AC
NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA
60,992 SF

HAUL ROUTE

1. ACCESS TO THE DEVELOPMENT BY CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT, MATERIAL DELIVERIES AND OTHER HEAVY LOADS SHALL BE LIMITED BY THE DEVELOPER TO THE FOLLOWING ROUTE: HWY 580, FOOTHILL RD, LAUREL CREEK DR, BLESSINGS DR, HWY 680, STONERIDGE DR, LAUREL CREEK DR, BLESSINGS DR.

EXCESS FILL TO BE IMPORTED FROM VULCAN MATERIALS,
LOCATED IN, PLEASANTON, CALIFORNIA

ENGINEER CERTIFICATE

PLANS PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF:

Rob Diestler

ROBERT D. DIESTLER RCE NO 66722, EXPIRES 09/30/22



LEGEND

- DRAINAGE ARROW INDICATES DIRECTION OF DRAINAGE
- STORM DRAIN
- 4" PERIMETER DRAIN
- EXISTING INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR
- EXISTING INDEX CONTOUR
- NEW DESIGN CONTOUR
- SWALE
- PROPERTY LINE
- REMOVE EX-TREE

ABBREVIATIONS

- AD AREA DRAIN (HANSON P6 OR APPROVED EQUAL)
- BW BOTTOM OF RETAINING WALL
- CO CLEAN-OUT
- DI DRAIN INLET (HANSON P18 OR EQUAL)
- DS DOWNSPOUT
- ED EMERGENCY DRAIN (HANSON P6 OR APPROVED EQUAL)
- FF FINISHED FLOOR
- FL FLOWLINE
- FG FINISHED GRADE (UN-PAVED SURFACE)
- FS FINISHED SURFACE (PAVED SURFACE)
- GR TOP OF GRATE
- OFF GARAGE FINISHED FLOOR
- HP HIGHPOINT
- INV INVERT
- LS LANDSCAPING
- PA PLANTER AREA
- SW STORM WATER INLET
- TC TOP OF CURB
- TG TOP OF GRATE
- TW TOP OF RETAINING WALL
- PERF. PERFORATED
- (E) EXISTING
- (N) NEW

ALAMEDA COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT
FIRE PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS AS SHOWN ON THESE
PLANS ARE HEREBY APPROVED

THIS DAY OF , 2021.

BY: DEPUTY FIRE MARSHALL

ALAMEDA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY
IMPROVEMENT PLANS REVIEWED BY:

BY: WILLIAM LEPERE P.E., DEPUTY DIRECTOR
CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
ALAMEDA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY

DATE:

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISIONS	APPROVED

ALEXANDER & ASSOCIATES INC.
SURVEYORS
ENGINEERS
PLANNERS
147 OLD BERNAL AVE. SUITE 10, PLEASANTON, CALIFORNIA (925) 462-2265

DRAWN BY:	RD
DESIGNED BY:	RD
CHECKED BY:	DA
SCALE:	AS SHOWN

COVER SHEET
9480 BLESSINGS DRIVE
CITY OF PLEASANTON
ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

JOB NO.:	2020 281
DISK NO.:	2020 281
FILE NO.:	2020 281
DATE:	7-26-22

SHEET NO.:
C1
OF 4 SHEETS

[illegible]

RD
DESIGNED BY: RD
CHECKED BY: DA
SCALE: AS SHOWN


2020 281	<div> <div>SHEET NO.:</div> <div>C3</div> <div>OF 4 SHEETS</div> </div>
DISK NO.:	
FILE NO.: 2020 281	
DATE: 7-26-22	

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
ROBERT D. DIESTLER
NO.
C 66722
EXPIRES 09/30/22
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Rob Diestler

1. A GRADING PERMIT SHALL BE REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY EARTHWORK.
2. AN ENCROACHMENT PERMIT SHALL BE REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK WITHIN PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY.
3. ALL GRADING SHALL CONFORM TO THE CITY SPECIFICATIONS AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY ENGINEER'S COMMENTS CONTAINED IN THE SOILS REPORT PREPARED BY BERGLER, DATED 11/1/00. THE SOILS ENGINEER WILL PROVIDE ON-SITE OBSERVATION AND SOILS TESTING DURING THE GRADING OPERATION.
4. EMBANKMENT CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO SECTION 19-6 OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.
5. THE MINIMUM FILL DENSITY COMPACTION WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D 1557.
6. GRADES SHALL NOT BE MORE THAN 0.1 FEET LOWER NOR 0.1 FEET HIGHER THAN THE ELEVATION INDICATED ON THIS PLAN.
7. EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO RUN-ON AND RUNOFF CONTROL, EFFECTIVE SITE MANAGEMENT, AND NON STORM WATER MANAGEMENT THROUGH ALL PHASES OF CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE UTILIZED BY THE LANDOWNER AT ALL TIMES, YEAR ROUND, UNTIL THE SITE IS FULLY STABILIZED AT THE SLOPES OR THE INSTALLATION OF PERMANENT EROSION CONTROL MEASURES.
8. THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR HIS SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL PREVENT THE FORMATION OF AN AIRBORNE DUST NUISANCE AT ALL TIMES. THEY SHALL DO SO BY WATERING AND/OR TREATING THE SITE OF WORK, AND SHALL MAINTAIN DUST CONTROL EQUIPMENT ON THE SITE AT ALL TIMES DURING CONSTRUCTION AND UNTIL FINAL COMPLETION. THEY SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE DONE BY DUST FROM THEIR CONSTRUCTION OR FROM THE PERFORMANCE OF ANY WORK UNDER THIS CONTRACT. THE PRICES FOR THE VARIOUS ITEMS OF WORK SHALL INCLUDE PROVIDING ADEQUATE DUST CONTROL, AS REQUIRED BY THE LOCAL AGENCY.
9. THE APPROXIMATE QUANTITY OF CUT IS 7840 CUBIC YARDS & FILL IS 8640 CUBIC YARDS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ALSO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFICATION OF ABOVE EARTHWORK QUANTITIES PRIOR TO THE START OF THE GRADING OPERATION.
10. EXISTING CEILING CRACKS, FOUNDATIONS, BASEMENTS, TANKS OR OTHER UNDERGROUND STRUCTURES, IF ENCOUNTERED, SHALL BE REMOVED AND THE RESULTING DEPRESSIONS BACKFILLED AND COMPACTED UNDER OBSERVATION BY THE SOILS ENGINEER.
11. ANY EXISTING WELLS ON PROPERTY BEING DEVELOPED SHALL BE SEALED AND ABANDONED IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE GROUNDWATER PROTECTIONS ORDINANCE. THE OWNER OR OTHER RESPONSIBLE PARTY SHALL CALL ZONE 7 AT 424-4262 FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. ZONE 7 INSPECTOR SHALL WITHNESS THE SEALING AND ABANDONMENT.
12. ANY DEVIATION FROM APPROVED PLANS DURING CONSTRUCTION WILL REQUIRE APPROVAL BY THE CITY ENGINEER.
13. TOPSOIL SHALL BE STOCKPILED AS DIRECTED BY THE SOILS ENGINEER. PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF GRADING, THE STOCKPILE SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE GRADING AREA.
14. FILL SLOPES SHALL BE 2:1 MAXIMUM AND CUT SLOPES TO BE 2:1 MAXIMUM, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
15. GRADE BREAKS AT TOPS AND TOES OF CUT AND FILL SLOPES SHALL BE ROUNDED TO PRESENT A SMOOTH NATURAL APPEARANCE.
16. CONTRACTOR TO RESTORE SLOPES AND LANDSCAPE ON OFFSITE WORK TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE PROPERTY OWNERS.
17. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EXIST THE EXISTING 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION REQUIRING FILL PLACING.
18. CONSTRUCTION WATER TO BE RECLAIMED WATER OBTAINED FROM DUBLIN - SAN RAMON SERVICES DISTRICT IF POSSIBLE OR THE CITY OF PLEASANTON.
19. SUBDRAIN PIPE SHALL BE PERFORATED PVC (SDR 35) WITH A BLANKET OF FILTERING MATERIAL, PRECISE SIZE AND LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED AND FIELD BY THE SOILS ENGINEER.
20. PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF SUBGRADE PREPARATION, R-VALUE TESTS BY THE SOILS ENGINEER WILL BE REQUIRED AT LOCATIONS SPECIFIED BY THE CITY ENGINEER TO VERIFY THE PAVEMENT DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.

1. ALL GRADING SHALL CONFORM TO ALAMEDA COUNTY STANDARDS STANDARDS.
2. ALL GRADING SHALL BE DONE UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE SOILS ENGINEER. SEE GENERAL GRADING NOTE #3.
3. ALL DOWNSPOUTS SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM 3" DIAMETER SOLID DRAIN LINES AND A MINIMUM 3" DRAIN STORM DRAIN SYSTEM.
4. SURFACE WATER SHALL DRAIN AWAY FROM THE STRUCTURE FOR 5% MIN. FOR 5' MIN. (NATIVE SOIL OR LANDSCAPED AREAS) 2% MIN. FOR 5' MIN. (PAVED SURFACES)
5. SURFACE WATER SWALES SHALL HAVE A 1% MINIMUM SLOPE AND BE CONVEYED TO AREA DRAINS.
6. AREA DRAINS SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM 6 INCHES DIAMETER GRATE OPENING.
7. ALL DRAIN LINES SHALL HAVE A 1% MINIMUM SLOPE.
8. ALL DRAIN LINES SHALL PASS UNDERNEATH THE GRADE BEAMS, NOT THROUGH THEM, ANY SUBDRAINS PLACED UNDER THE STRUCTURE SHALL BE LOCATED TO MISS PIERS AND/OR GRADE BEAMS.
9. WHEN A PERFORATED DRAIN LINE IS CONNECTED TO A SOLID DRAIN LINE, THE INVERT OF THE SOLID DRAIN SHALL BE HELD BELOW THE INVERT OF THE PERFORATED LINE.
10. ALL DRAIN LINES FOR SURFACE WATER SHALL BE SOLID, NON-FLEXIBLE, R.P.P. PERFORATED PIPE SHALL BE USED FOR SUBDRAINS ONLY. (SEE DETAILS)
11. CLEANOUTS FOR PERIMETER DRAIN SHALL BE SPACED 75' MAX O.C.
12. EROSION CONTROL PLANS SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT BY SEPTEMBER 15 IF WORK CONTINUES INTO THE RAINY SEASON.
13. THIS PLAN TO BE USED FOR GRADING AND DRAINAGE ONLY. REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL PLAN FOR OTHER INFORMATION.
14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN THE SITE IN AN ORDERLY MANNER CONTINUOUSLY THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT. THE STREET SHALL BE KEPT CLEAR OF MUD AND DEBRIS AT ALL TIMES.
15. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COST CONTROL MEASURES TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE COUNTY. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ORDINANCES WILL RESULT IN A SUSPENSION OF WORK UNTIL COMPLIANCE IS VERIFIED.
16. THE OWNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR INSPECTING, MAINTAINING, AND REPAIRING STORM DRAIN, PERIMETER DRAIN, DOWNSPOUTS, AND DRAINAGE SWALES.



1. SWALE SHALL BE GRADED TO DRAIN TOWARD OUTLET AT A MINIMUM SLOPE 0.2%
2. PLANTINGS MAY INCLUDE TREES, MINIMUM INFILTRATION RATE 5"/HR
3. ENGINEERED SOIL - USE TOPSOIL BLEND AS SPECIFIED IN THE MOST RECENT ALAMEDA COUNTY C.3 GUIDEBOOK
4. DO NOT CONNECT STORM DRAIN INFLOW PIPES TO UNDERDRAIN.
5. MINIMUM SLOPE MEASURED FROM TOP OF GRATE OF AREA DRAIN (OR DOWNSPOUT DRAIN) TO TOP OF EMITTER SHALL BE 1% (4" PIPE) OR 0.5% (6" PIPE)
6. MINIMUM INFLOW PIPE SLOPE SHALL BE 1% (4" PIPE) OR 0.5% (6" PIPE)
7. MINIMUM UNDERDRAIN PIPE SLOPE SHALL BE 0.5% (6" PIPE)
8. INSTALL PERFORATED PIPE WITH PERFORATIONS DOWN.
9. NO FILTER FABRIC TO BE USED.
10. INSTALL CAPPED CLEANOUTS AT UNDERDRAIN ENDS.

NOT TO SCALE




NOTES

1. RIP RAP SHALL BE 4"-6" FIELD STONE OR ROUGH QUARRY STONE.
2. MINIMUM DEPTH SHALL BE 1 1/2 TIMES THE AVERAGE STONE SIZE.
3. ROCKS SHALL BE PLACED SO AS TO PROVIDE A MINIMUM OF VOIDS.
4. SURFACE ROCKS SHALL PROTRUDE 1/2 THEIR VERTICAL DIMENSION.
5. END OF STORM DRAIN PIPE TO HAVE A 45° BEVEL CUT OR 2' TEE.



NO SCALE



JOB NO. 2020 281	SHEET NO.: C4	PROJECT NAME NOTES AND DETAILS 9480 BLESSINGS DRIVE CITY OF PLEASANTON ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA	DRAWN BY: RD	DESIGNED BY: RD	CHECKED BY: DA	SCALE: AS SHOWN	ALEXANDER & ASSOCIATES INC. <i>SURVEYORS ENGINEERS PLANNERS</i> 147 OLD BERNAL AVE. SUITE 10, PLEASANTON, CALIFORNIA (925) 442-2255												
								NO.	BY	DATE	REVISIONS	APPROV							

Attachment 11

HOA Board letter to Alameda County

August 30, 2022

Damien Curry
Alameda County Community Development Agency
Development Planning Division
224 West Winton Ave, Room 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Re: Case No. PLN2018-00227, Site Development Review 9480 Blessing Drive, Rai Residence

Dear Mr Curry:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on and share our concerns about the proposed development of 9480 Blessing Drive. The proposed project site immediately abuts to our community, the *Preserve*. Our community streets are its only means of entry and exit. The location and nature of the site's development will have meaningful impact on our community. What kind of impact it may have on us, and on the city of Pleasanton is our concern. For that reason, our first request is that the County coordinate and cooperate with the city of Pleasanton as it relates to this proposed development.

The City of Pleasanton, in its July 1, 2022, letter, effectively outlined its concerns with respect to the proposed development at *9480 Blessing Drive and the IS/MND prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc. for the proposed development dated May 2022*. We share those concerns. What we believe is one extremely important point raised in the City's letter is the proposed development is within the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and planning area boundary. For that reason alone, the County should coordinate and cooperate with Pleasanton if this project is to move forward.

A second fact raised in the July 1, 2022; letter is that the proposed, more than eleven thousand feet of, structures fall only a few yards beyond the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line. The UGB line in fact splits the existing site. We believe the location for the house, pool, tennis court, etc. may have been selected in an attempt to sidestep any land use and development requirements and/or restrictions they knew the City would impose. In selecting that specific location, however, they have created an important question about "*Viewshed*" impacts which we hope the County will review and address.

Every year, as members of our community seek to renew our homeowner's insurance policies, we are reminded by insurance carriers that our area is of higher-than-average fire hazard concern for insurers. Our homes all have sprinkler systems and are connected to a municipal water supply with adequate pressure to support those systems.

What provisions has this proposed development included to mitigate fire hazard? What source of water will they be using? They claim there is "*existing municipal water service on-site*." Pleasanton's July 1, 2022, letter however says; "*The City has no records showing the site receives municipal water services. The proposal does not include any existing or proposed well for water. Hence, the analysis regarding water services is incorrect*." This heightens our concerns about the proposed development's foresight and to us shows there is inadequate planning to mitigate potential fire hazard. Again, this development immediately abuts our community, and our neighbors are who will be most at risk should there be a fire there.

Land use is another issue of concern to our community. Our community is called the *Preserve*. Our name derives from the fact that, when initially developed, approximately two hundred of our total three hundred

acres were set aside as permanent open space and hiking trails. Those acres can never be developed. Will this development have similar requirements? What access, if any, to the Pleasanton Ridgeland Park, will be required as *quid pro quo* for building on this site? More importantly, what limitations will be placed on future site development? Is this just the start of multiple residences on that piece of land? What limitations, if any, will the County place on such potential future development?

Building a single home on one hundred ninety-three acres is not objectionable *per se*. There are, however, far too many unanswered questions about this development at this point.

We urge the county to address both our concerns and the city of Pleasanton's concerns and answer the questions we are asking before considering approval of the development of this site as it is currently proposed. Additionally, as noted previously, we urge the County to coordinate and cooperate with the City of Pleasanton as you move forward.

Thank you,

Board of Directors
The Preserve Community Association

cc. Melinda Denis
Planning and Permit Center Manager,
Deputy Director of Community Development

Attachment 12

HOA Alameda County Response to HOA Comments

August 30, 2022

Damien Curry
Alameda County Community Development Agency
Development Planning Division
224 West Winton Ave, Room 111
Hayward, CA 94544

Re: Case No. PLN2018-00227, Site Development Review 9480 Blessing Drive, Rai Residence

Dear Mr Curry:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on and share our concerns about the proposed development of 9480 Blessing Drive. The proposed project site immediately abuts to our community, the *Preserve*. Our community streets are its only means of entry and exit. The location and nature of the site's development will have meaningful impact on our community. What kind of impact it may have on us, and on the city of Pleasanton is our concern. For that reason, our first request is that the County coordinate and cooperate with the city of Pleasanton as it relates to this proposed development.

Noted

The City of Pleasanton, in its July 1, 2022, letter, effectively outlined its concerns with respect to the proposed development at *9480 Blessing Drive and the IS/MND prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc. for the proposed development dated May 2022*. We share those concerns. What we believe is one extremely important point raised in the City's letter is the proposed development is within the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and planning area boundary. For that reason alone, the County should coordinate and cooperate with Pleasanton if this project is to move forward.

Noted

A second fact raised in the July 1, 2022; letter is that the proposed, more than eleven thousand feet of, structures fall only a few yards beyond the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) line. The UGB line in fact splits the existing site. We believe the location for the house, pool, tennis court, etc. may have been selected in an attempt to sidestep any land use and development requirements and/or restrictions they knew the City would impose. In selecting that specific location, however, they have created an important question about "*Viewshed*" impacts which we hope the County will review and address.

Project complies with Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, including any restrictions regarding viewshed.

Every year, as members of our community seek to renew our homeowner's insurance policies, we are reminded by insurance carriers that our area is of higher-than-average fire hazard concern for insurers. Our homes all have sprinkler systems and are connected to a municipal water supply with adequate pressure to support those systems.

What provisions has this proposed development included to mitigate fire hazard? What source of water will they be using? They claim there is "*existing municipal water service on-site*." Pleasanton's July 1, 2022, letter however says; "*The City has no records showing the site receives municipal water services. The proposal does not include any existing or proposed well for water. Hence, the analysis regarding water services is incorrect.*" This heightens our concerns about the proposed development's foresight and to us shows there is inadequate planning to mitigate potential fire hazard. Again, this development immediately abuts our community, and our neighbors are who will be most at risk should there be a fire there.

Project will have stored water for fire suppression on site. Project complies with Fire Marshal approval.

Land use is another issue of concern to our community. Our community is called the *Preserve*. Our name derives from the fact that, when initially developed, approximately two hundred of our total three hundred

acres were set aside as permanent open space and hiking trails. Those acres can never be developed. Will this development have similar requirements? What access, if any, to the Pleasanton Ridgeland Park, will be required as *quid pro quo* for building on this site? More importantly, what limitations will be placed on future site development? Is this just the start of multiple residences on that piece of land? What limitations, if any, will the County place on such potential future development?

Project will not afford public access to parklands. which is not a requirement for development.

Building a single home on one hundred ninety-three acres is not objectionable *per se*. There are, however, far too many unanswered questions about this development at this point.

This project was evaluated under CEQA guidelines, zoning ordinance and General Plan and found to be consistent.

We urge the county to address both our concerns and the city of Pleasanton's concerns and answer the questions we are asking before considering approval of the development of this site as it is currently proposed. Additionally, as noted previously, we urge the County to coordinate and cooperate with the City of Pleasanton as you move forward.

Noted

Thank you,

Board of Directors
The Preserve Community Association

cc. Melinda Denis
Planning and Permit Center Manager,
Deputy Director of Community Development