



FW: Formal Opposition to Project TM25-0003 / PD25-0005 (Serrano Village M5)

From Cameron W. Welch <Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us>

Date Tue 5/12/2026 7:39 AM

To Rhiannon R. Guilford <Rhiannon.Guilford@edcgov.us>

Cc Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>; Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>; Robert J. Peters <Robert.Peters@edcgov.us>; Aaron D. Mount <aaron.mount@edcgov.us>; Ande Flower <Ande.Flower@edcgov.us>; Brendan Ferry <brendan.ferry@edcgov.us>; Thea A. Graybill <Thea.Graybill@edcgov.us>; Angelic M. Madson <Angelic.Madson@edcgov.us>; Debra R. Ercolini <debra.ercolini@edcgov.us>; Patricia M. Soto <Patricia.Soto@edcgov.us>; Christopher A. Smith <Christopher.Smith@edcgov.us>; David A Livingston <david.livingston@edcgov.us>; Jefferson B. Billingsley <Jefferson.Billingsley@edcgov.us>; Adam J. Bane <adam.bane@edcgov.us>; Zachary S. Oates <Zach.Oates@edcgov.us>; Renee I. Jensen <Renee.Jensen@edcgov.us>; MaryJane E. Smith <Elizabeth.x.Smith@edcgov.us>

Hi Rhiannon,

Can you please upload the below comment to Legistar?

Sincerely,

Cameron Welch
Senior Planner
Planning Division

County of El Dorado Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
Direct: (530) 621-5816
Main: (530) 621-5355
cameron.welch@edcgov.us
[Planning Division - El Dorado County](#)



Elevate to El Dorado
A Great Place to Live, Work & Play

From: Sergio Sanchez-Chopitea <sergio.sanchezchop@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 9:20 PM

To: Cameron W. Welch <Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us>; BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Subject: Formal Opposition to Project TM25-0003 / PD25-0005 (Serrano Village M5)

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear El Dorado County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Serrano Village M5 development, specifically the request to install a gated entrance and a new four-way stop at the intersection of Sangiovese and Appian Way.

As a local resident, I am deeply concerned that this project prioritizes developer convenience over the safety and infrastructure of our established community. My objections are based on the following critical issues:

Public Safety & Emergency Access: The Highland View neighborhood is restricted to only two primary exits. By adding a four-way stop at this junction, the county is creating a bottleneck that will severely impede evacuation routes. In the event of a fire or other emergency, this added congestion puts hundreds of families at significantly higher risk.

Infrastructure Strain: Appian Way is not currently equipped to handle the backup this intersection will cause. Without existing shoulders or dedicated turn lanes, this stop sign will create a permanent traffic "trap" at an entrance that is already under heavy strain, resulting in a grave daily inconvenience for the 400+ homes to the north.

Outdated Planning Standards: It is unacceptable that this project is being evaluated under the 1988 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. A document nearly 40 years old cannot possibly account for the current density and traffic patterns of our area. Relying on outdated exemptions to bypass current CEQA reviews for drainage and traffic impacts is a disservice to the taxpayers.

Absence of Technical Oversight: To my knowledge, no current traffic circulation or sight-distance studies have been conducted for this specific 4-way stop. Moving forward without evaluating the offsite impacts to travel delay and emergency vehicle response times is a failure of the planning process.

I urge the Commission to require a full, modern environmental and traffic impact report before any permits are granted. Our community's safety and mobility must come before new development interests.

Sincerely,
Sergio Sanchez-Chopitea
Highland view resident.



EL DORADO HILLS
COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

TO: El Dorado County Planning Commission

2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

FROM: El Dorado Hills Community Service District

Department of Parks & Planning
1021 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills Ca

Subject: Serrano Village M5 (TM25-0003/PD25-0005) Parkland Dedication and Density Considerations

Dear Chair and Members of the Planning Commission,

I appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed Serrano Village M5 project, and the accompanying staff report and findings. I recognize that the project has been found consistent with the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP), including its provisions allowing density transfers and overall buildout within the plan's established limits. My comments are not intended to challenge the project's compliance with the Specific Plan. Rather, I would like to raise a broader policy question regarding how parkland dedication and in-lieu fee obligations are evaluated over time as development patterns evolve within the Specific Plan area.

As documented in the staff report, Village M was originally envisioned as a ranch estate area with approximately 37 large residential lots. Through subsequent approvals and density transfers, Village M is now planned to accommodate approximately 166 residential units at buildout, which equals a 350% increase in units for M lot. This represents a substantial shift from low-density ranch estate development to a more traditional single-family residential pattern, which may generate different levels of park and recreation demand. More broadly, this change reflects a pattern of incremental adjustments across the Serrano development where, over time, density has increased through individual entitlements without a corresponding amendment to the Specific Plan.

The staff report concludes that parkland dedication and park improvement obligations have been satisfied at the Specific Plan level and that no additional parkland dedication or fees are required for this project. This conclusion appears to be based on:

- Plan-wide parkland dedication requirements tied to the overall Specific Plan buildout.
- Completed Park improvements and dedications exceeding minimum requirements.
- A 2020 agreement acknowledging fulfillment of these obligations.

Given the evolution in development intensity described above, the El Dorado Hills Community Service District respectfully requests clarification on the following points:

Request for Clarification

1. Treatment of Incremental Density Increases

How does the conclusion that parkland obligations have been satisfied account for incremental density increases within individual villages, such as the substantial change in Village M?

2. Underlying Nexus Assumptions

Were the original parkland dedication and fee requirements based, in part, on assumptions about lower-density rural estate development patterns? If so, has any evaluation been conducted to confirm that those assumptions remain valid given the shift toward smaller-lot single-family development?

3. Proportionality of Park Funding and Fees

Do additional dwelling units created through density transfers generate any additional parkland dedication or in-lieu fee obligations? Or are these additional units effectively absorbed within the original plan-level framework without adjustment?

4. Current Service Levels and Capacity

Is there any updated nexus analysis, service-level review, or coordination with the El Dorado Hills Community Services District confirming that park capacity and funding remain sufficient to serve the development as it has actually built out?

While the project may be consistent with the Specific Plan as currently structured, these questions relate to the long-term alignment between development intensity and infrastructure funding mechanisms. As land use patterns evolve over time, it may be appropriate to periodically revisit whether the original assumptions for parkland dedication and fee structures continue to ensure equitable and adequate service levels.

Respectfully,

Daniel Savala

Principal Planner

El Dorado Hills Community Service District

CC: Stephanie McGann Jantzen, Interim General Manager, EDHCSO

Bob Williams, Planning Commissioner, Second District