

8/23/2016

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: EDH APAC letter on Saratoga Estates (for Planning Commission meeting this Thurs)



PC 8/25/16
#2
Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>
2 pages

Fwd: EDH APAC letter on Saratoga Estates (for Planning Commission meeting this Thurs)

Rommel Pabalinas <rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us>

Mon, Aug 22, 2016 at 5:19 PM

To: Tiffany Schmid <tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us>, Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <Hidahl@aol.com>

Date: Aug 22, 2016 4:58 PM

Subject: EDH APAC letter on Saratoga Estates (for Planning Commission meeting this Thurs)

To: <Jennifer.Franich@edcgov.us>

Cc: <rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us>, <Craig@sandberglaw.net>, <aerumsey@sbcglobal.net>, <jjrazz@sbcglobal.net>, <hpkp@aol.com>, <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, <gary.miller@edcgov.us>, <bosone@edcgov.us>, <bostwo@edcgov.us>

Hi Jennifer,

Attached is the EDH APAC letter for conditional support of the Saratoga Estates project. Please note that the primary conditional issues involve disagreement with County DOT's recommendations, and not the proponents project. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Thanks, John
(916) 933-2703

APAC LetteronSaratogaEstates8.22.16.docx
290K



El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee
1021 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2016 Board Chair
Ellison Rumsey
Vice Chair
John Raslear
Secretary
Kathy Prevost

August 22, 2016

El Dorado County Community Development Agency
Development Services Department, Planning Division
Attn: Jennifer Franich, Associate Planner
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA. 95667

Subject: Z14-0007, PD14-0006 & TM14-1520-APAC Letter on Saratoga Estates

Dear Jennifer,

The EDH APAC conducted its monthly meeting on Wednesday August 10th. The project proponents provided an update and answered questions from the public, which was well received. As a result, the full **APAC** voting membership present **voted unanimously (6-0) for Conditional Support of the project.**

The conditional support is largely due to APAC's disagreement with County DOT's positions on the necessary road improvements rather than the proponents proposal.

APAC disagrees with the County TDM modeling results that the Saratoga Way connection to Iron Point Road will be adequate as a two lane road initially. Once the residents of EDH and Folsom discover that this road has been opened, the traffic volumes will dictate the need for a 4 lane road. A four lane road, with a center landscaped median to match Folsom's Iron Point Road intersection, should be part of the project. Saratoga Way will become another gateway into El Dorado Hills for the residents of Folsom and surrounding areas West of EDH. It needs to be consistent with the connecting Folsom roadways to encourage more business transactions in EDH (reverse sales tax leakage). The four lanes need to be built sooner rather than later, which will also save significant CIP resources in the long run for other needed projects. The additional project costs for the developer to build four lanes vs. two was estimated to be ~\$400,000, and affords huge 'economies of scale' compared to waiting and having DOT pave the additional two lanes sometime in the distant future.

Likewise, the Wilson Blvd connection to Saratoga Way also needs to be built as a 4 lane road (instead of 2 lanes) at the time the project is built. During peak demand periods when the intersection of El Dorado Hills Blvd and Highway 50 are near gridlock, residents will use the Wilson Blvd to Saratoga Way routing as a cut-off to circumvent the traffic problems near Hwy 50. APAC supports the installation of lighted signals at this intersection concurrent with the road construction work. The need to ensure that a Class 1 bikeway be installed over the

length of Saratoga Way and for the newly constructed section of Wilson Way, concurrent with the road construction was also emphasized.

From discussions with the project planner, and the developer, our understanding is that most if not all of the streets within the project will have 28 foot roadway widths and thus only allow parking on one side of the residential streets. This creates real issues in terms of enforcement of the restricted parking condition. APAC is concerned with the enforcement of this requirement when parties or large gatherings are held inside the residences. A public safety issue is created without enforcement. APAC supports the use of 32 foot minimum roadway widths for internal circulation and thus parking on both sides of the street to eliminate the costly burden of enforcement to allow emergency vehicles the proper access at all times.

General comments: 1) Lots B and D may not be suitable for recreational use unless they are maintained by the HOA, with due consideration given to public safety, and especially the risk of unsupervised children accessing the area. Provisions to install fencing to allow lock-off the area from public access during certain seasonal conditions may be required; 2) Lot F poses similar concerns from a public safety perspective, and especially the risk of unsupervised children accessing the area. Provisions to install fencing to allow lock-off the area from public access during certain seasonal conditions may be required; and 3) With the passage of Measure E in June 2016, County staff must re-analyze the project to ensure that the proper implementation of the voter's intent, including 'not worsening' the CalTrans LOS F rating of Highway 50 during peak weekday commute hours is accomplished prior to project approval.

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to provide comments for this DEIR. If you have any questions please contact John Hidahl, the subcommittee chairperson hidahl@aol.com or (916) 933-2703; or Ellison Rumsey, 2016 APAC Chairman at aerumsey@sbcglobal.net or (916) 358-5733).

Sincerely,

Ellison Rumsey

Ellison Rumsey

APAC Chairman

Cc: EDCo Planning Commission

EDCo BOS

APAC read file