

Small lot size: The project is consistent with Residential Development Standards for Multi-Unit Residential (RM) zoning, and the minimum size lot in RM is 2,000 sqft. The project proposes lots within the size range of 2,821 square feet to 7,725 square feet.

Design Waiver Concerns:

Sidewalks: A continuous sidewalk through the project is proposed along D and E Drives and will be connected to the existing sidewalk along Rite Aid, which connects to the new bus stop. The proposed pedestrian improvements are approved by Fire per Conditions of Approval (COA) 50.C, and will meet current ADA Guidelines in accordance with COA #19.

Parking: The project is required to conform to standards outlined in table *130.35.030.1-Scheduled of off-street Vehicle Parking Requirements*. This project provides at least four off-street parking stalls per house (two in garage and two on driveway), and an additional 26 on-street parking stalls. The majority of the on-street parking will be centrally located on D Drive.

Sound wall/Noise: The proposed sound wall 7-foot height along Green Valley Road is based on the project's noise study recommendation to mitigating noise to a less than significant impact threshold, in accordance with Conditions of Approval #11. Applicant is open to including vegetation along the sound wall to allow for a more attractive esthetic.

Landscaping: Applicant has submitted a landscape plan for the installation of proposed residential front and side yards to be maintained by HOA. The frontage along Starbuck Road will be very similar from pre- to post-development as the majority of the existing vegetation, including oak trees, will be maintained. Street trees will be planted on the north side of D Drive as space allows.

Cemetery: No physical development is proposed outside of the project parcels. The existing cemetery is located off-site directly across the street from Hastings Drive from the project. According to the County Cemetery Administration, ground-penetrating radar was conducted previously at the cemetery, which identified its existing fencing and construction of Hastings Drive. A standard Conditions of Approval #62 has been added to the project to address accidental discovery of human remains on-site during grading activities.

Special-Status Species: The biological site assessment did not indicate that any special-status species were observed or documented on the site, including the Tri-Colored Blackbird. The Tri-Colored Blackbird has been a species of special concern since 1990 and is protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

PC 4-26-18
Item # 3



Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Rezone Z17-0001/planned development PD17-0001/tent. sub. mapTM-17-1531

1 message

Dave & Joni Stackpole <sdavejoni951@gmail.com>
To: planning@edcgov.us

Mon, Apr 16, 2018 at 3:36 PM

Members of the Planning Commission,

I would like to submit my opposition to the above planned development along with the requested zoning changes. Rescue is a rural area, the location this proposal is located as a rule are 5 acre parcels with some gated communities. Prior to the location are single family homes on 1/4 to 1/3 acre lots. **What we do not need are "cluster homes", I'm assuming that these are either condos or apartments,** stuck together with 9 detached homes on minuscule lots with substandard roads, sidewalks, and a change of the zoning. The **zoning rules** and DISM standards were adopted after much study and to fit the overall planned development of this area. To down grade the existing standards with this poorly planned conglomeration would be a blight on the area, proposed by the developer to stuff as many houses into an area too small, without doubt to increase his monetary gain. Additionally, **Starbuck road has more than enough existing traffic,** and does not need an 41 to 82 more cars crowding the road. **Starbuck was not designed to handle the amount of traffic it now accommodates, without additional.**

Question 1

Question 2

Please give serious thought to the points I have brought up and deny the proposal.

Thank You

David L Stackpole
2932 Fulam Ct.
Rescue, CA 95672

Response 1: The County General Plan (adopted July 2004) designated this property Multifamily Residential (MFR), which allows for higher density between 5 to 24 units per acre. This project site is 5.6 acres which would allow 134 units under the current zoning. The proposed project is only 41 units which is far less than what the current zoning allows. The rezone component of the project is only to add Planned Development (PD) overlay to the Multi-Unit Residential (RM) zoning (adopted December 2015), which allows flexibility to development standards. The project is neither a condo nor apartment project. While several of the units are attached, each house will be sold separately as a single family home.

The previous project that was approved on May 14, 2012 for half of this same site and was a project that consisted of three story buildings and 80 apartment units. The second phase of the same apartment project would hve added additional three-story buildings and another 80 apartment units taking the total number of units to 160 for this same 5.6-acre project site. The Cameron Ranch proposes a single-family project (32 attached and 9 detached homes), is not condos nor apartment units and is an alternative to the concern about "cluster homes." As an example of what this project may look like, please visit the new home around and below Promontory Park in El Dorado Hills.

Response 2: The traffic study addresses traffic on starbucks road and the project does not increase existing traffic to a level that cannot be mitigated. The project has a mitigation measure to restripe the Hastings and Green Valley Intersection. The project is also required to pay their fair share of TIM fees.

4/23/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - April 26, 2018 Planning Meeting

PC 4-26-18
#3
3 pages



Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

April 26, 2018 Planning Meeting

1 message

Lisa Matteo <lisam@lectroid.net>
To: planning@edcgov.us

Sun, Apr 22, 2018 at 9:08 PM

Attached is my letter opposing the proposed Cameron Ranch Subdivision coming up for hearing on April 26, 2018. Please present it to the Planning Commission. Thank you,

Lisa A. Matteo

 **Cameron Ranch Development.pdf**
110K

Question 1: Small Parcels

Response: The project is consistent with Residential Development Standards for Multi-Unit Residential (RM) zoning as outlined in table 130.24.030-Residential Zones Development Standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The minimum size lot in RM is 2,000 sq ft when residential units are proposed as attached. The project proposes lots within the size range of 2,821 sq ft to 7,725 sq ft.

Question 2: Open Space

Response: Because this is a Multi-Family Residential Development, the project is not required to provide open space (General Plan Policy 2.2.3.1). A further explanation is provided in the staff report under finding 2.2.

Question 3: Setback/Outdoor Living

Response: The project meets the standard setbacks outline in table 130.24.030-Residential Zones Development Standards of the Zoning Ordinance, except the side setback; however, the Planned Development (PD) component of this application allows flexibility to reduce side setbacks from 5 feet to 4 feet.

Question 4: Parking

Response: The project is required to conform to standards outlined in table 130.35.030.1- Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements. In addition to providing at least four off-street parking stalls per house (two in garage and two on driveway), this project also provides an additional 26 on-street parking stalls. The majority of the on-street parking will be centrally located along the north side of D Drive.

Question 5: St. Michael Cemetery

Response: No physical development is proposed outside of project parcels. The cemetery is located off-site directly across the street from Hastings Drive. A standard condition of approval has been added to the project to address accidental discovery of human remains and would apply during any grading activities. According to the County Cemetery Administrator ground penetrating radar was conducted at the cemetery, which identified the existing fencing and construction of Hastings Drive.

Question 6: Possible Graffiti on Sound Wall

Response: Applicant is open to the option of including vegetation along the Green Valley and Starbuck sound walls to allow for a more attractive esthetic.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/4/Hud471vrbR1MAmchff3Ql1aFErd_44AYkfu_Cn_eERKy6PEfnV/1/1u/0?ui=2&ik=c5aee7cbe38&iever=QeNAxYlUPeAg_0n_2uivwnt8c

Lisa A. Matteo
3603 Tourmaline Court
Rescue, CA 95672

El Dorado Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Hearing April 26, 2018 for Proposed Rezone/Planned Development/Tentative
Subdivision Map for Cameron Ranch, File #18-0578

Dear Planning Commission:

I have been a resident near this proposed development for 20 years. Although I accept that development will eventually happen at this site, I am opposed to this development as it has been proposed.

These parcels are zoned to allow up to 134 units while this project is only proposing 41.

Question 1

Question 2,3

Question 4

Question 5

The large number of single-family residential units (41) proposed for this **small parcel** is not what I believe our residents want, nor what our county should want for the new families that would move there. This proposed subdivision lacks any **open space**, **outside living area** (front or back yards), adequate **parking** or aesthetic appearance at its boundaries. I'm also concerned about the possible negative effects this development may have on **St. Michael Cemetery**

[See preliminary landscape plans](#)

Question 3

Question 2

The front and back yards of many of these parcels are only 10 feet around many of the houses. How will there be room for much landscaping, let alone any trees? There isn't any **outdoor living space available**. I realize that this is not required by the county, but it should be something we strive for. There is more **open space** and outdoor areas in the newer apartment complexes that had been built than in this proposed development. While the developers may think these types of homes look nice and that they are providing moderate income single family homes for our residents, I believe they are more concerned with making as much money as possible.

Question 4

The Transportation Impact Study (Staff Report Exhibit M 8.2) says, "On-street parking is planned to be provided on all internal Project roadways." However, that doesn't appear to be true. Drive D will only allow on-street parking on one side of the street and although Drive E appears to allow on-street parking, none will be allowed in the cul-de-sac bulb. I do not believe there will be **adequate parking** for people who live there, and especially not for guests of residents.

There needs to be space for landscaping (trees and bushes) along the sound walls on Green Valley Road and Starbuck. The retaining wall which currently surrounds Rite Aid has



Question 6

already had to be painted multiple times **due to graffiti** Trees and plants not only deter would be illegal street artists, but also provide an aesthetic appearance for nearby residents.

The developer has asked for multiple waivers to the El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual. Requested are four (4) waivers, which will in fact impact every road of this planned development. These waivers should not be allowed. Our county has these standards for a reason, please do not change them simply because, "Strict application of the Design Standard would result in additional expense and creation of additional hardship." Staff Report Findings 5.0 The developer should have ensured compliance with the standards when the initial plan was being developed.

Question 5

I did not find any information in any report about **St. Michael Cemetery** which is located on Hastings Drive across from where proposed Drive D will exit onto Hastings. St. Michael Cemetery is one of El Dorado County's pioneer cemeteries. There are 29 known plots and many of the area's prominent landowners and oldest pioneer residents are buried there. There has been no evaluation of the potential adverse effects this development could have on this cemetery. There is a beautiful Zentgraff family monument on the family plot at this site. It is still standing tall, straight and proud after all of these years. This is part of our history and it needs to be protected. I have spoken to Thomas Stewart, a descendant of the Zentgraff family, and the Stewart Family opposes this development due to its potential to promote vandalism and degradation to St. Michael Cemetery.

Some graves in this cemetery have already fallen into disrepair. Headstones broken, cement slabs crumbling and sinking into the ground just to name a few. Descendants of the Zentgraff family (the Stewart Family) maintain their family plot and have also done work to help preserve and maintain the other graves at this site. In Coloma, the California Department of Parks and Recreation was concerned that heavy vibrations from vehicles would tend to promote deterioration of historic structures along Highway 49. Any heavy construction equipment used to build this proposed development may pose the same danger to this historic pioneer cemetery. Also the additional level of traffic using Hastings Drive if the proposed development is approved may cause increased degradation to this cemetery. **This is a concern that should be evaluated before any proposed development is approved.** At the very least heavy vehicles used during construction should not be allowed to use Hastings Drive to enter or exit.

Finally, Hastings Drive is a narrow road and there is NO room for widening it on the West side where the cemetery is located. Any encroachment permits that are mentioned in the Conditions of Approval for Drive D at Hastings Drive need to be on the East side of that road.

I appreciate your time in considering my concerns before a decision is made regarding this development.

Lisa A. Matteo

4/24/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - El Dorado County - Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivisio...



PC 4-26-18
#3
Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

5 pages

El Dorado County - Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

1 message

PATRICK RODGERS <pj.rodgers@comcast.net>

Mon, Apr 23, 2018 at 9:54 PM

Reply-To: PATRICK RODGERS <pj.rodgers@comcast.net>

To: bosfour@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us, ken.kochevar@dot.gov, auduboncalifornia@audubon.org, drayres@ucdavis.edu, pinehillpreserve@gmail.com, rdarling@sbbmail.com, Efren.Sanchez@edcgov.us, srose@audubon.org, gfrost@audubon.org, aamos@audubon.org, sarthur@audubon.org

Cameron Ranch project Z17-0001 PD17-0001 TM17-1531.pdf
66K

Response 0: Public Notice for this project included mailed notification to property owners within 1,000 of the project site, physical sign posting, legal ad on the March 26, 2018 Mountain Democrat, and notification to users who are subscribed to planning services. https://service.govdelivery.com/accounts/CAELDOR/subscriber/new?topic_id=CAELDOR_25

Response 1: The traffic study analyzed those intersections that may experience impacts from the proposed project, based on preliminary trip generation and distribution. Tourmaline Way was not selected to be part of the traffic study based on the prerequisites established by El Dorado County TIS Guidelines criteria, engineering judgement, and coordination with County Staff. Please see Exhibit M of the Staff Report for the full traffic study. The County has restricted access to Green Valley Road from this parcel, therefore, E Drive cannot be extended due to the access restriction placed on this parcel's frontage by the County. In addition, existing underground utilities in Rite Aid requires E Drive to be at a much higher grade than Green Valley Road further complicating any potential connection.

Response 2: The parcels are zoned for an excess of 100 units. While working with County Staff and evaluating the surrounding area, it was determined that a far reduced density would benefit the surrounding developments and provide a transition between a busy road, a commercial building, and an apartment complex. The County has also made it clear that they do not have sufficient funds to maintain any new roads. As a result, the applicant is proposing a HOA that will own, operate, and maintain the roadway and storm drain system. In order to sufficiently fund an HOA and the proposed improvements, a certain number of home sites are required to adequately distribute the cost burden. This balancing act required some deviations from the current County design standards while still meeting current State Codes including the Fire Code. The benefit to the public is a new moderately priced subdivision with privately maintained streets, storm drain system, and front yard landscaping which will significantly enhance the surrounding area and adding additional revenue into the County while not burdening the County with additional maintenance costs.

Response 3: The project will include a sidewalk through the project, Exhibit G identifies a sidewalk on both D Drive and E Drive. Also, sidewalks are a condition of approval for this project. Please see condition #19 of the Conditions of Approval. The proposed project is not a condo project and is a single family development. The proposed pedestrian improvements included in this project will meet current ADA guidelines.

Response 4: The county has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration dated March 3, 2018 based on expert studies submitted as supporting evidence. Special-status species was a category that was discussed in the Biological Resources section IV of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. A biological site assessment prepared by Helix Environmental Planning in March 2017 was a reconnaissance to a previous biological site assessment from August 2007. Both biological site assessments did not indicate that any special-status species were observed or documented on site. The Tri-Colored Blackbird has been a species of special concern since 1990 and is protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918.

Response 5 & 6: Please see Noise section XII of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The sound wall with a minimum height of seven feet would reduced exterior traffic noise exposure to below 60 dBL and will also provide the future residents protection from neighboring commercial lights. The concern about DOT removing trees and vegation is outside the scope of this project.

Response 7: A preliminary drainage study was prepared for this this project, please see Exhibit K of the staff report. Also, please see section XVIII Utilities and Services System of the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration. The payment of flood insurance is outside the scope of this project.

Response 8: The County of El Dorado Transportation Division takes no exception to the design waiver that reduces the side walk from 6 feet to 4 feet. Also, Conditions of Approval #19 and #22 address this concern. A 4-foot sidewalk is compliant with ADA Guidelines.

Response 9: The noise concerns are addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration section XII-Noise and Conditions of Approval #11 and #12. The dust concerns were addressed in section III-Air Quality of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Response 10: The response time from police and fire protection was addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration section XIV-Public Services.

Response 11: The project is required to conform to standards outlined in table 130.35.030.1- Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirments. In addition to providing a least four off-street parking stalls per house (two in garage and two on driveway), this project also provides an additional 26 on-street parking stalls. The majority of the on-street parking will be centrally located along the north side of D Drive.

Response 12: The proposed project result in dwelling units, which could produce minimal new light and glare. All development would be required to comply with County Lighting Ordinance requirements, including the shielding of lights to avoid potential glare. Impacts would be less than significant.

Response 13: The project was reviewed by the El Dorado County Airport Land Use Commission who found the project to be consistent with the current Adopted Cameron Airpark Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The County's Airport Land Use Commission found it consistent on July 29, 2017 and did not voice any concerns with the project.

Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

22 April, 2018

Comments on Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531 Parcel numbers 102-110-24,102-110-14 and 102-421-01

Question 0

My wife was reviewing the El Dorado County Zoning Website this evening and noticed the above noted project that we, in the affected area, **didn't receive any formal notification** of from the County.

After reviewing the information, we have the following comments:

Question 1

1. The traffic effects assessment mentions Peridot Drive and Green Valley as an intersection of interest. As a resident of Rescue, who lives near the proposed site, it is odd that **Tourmaline Way was not included in the traffic evaluation** because regardless of what the traffic evaluation assumes the traffic patterns will be; traffic will be using Tourmaline Way to get to Peridot Drive to continue to Cambridge Way. Tourmaline Way is nominally a two lane road but at the western end, cars are usually parked so as to reduce the road width to a single lane. **We recommend that proposed cul da sac on (drive E) be extended to Green Valley** as an Entrance and the road on Hastings be closed and converted to a cul de sac instead of whats presented.

Traffic

Question 2

2. The County has taken the time and review process to create development standards for property development. What is the developer offering to the area in return for the relaxation of the development standards? The rezoning request doesn't seem to address this.

Waivers

Question 3

3. The proposed builder chooses to request **a waiver** from current Laws that are in place to enhance design features added to protect mobility impaired person using wheel chair and or pedestrians. **We request you say no to any and all request.** The proposal ask to waive these known Federal laws regarding walkways **Safety considerations**. We feel this is wrong and need to be addressed, (Federal legislation title 23 of the United States 217.) We feel the proposal is not in compliance with the **current ADA Americans with disability Act, July26,1990 42 U.S.C chapter 136 section 12101 et seq. APAAG. Visual impairments need to be addressed** as there is a bus stop that does not currently comply. We request the no vote on this proposal because **too many tight condos together next to a rural Green Valley** road could lead to pedestrian collisions, injuries, and death in residential areas and along two-lane roadways. We feel this **proposal offers no consideration to bicyclist, pedestrians and non motorized equipment such as wheel chairs and walkers.**

Walkway
Safety

Question 4

4. We request that the city **prepare a recent new environmental activity report because the old one is out dated because the tri-colored black bird was just added as threatened under the California Endangered species act.**(Endangered Species FHWA FTA National policy NEPA need to be followed.) Migratory Bird Act. **We disagree with your findings that the grassland area offers no value to the proposed area.** Grasslands and pastures are crucial for raptors and terrestrial land birds. So I question who did the last environmental report stating that the area offers no value to the surrounding habitats.

Birds

Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

In short, we feel the development does nothing to improve the neighborhood, and does much negatively impact the surrounding area.

We are against the request for the Rezone and planned Development which would allow 41 residential units as proposed. The area near this area of land is part of the Federally protected migratory bird act and contains endangered birds that frequent the area. The amount of new proposed building would destroy habitats. **The noise levels would also be of concern.** As rural Green Valley Road has no sound barrier other than a concrete block wall that once was LOVELY with high bushes shrubs and pine trees until for some unknown reason the **El Dorado County DOT has continued to remove the area trees and vegetation** that once covered the walls behind the houses that face Green Valley Road thus making the area hear more noise from the cars that race through the area streets - both on Starbuck Road, Hastings Drive, Deer Valley and Green Valley Roads. The sound from motorcycles and cars and trucks seems amplified and echoes. **We would like to know why this was done?** Please replace all the trees and vegetation that you removed. **It gave us some sound protection.** It hid the glare from the **CVS, Starbucks, Jamba juice, Good will** store lights at night. Now we see the cars on Green Valley because our houses sit lower than that road way. We live in flood plane that our wet land protects us from as the rain water fills the drainage ditches up to our lawn areas during heavy rains. **We are afraid this added hill slope will create more rain that could flood our surrounding subdivision.** Will the developer pay for our flood insurance coverage that we will need if the proposed slop creates additional run off into our area. We refuse to have our water & sewer rates increase because you have to address these issues regarding **Stormwater management control.**

We are against the request for a **waiver** of El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual (DISM) and question even why this would be allowed! Our area of El Dorado county - Rescue and Cameron Park, and Shingle Springs, should be maintained to the standards of the other communities such as El Dorado Hills. Why does the county continue to allow inappropriate projects out in our area? Crime has gone up due to the fact that you have approved a cigarette store, and a hamburger shop to sell alcohol all near the proposed building site and Pleasantgrove Middle school! **The students hang out at the CVS and Starbucks parking lot** where the cigarette and hamburger shops are. There is already a Circle K gas station and Rite Aid that sell liquor as well as Vineyard liquor store across the street from the proposed site. I do not understand **how you can allow the proposed cram packed subdivision to be approved.** This over crowding of houses with no sidewalks or ADA approved paths should not be approved. There is no protection for non motorized transportation traffic, (23U.S.C.33b&c). Please reconsider this. If you live in our area you would see how nice our community is. **We do not need more traffic. Our roads were never as congested as they are now.** Animals die everyday on the roadways due to the traffic. We feel three stores that sell liquor on three out of the four corners of Green Valley Road and Cameron Park Road all surrounding your proposed site is enough problems for our once quiet area. You already approved the building of 10 ugly townhouse right on Rural Green Valley road that have impacted our community. Please do not approve this new proposal. **We also don't understand why we were not notified of this proposal when our neighborhood will be impacted immensely!!!!!!** We are against the request to reduce the right of way and road way width, etc. When the surrounding rural communities are already reduced to two lanes and often have cars parked on the streets making the passing very difficult so a smaller road way doesn't make since. **We are against the proposal to reduce the side walk distance. As many ADA compliance needs to be accordance with the state and federal requirements.**

Question 5

Noise/Walls
DOT

Question 6

Sound

Question 7

Flood/Drainage

See Question 0

Noticing

Question 8

ADA

- Question 9 **The noise and Fugitive dust** (PM10) bad air quality that the building of such homes would create isn't fair to us homeowners. The building of high soundwalls does not fit the rest of our area of wood fences. The current houses will be looking at a proposed concrete wall. This will detract from our current environment. (This is not Southern California after all!) . Your proposal says the 6 foot walls will be enough to contain the sound. I disagree with this and **question how can sound be be contained to a 6 foot wall?** I am sure it will travel to the surrounding communities and create a sound nuisance. In my opinion **41 Condos** equals at least 120 voices of people out on their patios will create a sound nuisance. More people will tax our fire department services and hospitals. Does the builder plan to build more **hospitals** and **Fire/ Police Departments?** It already takes over 25 mins to get a **police response** to our area because of limited resources. People die now because help doesn't arrive on time due to limited resources. Can the city guarantee that this response time wont increase? Will the builder pay to build a new School in the area? As more people move in more children will need a place to attend school. Will the city with their approval to **allow less ADA or no ADA compliant side walks and or** limit of parking guarantee the safety of the surrounding children **at the abutting Emerald Meadows neighborhood** and surrounding areas?The proposal shows no **visitor parking spaces and without ample visitor parking** , the surrounding neighborhoods will end up with cars parking on their one lane rural street because your proposal offers no visitor spaces. The Rural road way now is farely quiet but your proposal will impact the surrounding wetland and Rural roadways impacting the safety of the children who play in their front yards near the road ways . Rural Road ways will be impacted. Peoples lives will impacted, so will habitats and Federally protected , bumble bees, butterflies, Golden Eagles, Ferruginous Hawk, trio colored blackbirds, Coopers Hawk, raptors, elderberry beetles & OTHER ENDANGERED animals too many to list here. The area has black birds & tri-colored black bird that nest in the wetland this bird is protected and so is it's breeding habitat.
- Question 10 **impacted both visually, auditory by noise, by health issues** from particulate dust in the air, stirred up from the building site, our local fire **response teams** to local ambulances will need to be enlarged. The noise on Green Valley has increased. We as tax paying home owners had enough of this. We in good faith chose to live here to have a quiet environment to raise our families and you are choosing to ignore our request and laws . Please do not approve this house, apt/proposal. More cars would frequent our roadways or or be parked all over the surrounding neighborhoods. This distracts from the area. You mention nothing of the prices these condo/apts would be sold at or are they rentals?? We feel this project would disrupt our current ways of living if approved. Our current property values are rising and we feel this project of condos would lower property values. Please listen to the homeowners . We have to live in this town.We like our community the way it is. Please stop taking it away form us.
- Question 11 **nothing about lighting.** This area is part of the migratory belt way for **birds who rely on dark sky to migrate.** What about height restrictions for the houses as there is an airport down the road. The FAA has density laws regarding building near airparks. How does the city plan to get around this? **I request a full FAA report** be completed to prove that more houses & human life ,right in a **flight pattern** wont be at risk. How does the proposal plan to add lights and what kind to the areas?There is within eye sight the protected rare plant area of Pine Hill Preserve, Rescue, CA. This area will be affected by more noise, light and loss of habitats. The planning department should think about what the community needs are instead of filling a beautiful empty space with cram packed houses. Cutting corners isn't the solution. Watch how many local children in the area play at the Rite Aid/Starbucks parking across from your
- See Question 4
- Question 12
- Question 13

Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

proposed site. More cramped houses will mean no place for kids to play. You already have given the area a Rite Aid, a CVS and a hamburger shop that sells beer and, cigarettes shop -all across from your proposed site all right next store. If this is what the city planners have in mind for our community then then I am appalled. I recommend you drive out to this area and see for yourself what you have already created and it isn't a pretty site. We are hard working law abiding tax payers who have been here for a long time. We accepted some change but after seeing what you give us. The choices need to be better, our area deserves better. Please reconsider this proposal and vote no. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick Rodgers and Constance Rodgers
Pj.rodgers@comcast.net

cc: Efren Sanchez, Community Development Services, Planning and building Department
Michael Ranelli - Supervisor Fourth District bosfour@edcgov.us
Shiva Frentzen - Supervisor Second District bostwo@edcgov.us
John Hidahl - Supervisor First District bosone@edcgov.us
Robert Peters - El Dorado County Planning planning@edcgov.usgov.us
ken.kochevar@dot.gov
Sara Rose, Executive Director Audubon CA auduboncalifornia@audubon.org
Garrison Frost, Directory of Advocacy and communications
Debra Ayres, PHD, drayres@ucdavis.edu
Graciela Hinshaw pinehillpreserve@gmail.com
Sierra Foothills Audubon Rudy Darling rdarling@sbbmail.com

4/25/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting



PC 4-26-18

#3

4 Pages

Serena Carter <serena.carter@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting

1 message

Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>
To: Serena Carter <serena.carter@edcgov.us>
Cc: Efren Sanchez <efren.sanchez@edcgov.us>

Wed, Apr 25, 2018 at 7:52 AM

Serena,

Please prep this email and the attachment for public comment received 04-24-18 for the Cameron Ranch project being considered by the Planning Commission on April 26, 2018. Include this with any other public comment being uploaded today for this project. Thank you.

Char Tim
Clerk of the Planning Commission

County of El Dorado
Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5351 / FAX (530) 642-0508
charlene.tim@edcgov.us

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

From: **EDC COB** <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
Date: Wed, Apr 25, 2018 at 7:47 AM
Subject: Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting
To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>, The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>

fyi

Office of the Clerk of the Board
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5390

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

From: **K Frevert / H Levenson** <kathyhoward85@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Apr 24, 2018 at 8:32 PM
Subject: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Please see the attached letter for our comments regarding the Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

4/25/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting

Kathy and Howard Levenson
Kathyhoward85@yahoo.com

 **Cameron Ranch Development ,4-24-2018.docx**
20K

Response A: The parcel is actually zoned Multi-unit Residential (RM). The traffic concerns were addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration section XVI-Transportation/Traffic and condition of approval #13 also addresses the traffic concern.

Response B: The project will include a sidewalk through the project, Exhibit G identifies a sidewalk on both D Drive and E Drive. Also, sidewalks are a condition of approval for this project. Please see condition #19 of the Conditions of Approval. Providing sidewalks on adjacent properties/parcels would be outside the scope of this planning project. Conditions 38-40 have been recommended, however, the project does not rise to the level of impact that it necessitates these items.

Response C: The Park-in-lieu fees are determined at the building permit stage of the project and is calculated by the County Assessor Office in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The payment of such fees will be completed prior to the filing the final map of TM17-1531.

Response D: Please see the traffic study which is included as Exhibits M and N of the Staff Report.

Response E: This Oak tree concern was addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration section IV-Biological Resources. This analysis was based on an Oak Canopy Analysis and Replacement Plan dated April 18, 2017, which was prepared by Sycamore Environmental Consultants, Inc. Mitigation measures and conditions of approval were added to help mitigate impacts to oak trees.

Response F: Police protection was addressed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration section XIV-Public Services.

Response G: Staff has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, including county services; therefore, a mitigated negative declaration was prepared. This project does not rise to the level of having to prepare an EIR.

April 24, 2018
Roger Trout, Division Director
El Dorado County Planning
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
edc.cob@edcgov.us

Re: Cameron Ranch Project

Dear Mr. Trout,

Question A We would like to express our opposition to the proposed Cameron Ranch Project, as proposed. This project would **increase traffic** on rural Starbuck Road and Hastings roads. The parcel is currently zoned **Rural Lands Twenty-Acre**. Further, the project appears to encroach into the rural Rescue area could induce new development or redevelopment in Rescue as the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary is amended. Leave development in Cameron Park to areas currently covered in the boundary.

While we oppose the **redesignation** of the project site to increase the intensity of development in the area and the encroachment of the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary into Rescue, we offer the following comments on the project as currently proposed.

- Question B
1. **Sidewalks.** The language in the Conditions of Approval document dated April 26, 2018 provides ambiguous language on page 10 stating "Pedestrian/bike paths (**Recommended**): The proposed subdivision **shall** include sidewalks and bike path (Class 1) connecting the project to adjacent subdivisions..." The words "recommended" together with "shall" make this sentence unclear. The word "recommended" should be deleted for items 38, 39, and 40 so these items are clearly included, indicated by the word "shall". It is also unclear where sidewalks would be placed. They should go throughout the neighborhood so people and cars are not mixed together on the street. This is a basic safety issue. Additionally, sidewalks need to extend to other sidewalks on adjacent properties, which unfortunately are lacking. For example, the adjacent apartment complex on the corner of Hastings and Green Valley Road doesn't have sidewalks and is unattractive. That should be fixed to create a safe and pleasant neighborhood. Need Sidewalk/
Bike path exhibit
- Question C
2. **Park or play areas.** Item 7 on the Conditions for Approval says the development should pay parkland dedication fees. *Where is the park the fees would go towards and can people in the neighborhood walk to the park? And how much are the fees?* Some area in the neighborhood should be designated as a point where people can gather as there isn't such a place on the north side of Green Valley Road. Busy roads are real dividing lines and Green Valley Road has a lot of traffic. To have piecemeal development, one after another, without parks, sidewalks, and bike paths, is not creating a very nice community. Even the low-income housing on Bass Lake Road and Green Valley Road offers a pool for its residents. If there are going to be urban-like densities, then there should be urban-like amenities such as neighborhood parks.
- Question D
3. **Transportation.** It is very important that Hwy 50 traffic flows. It functions as our county's main street. All residents are negatively impacted with more traffic and there are some enormous projects being built in the region. *What other projects in the county and just across the county line also are seeking higher density and what would be the cumulative impact of these projects on roads and highways?*

In 2016, El Dorado County voters approved Measure E, which includes a number of requirements regarding traffic impacts from residential development projects. **How does the County propose to implement Measure E for this site?**

Question E 4. **Oak trees.** The project description notes the project has some oak canopy and the removal of one large oak tree. First of all, it is possible to construct a road around a tree (examples exist in Curtis Park in Sacramento). Time and time again developers fence off oak trees but the area blocked off is either too small or soil is placed on the tree roots regardless of fencing. Oak trees die when soil is placed under them or on their roots. It doesn't take place immediately, but within a few years they are dead (examples are found at the Rite Aid location and nearby golf course). *What assurances do we have that there will be adequate county oversight and enforcement of any agreement concerning protection of oaks?*

Question F 5. **Public Safety.** Regarding other County services, with the Sheriff's department currently understaffed, how will law enforcement be affected by additional high-density units in this area? Will additional patrols be established and will more deputies or other staff be needed to accommodate this level of development in the rural area of Rescue?

Question G For the record, we would like to restate our opposition to the redesignation of the site for urban development. If the project moves forward, any proposal for development of this site **should be accompanied by an EIR** that fully analyzes the potential physical impacts that such a development would cause in the area and on County services and the project should have basic amenities found in urban areas, if it is going to be urban in density. It appears that the alternative of less dense housing would be what residents expected in a rural community.

Please include us on all future correspondence for this project.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Howard Levenson
1590 Velvet Horn Lane, Rescue, CA 95672
email: kathyhoward85@yahoo.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)

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:

Question 1

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:

Question 2

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:

Question 3

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:

Question 4

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:

Question 5

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.

Question 6 **Vehicular Access:**
Streets should be wide enough to accommodate parking, sidewalks and emergency vehicle access requirements.

Question 7 **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

Question 8. Parking is an issue. More should be provided

It is essential that that e 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.

Question 9 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

Response 1: Development standards allow a ten (10) foot rear setback from property lines. Applicant has submitted a landscaping plan for this project. The project is targeting moderate-income home buyers who are interested in low maintenance yards.

Response 2: Applicant has submitted a landscape plan for the proposed residential front and side yards. The frontage along Starbuck Rd will be very similar from pre- to post-development as the majority of the existing vegetation, including oak trees, will be maintained. Street trees will be planted on the north side of D Drive as space allows.

Response 3: The proposed sound wall height along Green Valley Road is based on the recommendation made in the project's noise study towards mitigating noise at a less than significant impact threshold. Applicant is also open to the option of including vegetation along the sound wall to allow for a more attractive esthetic.

Response 4: Currently, no proposed monument sign with the project; however, if one does become available in the future, it will conform to sign ordinance standards and have compatible esthetics and colors as the proposed dwellings. Please reference Staff Report Exhibit T: Color Board.

Response 5: The project is required to conform to standards outlined in table 130.35.030.1- *Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements*. In addition to providing a least four off-street parking stalls per house (two in garage and two on driveway), this project also provides an additional 26 on-street parking stalls. The majority of the on-street parking will be centrally located along the north side of D Drive.

Response 6: Applicant is requesting design waivers to road width and sidewalks, which both Transportation and the Fire Department have reviewed and provided conditions of approval.

Response 7: This recommendation has been received by the applicant.

Response 8: The project is required to conform to standards outlined in table 130.35.030.1- *Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements*. In addition to providing a least four off-street parking stalls per house (two in garage and two on driveway), this project also provides an additional 26 on-street parking stalls. The majority of the on-street parking will be centrally located along the north side of D Drive. The four stalls per house of off-street and an additional 0.5+ per house on-street is adequate.

Response 9: A continuous sidewalk through the project is being proposed along D and E Drives and will be connected to the existing sidewalk along Rite Aide, which connects to the new bus stop.