

---

## Gold Rush Ranch specific plan area

---

From Robin Peters <rpeters010@gmail.com>

Date Wed 3/5/2025 1:01 PM

To Tom DuBois <tdubois@cityofsuttercreek.org>

Cc Claire Gunselman <cgunselman@cityofsuttercreek.org>; Julia Sierk-Zanze <jsierk@cityofsuttercreek.org>; Susan Feist <sfeist@cityofsuttercreek.org>; James Swift <jswift@cityofsuttercreek.org>

Good evening Tom and members of the City Council,

I read with interest the background information for Item 9C on tonight's City Council agenda. I understand the item is agendized for information only – as a way for the applicants to read the community tea leaves - so I thought a few big-picture comments might be of some help.

### General comments about the original approvals

Many will recall that the original GRR project split the community into two camps: those who had no interest in nor use for the magnitude of the proposed development and its attendant impacts, and those who accepted certain impacts with the understanding that the way the project was ultimately conditioned would bring badly-needed or at least positive amenities (a new wastewater treatment plant, a golf course community, etc.). The only reason the City Council ultimately approved the project and, later, the referendum was unsuccessful, is that it was clear in the conditions that the project couldn't move forward without providing certain amenities *up front*.

In effect then, there was little risk to the City because the project could never reach the point where impacts were generated without first constructing the amenities. This arrangement was not a result of happenstance, but rather of painstaking work by the City over a period of several years, through countless meetings, to make certain the City would be made whole in the end. Most folks know that a developer's first responsibility to his shareholders is to kick conditions, obligations, infrastructure, etc. forward – to a future phase – to a phase that, alas, is never reached. Today, it is the City Council's responsibility to its constituents to make certain that isn't allowed to happen in this instance.

### Consistency with the Gold Rush Ranch Specific Plan (GRR-SP)

The GRR-SP (Attachment J) very specifically delineates conditions that apply to: all projects and activities within the GRR-SP area, to large lot subdivisions within the GRR-SP area, and to subsequent small lot subdivisions within the area. It would appear that this developer is skipping the large-lot approach, at least for the time being, and moving directly to the first small-lot subdivision. In this case then, all of the conditions in Attachment J, Sections 1.0 and 3.0 must be placed on this tentative small lot subdivision map, if approved. Condition 1.14 is of particular interest ... compelling construction of a new wastewater treatment plant before the issuance of any residential building permits.

The slide presentation in tonight's packet indicates that the development wishes to proceed by "... following the current specific plan." Yet the phasing is different, proposed roadway alignments are different, the golf course is being pushed to a future phase, and there is no mention at all of constructing a new wastewater treatment plant (only of contributing to a WWTP, and then only in a future phase). No part of those proposals are consistent with the GRR-SP and therefore cannot be approved as presented.

### Wastewater capacity

The subdivision proposal currently on the table appears to be moving forward on the assumption that it will be allowed to consume the entirety of our current wastewater treatment plant's capacity – the reason only 150 homes are currently being proposed. This is in stark contrast with the strict language of the GRR-SP, but also with the intent of a number of the wastewater conditions. The GRR-SP was approved by the City Council with the understanding that the project would not only replace its aging wastewater treatment plan with a new

one, but to provide additional capacity beyond its current 0.48 MGD. Any tentative subdivision map application within the GRR-SP area that proposes instead to *consume* the City's remaining treatment plant capacity, rather than *replace and augment* it as required by the GRR-SP, should be considered dead on arrival.

### Golf Course

It's difficult to tell from the slide presentation, but it appears that the 17 acres of community park dedication sits squarely on a portion of the golf course and also on a portion of another village. Say what you want about the viability of golf courses in today's market, but an up-front golf course is baked into the GRR-SP, so any proposal that has the potential to negatively affect implementation of a golf course would be inconsistent with the GRR-SP.

### Allen Ranch Road-Ampine Road intersection improvements

The slide presentation indicates that Allen Ranch Road would be extended to SR 104 at Ampine Road. Condition 1.36(a) requires that intersection improvements, possibly including signalization, are required prior to issuance of the first building permit within the GRR-SP area. These improvements don't appear in the slide presentation but are required as a condition of approval of any small lot subdivision map.

### Grading

The slide presentation identifies grading as a "Key Consideration." The snippet of grading included in the slide presentation is clearly mass grading, which is not consistent with the GRR-SP for this portion of the specific plan area. Grading and grading limitations occupied a great deal of time and consumed a great deal of energy during the original approval process, and compliance with the GRR-SP grading standards must be demonstrated.

Please send the message to the developer this evening that the City Council expects any development project within the GRR-SP area to demonstrate consistency with the entirety of the adopted GRR-SP. And please enter these comments into the public record for tonight's meeting.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Robin Peters  
146 Badger Road  
Sutter Creek