


Exhibit F



Jacqueline M. Zischke, Attorney at Law

A Professional Corporation

PO Box 1115

Salinas, California 93902

P: 831/761-8714

F: 1-888-385-9198

jzischkelaw@charter.net

June 17, 2011

Delinda Robinson, Planner
Monterey County Planning Dept
168 West Alisal Street
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: York Highlands Re-subdivision, PLN 100020

Dear Ms. Robinson:

This letter responds to your letter dated June 13, 2010 and our subsequent meeting on that same date.

1. The ownership information that you have requested is being provided to County Counsel's office. You are correct that some property is still under the Monterra Ranch Properties LLC ownership, however, contractual arrangements are in place that will result in the transfer of this property.
2. The project is consistent with Policy No. LU-1.19. The project does not meet the criteria to be evaluated through the Development Evaluation System. No new lots will be created by the York Highlands Re-Subdivision, nor will the re-subdivision result in any change in use or intensity. The project will greatly reduce impacts to oak woodlands otherwise slated for removal under existing grading permits for the previously approved lot configuration.
3. The building envelopes have been carefully placed to avoid ridgeline development. Moreover, as we discussed, the General Plan does not require building envelopes to be invisible from Highway 68. As you know, the lots have been staked since April and there is very limited visibility to a couple of lots, and no ridgeline visibility. The only ridgeline development that we are aware of are the homes visible above this area in Hidden Hills, a different subdivision east and at a higher elevation than York Highlands.

You had indicated almost a month ago that a letter would be forthcoming to identify further staking to address your concern that you could not sufficiently confirm from the

existing staking that the proposed Lots 2 and 44 and one other lot would not have ridgeline visibility. We were finally glad to be able to meet with you earlier this week to sort through the staking that you will need, and we are currently in the process of providing further staking as you instructed for the building envelopes on proposed Lots 2, 44 and 6. Moreover, below is the language you requested that would require three dimensional envelopes to ensure that the buildings will not be visible as ridgeline development from Highway 68.

Prior to filing the Final Map, specific three dimensional building envelopes shall be prepared for Lot 44, Lot 2 and Lot 6 subject to the approval of the Director of the Planning and Building Inspection Department. The plans shall: (1) define the specific building site; (2) indicate maximum allowable building height for the lots; (3) identify natural vegetation that should be retained; (4) identify landscape screening as appropriate. The approved plans are to be recorded with the subdivision's CC&Rs. A note shall be placed on the Final Map stating that a specific plan has been prepared for these lots and that the property may be subject to building and/or use restrictions.

4. Due to the topography of the area, there is no feasible alternative that would allow development of the roads and driveways to occur on slopes of less than 25%. Moreover, the realigned roads and driveways already follow existing jeep trails. The proposed re-subdivision also better achieves the resource protection objectives and policies contained in the General Plan since the realigned road substantially reduces the impacts to oak woodland currently slated for removal under existing grading permits for the already approved and recorded final map lot and road configuration. As such, the project complies with Policy OS-3.5.
5. Your letter states that "assuming the building envelopes will be completely developed" you would like to see a fuel management plan. As we discussed, the larger sized building envelopes are intended to provide flexibility in siting the homes. As with lots currently in the Monterra and Tehama subdivisions, the building envelopes will not be completely developed. Fuel management will be similar to that which has occurred in the Monterra and Tehama subdivisions.
6. Please find attached a letter from WWD Engineering, which identifies that the resubdivision will reduce grading by approximately 20,000 cubic yards. You indicated that this would be sufficient for purposes of processing this application.


Finally, attached are two other items: (1) a copy of the preliminary revised vesting tentative map, which corrects the reference to the fire access road for Phase 6. As we discussed, I have provided a copy of this map to Chad Alinio at County Public Works so they can clear the application as complete and (2) a map illustrating the offered trail alignment through the

Delinda Robinson, Planner
Monterey County Planning Department
June 17, 2011

proposed York Highlands resubdivision. We have also provided a copy of this map to David Lutes with County Parks Department so they can clear the application complete as well.

The York Highlands Re-subdivision does not create any new lots, and hence should be readily processed. We request that you proceed to schedule this project for hearing.

Sincerely,


Jacqueline M. Zischke

Jacqueline Zischke
Attorney At Law, PC
PO Box 1115
Salinas, California 93902

June 14, 2011

RE: York Highlands grading

Dear Jacqui,

As requested by the project planner, we have estimated the reduction in grading work resulting from the York Highlands re-subdivision. The York Highlands re-subdivision lot and roadway realignments reduce the required grading by approximately 20,000 cubic yards. This reduction in grading is primarily due to the reduction in roadway improvements and associated infrastructure. This is readily illustrated by the removal of the road alignment through the oak woodland, and the realignment of the main road through the re-subdivision.

Sincerely,



David Fuller
PE 24400

Cc: Michael Waxer
Alan Williams
Jacqui Zischke