

4/3/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531/Cameron Ranch



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

PC 4/26/18  
#3  
4 pages

---

## Fwd: Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531/Cameron Ranch

---

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>  
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Mon, Apr 2, 2018 at 3:34 PM

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

From: **Joshua Divelbiss** <joshua.divelbiss@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Apr 2, 2018 at 3:06 PM

Subject: Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531/Cameron Ranch

To: planning@edcgov.us

Dear Planning Commission,

Please find attached for your consideration the Cameron Park Design Review Committee's review comments / recommendations on the Cameron Ranch documents presented to the Committee on July 24, 2017.

Thank you!

--

**Josh Divelbiss**, NCARB, LEED AP  
Architect  
916.316.6759  
joshua.divelbiss@gmail.com



**Committe Comments CPDRC CAMERON RANCH Z17-0001,PD17-0001,TM17-1531.pdf**

79K

**MEETING DATE:** July 24, 2017  
**FILE NO.:** Z17-0001,PD17-0001,TM17-1531  
**PROJECT:** CAMERON RANCH  
**APPLICANT:** Starbuck Road 56 CA LLC/R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc.

---

---

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Cameron Park       Pollock Pines       Staff Review

---

**Setbacks:**

The DRC expressed concern about the 10' backyards where they abut other yards and adjacent uses and the lack of any attractive interface with the adjacent existing apartment off Hastings in that there is no landscaping planned between the development and Hastings and Starbuck. Does the 10' rear yard setback meet the County's requirements?

---

**Landscaping and Existing Growth:**

There appears to be no effort to create landscaping along the existing streets. Imperative that there be adequate space devoted to landscaping to include street trees. Developer indicated the HOA will maintain front yards.

---

**Fencing:**

The sound wall concept is very unattractive from Green Valley Road. The DRC would recommend either no sound wall or the sound wall should be of an attractive design and opt for vegetation, with a native plants theme. Any alternative should not remove sidewalk. It is our understanding that with the proposed 4' retaining wall, and a 7' sound wall, a minimum 11' high wall is anticipated along Green Valley Road. A noise study will recommend the height of the sound wall, which must be measured from the finished floor grade of the nearest houses. Fencing on houses on corner lots should continue from the edge of the house to the rear property line in order to maximize the amount of landscaping along the street.

---

**Mail Boxes:**

Not presented.

---

**Signs:**

Developer stated there would be "monuments" at the entrances but no design was put forth. Signs should be reviewed by the DRC.

---

**Lighting:**

Not presented.

---

**Parking:**

Parking is not well addressed in this project; visitor parking is non-existent. Project should show adequate on-street parking and room for guest parking. Developer stated an HOA would take care of streets and front yards.

---

**Trash Areas:**

Not presented.

**Vehicular Access:**

Streets should be wide enough to accommodate parking, sidewalks and emergency vehicle access requirements.

---

**Siding or Exterior:**

Elevations should be improved with more texture (e.g., "rock") and the articulation should wrap edges of the buildings. Side elevations of homes located on corner lots should be enhanced. Elevations should be submitted to the CP DRC under a separate application.

---

**Colors:**

Adequate color boards presented.

---

**Roofing Materials:**

Not addressed

---

**Air Conditioning:**

Not addressed.

---

**Roof-Mounted Items:**

Not addressed.

---

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**PROJECT: CAMERON RANCH**  
**PAGE 2**

**General Comments:**

The developer stated that a 4' retaining wall at the cul-de-sac is not able to be changed due to topography. However, it would be possible to do so by eliminating a unit.

Beautifying the Hastings orientation with landscaping which is of adequate size, e.g., 10' to accommodate street trees, is recommended. Fencing must be attractive

Parking is an issue. More should be provided

**It is essential that that a project be annexed into the Cameron Park Community Services District prior to final map in that this .**

project will impact Cameron Park amenities, including parks.

Pedestrian access to transit stop is important to include (sidewalks). Sidewalks are essential in order to promote and provide for walking opportunities to nearby neighborhoods, shopping and bus stops.

Lack of group spaces noted. No onsite parks. Group space should be provided or the drainage area should be enhanced to provide a recreational area such as a playground and picnic area.

Developer stated the retention pond could serve as a playground, but it should be enhanced.

The project lacks a community feel and is not well integrated into the surrounding area. The surrounding streets will only view the backs of the homes, including Star Bucks and Hastings.

The Design Review Committee would like to see revised/enhanced building elevations.

There was a suggestion by a community member to hyperlink the project documents to the DRC website so that interested citizens can see it there in case they do not see it on the Planning & Building Dept. websites.

These units should not be attached. The savings in permit fees are not a good reason to attach them. If anything, the County should change its fee structure.

(If it is true that attached structures have lower permit fees, the County should consider changing its fee structure.)

**Recommendation: REDESIGN AND RETURN TO DRC FOR REVIEW**