

Exhibit #9

**Neighbor's Request for Denial  
In regard to County File #VR14-1021**

We, the undersigned, have had the opportunity to review the 200 Sydney Drive proposal, by reviewing the plans, attending hearing(s) or both.

The proposed project is in a well-established hilltop planned community (Est. 1960). The Developer carefully planned and constructed each lot, placing them in a way that best achieves a quality neighborhood to the benefit of all property owners. Lots appear quite large on a parcel map, but the building pads are a small part, with most of the lot being a very steep and unbuildable down slope. The limits of the terrain, along with building pad size and location, place homes in close proximity with one another. We are not like some other developments (such as Legacy Ridge, Blackhawk, etc.) designed to accommodate very large and spacious homes. We love the size, scale and wooded hilltop beauty of this unique neighborhood. We request that any new development be representative and respectful of our neighborhood plan and pattern. For 50 years, our neighborhood's County approved plans to create proper drainage, reasonable building size and placement of structures on lots, for every home, has held sway. Over this time, every home built or remodeled has adhered to this concept. The applicant's proposed plans do not.

Shifting the house to avoid side setbacks was a positive step. However, problems continue and we believe there are very reasonable alternatives. We believe the continued requests for more trees and variance, indicate the proposed project is too big for the neighborhood and the lot. The proposed house is 210% the size of the average home on the street and 54% larger than the largest home. At a minimum this "overbuilt" proposal demonstrates a capacity to make adjustments to better fit the neighborhood.

Beyond the size of the house, are problems with the garage and driveway. The perpendicular placement of the garage on the lower of two levels is at variance. Perpendicular placement with a second story is very rare (only 3 of more than 50 homes) and has only been done when there is a shared driveway and both homeowners could plan room layout accordingly. The garage placement also gives rise to a  $\pm 10$  foot "bridge" on the top of the building pad. This bridge sweeps out 15 feet over the hillside, and is more than 20 feet above the ground at that point. This is incompatible, unsightly and a safety issue (especially when combined with the steep driveway). The applicant has stated the driveway is so steep that others in his family do not want to use it. Routine parking on the cul de sac will not work. It is small and already causes turnaround problems for cars, garbage pickup and delivery trucks, not to mention emergency vehicles. Now that the home is shifted, there is adequate room for a three-car garage at street level, like other homes in the neighborhood. Thereby eliminating these significant problems.

Finally, the proposed structure will be 3-stories under the California Residential Code. This is in excess of the County limit (2 1/2 stories) and the CCRs (2 stories). The proposal shows an "open" post and beam structure elevating the house a story above the developer established building pad. There has been repeated testimony by a structural engineer (licensed in the State of California) that the house as shown, elevated over 15 feet, is most unusual for residential construction and could not be built as drawn. Even if extraordinary structural investments were made, the proposal ignores the purpose of the building pad and disregards neighbors and the neighborhood. It also creates a man-made "cave" for the deer, coyotes, fox, raccoons, rattle snakes and rodents that populate the hillside.

There are many alternatives to what is proposed. It is not our intent to prevent development. We believe the applicant can address these issues and still have the largest house on the street. It is our request the development be in a manner that respects the neighborhood and neighbors. We look forward to welcoming Mr. Rassai and his family. However, for the reasons noted (and others), we request denial at this point.

<u>Name (Print)</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Signature &amp; date</u>
FRANK RINELLA	207 SYDNEY DR	Frank Rinella 9/23/14
MARILYN A. KELLY	207 Sydney Drive	Marilyn A Kelly 9/23/14
GWEN GALLAGHER	231 Sydney Dr	Gwen Gallagher 9-24-14
Doris Ross	231 Sydney Dr	[Signature] 9-24-14

<u>Name (Print)</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Signature &amp; date</u>
Lawn Rhodes	236 Sydney	Lawn Rhodes 9-24-14
TIM FARRELL	206 SYDNEY DR.	Tim Farrell 9/28/2014
FRANK ANAK	236 SYDNEY DR.	Frank Anak 9/28/2014
Dennyece Farrell	206 Sydney Dr	Dennyece Farrell 9/28/14
BRIAN GRANGER	224 SYDNEY DR.	Brian Granger 9/28/14
KATHLEEN DOLAN	224 Sydney DR.	Kathleen Dolan 9/28/14
BOYD BURKE	377 Castle Crest Rd	Boyd Burke 9/28/14
Barbara Ann Richter	230 Sydney Drive	Barbara Ann Richter 9-28-14
Ruth Cranston	201 Sydney Dr.	Ruth Cranston 9-29-14.
JOHN CUDDIHY	212 Sydney DR	John Cuddihy 9-29-14
GIYAN SENARATNE	201 SYDNEY DR.	Giyana Senaratne 9/29/2014.
Daniel Moore	215 SYDNEY DR.	Daniel Moore 10-1-14
Jacklyn Chandler	218 Sydney Dr	Jacklyn S. Chandler 10/1/14
PAUL HUNTER	218 SYDNEY DR	Paul Hunter 10/1/14
Rogen Hill	219 Sydney Dr	Rogen Hill 10/1/14
Beth Hill	219 Sydney Dr	Beth Hill