
T&C Village

From Doug Stanley <producerdp@gmail.com>
Date Thu 10/23/2025 12:26 PM
To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello from Doug Stanley,
I am the owner of SmackDab Studios in the EDH business park.
My industry is entertainment, my business is developing, selling and producing television series, though we also do commercial and social media content for clients, as well as high end photography.

As I often have people; cast, crew, and clients coming into town, I am aware that there is often a shortage of hotel beds in this town. More often than not, my "people" have to stay in Folsom.

When I heard about the T&C Village project, I was interested in the value that such a project could bring to this area. Yes, there are always negatives to consider, but for me this project seems to be mostly positive, and I believe it will made a great addition to our town.

El Dorado Hills could use some ball-in-motion growth. I think we should get this particular ball headed downfield.

Sincerely,
Doug Stanley

--

Doug Stanley
Producer/Director/Cinematographer
2008 & 2011 Primetime Emmy Awards
916-300-8928

To: Clerk of the Board, El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
From: Robert Williams, El Dorado County Resident
Date: October 22, 2025
Subject: October 28 Town & Country BOS Hearing – Comment

Dear Chair George Turnboo and Members of the Board:

I submit this report as a resident of El Dorado County. These public comments are made independent of my role as a dissenting member of the Planning Commission on the Town and Country proposal.

Background

As documented in the record, the Planning Commission, the public, and interested parties were effectively provided six working days to review approximately 2000 pages of highly technical information. The September 10 hearing opened with an expression of concern about the adequacy of review and comment time.

The staff divided the Town & Country into the hotel center “project” and the 814 residential units into “program” components. The “project” was subject to full CEQA and EDC code analysis. In contrast, the “program” housing developments (reportedly \$700,000++ townhomes) will not be subject to further CEQA and only minimal development plan reviews. Instead of choosing alternative comprehensive CEQA review types, the project/program approach provides a partial analysis and grants the applicant implied, unvetted entitlements.

The applicant has done an exceptional job of public outreach in promoting the hotel/commercial elements. Many of the pictures they paint are very attractive. However, the applicant provided minimal public discussion on the high-density/high-priced townhouse residential community. Large residential and hotel/commercial proposals have significantly different CEQA, General Plan, and EDC land decision points, each deserving complete analysis.

At the full-day September 10 Special Meeting hearing, the Planning Commission reviewed staff presentations, received the applicant's testimony, and conducted several hours of public comment. A regular Planning Commission meeting was agendaized for September 11 for further analysis and deliberation of the Town and Country proposal.

Per the recorded proceedings, the Commission Chair indicated the need to conduct additional questions and time to properly digest the new data during the previously scheduled September 11 Commission meeting. During the hearing, several participants were asked to be available the following day for further inquiries, and these requests were acknowledged with agreements to appear. After closing public comment, the Chair indicated that the Commission would focus on the unresolved questions in the Final EIR Findings of Fact as the first action for September 11.

The Chair asked the Commissioners to offer a motion to continue the hearing to 8:30 AM to complete the investigation and deliberation. No motion was forthcoming. Instead, the Commission decided to truncate further vetting and move directly to approving staff recommendations.

In less than a half hour, Commission majority voted to move the following recommendations to the Board: (1) certify the Final EIR and adopt the CEQA Findings of Fact; (2) adopt the General Plan Amendment; (3) adopt the Revision to the BLHSP and the Revision to the BLHSP Public Facilities Financing Plan; (4) approve Rezone, Planned Development Permit, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Conditional Use Permit with provisions to limit housing to 814 residential units and to connect the hotel to EID sewer.

The Chair declined to support the four resolutions, reportedly based on incomplete hearing reviews and deliberation.

I respectfully offer the following opinion to examine the (1) flawed Final EIR and CEQA findings of fact, (2) inconsistencies with the EDC General Plan and recently affirmed strategic objectives, (3) unvetted issues with the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, and (4) additional concerns of potential value to the Board of Directors.

Opinion 1: FINAL EIR AND FINDINGS OF FACT FLAWS

Flawed CEQA Findings: The Final EIR admits ten significant and unavoidable impacts, yet relies on speculative “overriding benefits” like affordable housing and tourism. In reality, only 56 tiny homes are reserved for hotel employees, and the bulk of housing consists of \$700,000 townhomes. Water and sewer services remain unverified, and cumulative impacts from adjacent developments were ignored.

The 78-page “FINAL EIR *FINDINGS OF FACT*” attempts to consolidate volumes of staff analysis and opinion, along with public and interested parties’ comments. “*Final EIR concludes that the project, even with the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures and consideration of alternatives, will nonetheless cause [10] direct significant and unavoidable impact.*”

Interestingly, the Staff fails to reference other significant impacts, such as no verified water sources or sewage services, proposed use of septic systems, undefined hotel and wildland fire management, cumulative impacts of other proposed developments (e.g. Marble Valley and Lime Rock SPs), and other considerations that should have been thoroughly vetted at the public hearing. The applicant did not apply for annexation into El Dorado Irrigation District; as a result, certification of sufficient water was not obtained. ***Verification of water availability and sufficiency is a baseline environmental impact issue that should have been resolved before determining CEQA compliance.***

In response to the acknowledgement of significant environmental impacts, the FEIR Findings of Fact provides for a means to disregard the CEQA conclusions by stating: “*Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.*”

The FEIR justifies the use of CEQA OVERRIDES based on four subjective Project Benefits. Below are the specified “project benefits,” followed by my comments for consideration:

SUGGESTED OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS OF PROJECT BENEFITS

”The project will provide for the following benefits:

1. Provide a variety and diverse mix of affordable housing opportunities.

NOTE: This benefit is incorrect. The proposal permits the addition of 814 housing units. Per the applicant’s testimony, the remaining 702 residential units are slated to become townhouses with a price tag of \$700,000 or more. The proposal allows for ONLY 56 “affordable” 600 sq/ft tiny homes that are reserved for hotel employees. An additional 56 tiny homes are reserved as vacation rentals as part of the hotel complex, which does nothing to support affordable housing needs.

2. Provide needed commercial and tourism opportunities;

NOTE: The FEIR did not establish the “need” for commercial opportunities on this property. Historically, the Base Lake Hills Specific Plan was designed for residential purposes, with commercial operation focused on Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills. An overriding benefit should not be based on a need that has not existed in the past, nor a need that is backed with by evidence. As to the “tourism opportunities,” it is true that this industry is vitally important to El Dorado County.

3. Generate new property tax and sales tax revenue to support and enhance public services within the County such as an annual net surplus of \$312,000 for the El Dorado Hills Fire Department and approximately \$2.47 million for the County’s General Fund;

NOTE: El Dorado County Auditor/Controller does not concur with the figures used to justify overriding economic benefits. Additionally, the fiscal projections are based on the assumptions that real needs exist, and that a successful, profitable operation will emerge. As the applicant has no hotel experience, such a conclusion is speculative. The demand for a 300-room hotel with 56 tiny-home rentals was not established.

4. Enhance transportation circulation within the County by providing new roadway networks.

NOTE: The presumption that the proposal enhances transportation circulation is subjective. The expansion of Bass Lake Road to four lanes remains unresolved again; the project would widen the Road only from the HWY 50 off-ramp to Country Club Road. Minor accommodation for the HWY 50 off-ramps is noted. Additional traffic on Country Club Road is not mitigated; in fact, the right-turn-only access onto Bass Lake Road limits traffic flow. Town and Country offer minimal or non-existent enhanced transportation circulation.

CAUTION: The Board of Supervisors is asked to certify the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

“As discussed above, the Board of Supervisors has balanced these benefits and considerations against the significant unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the project. The Board of Supervisors hereby concludes that those impacts are outweighed by these benefits, among others. After balancing the environmental risks against project benefits, the County concludes and therefore finds that the project benefits outlined above outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the project.”

QUESTION: Should the Board certify these four questionable “benefits” to override the documented significant environmental impacts?

I contend that the FERI Findings of “FACT” conclusions and the overriding benefits are speculative and dubious. Pursuant to EDC Code 130.56.30, “the Board may adopt a proposed specific plan **only if** it finds that the plan ... will not have a significant effect on the environment or a statement of overriding consideration has been made for the proposed specific plan in compliance with the provisions of California Code of Regulations Section 15093 (CEQA Guidelines).” The identified special benefits do not appear to justify the overriding of CEQA.

Opinion 2: INCONSISTENCY WITH EDC STRATEGIC VISION & GENERAL PLAN

General Plan Inconsistencies: The proposal conflicts with multiple General Plan elements—especially those concerning rural character, infrastructure, and environmental stewardship. It also falls short of the County’s own Vision Statement for managed growth and community integrity.

According to EDC Code 130.56.30, the Board of Supervisors may adopt a specific plan (or an amended specific plan) only if it “is consistent with and implements the General Plan.”

Question 1: Does Town & Country Comply with El Dorado County General Plan?

From the first paragraph of its introduction, the General Plan states:

“It provides for growth in an environmentally balanced manner, maintains the rural character and quality of the living environment, providing adequate infrastructure while conserving agricultural lands, forest and woodlands, and other natural resources.”

Question 2: How does Town & Country align with the General Plan’s component Elements??

Below is my opinion on the level of compliance with each of the Elements:

- Land Use Elements **Partially Compliant**
- Transportation & Circulation Elements **Minimally Compliant**
- Public Health, Safety & Noise Elements **Low or Non-Complaint**
- Conservation & Open Space Elements **Low or Non-Compliant**

- Agriculture and Forestry Element **Low or Non-Compliant**
- Parks and Recreation Element **Partially Compliant**
- Economic Development Element **Mostly Compliant**

In theory, a specific plan or a specific plan amendment proposal should reflect a high level of compliance across all relevant General Plan elements.

Question 3: How does Town and Country match the General Plan's OBJECTIVES?

The following is the unedited statement of objectives that can be used as check-list:

"It is the explicit intent of the Plan, through the appropriate application of these planning concept areas, to: (1) foster a rural quality of life; (2) sustain a quality environment; (3) develop a strong diversified, sustainable local economy; (4) plan land use patterns which will determine the level of public services appropriate to the character, economy, and environment of each region; and (5) accommodate the County's fair share of the regional growth projections while encouraging those activities that comprise the basis for the County's customs, culture, and economic stability. The objectives of the General Plan are:

1. To develop a strong diversified and sustainable local economy;
2. To foster a rural quality of life;
3. To sustain a quality environment;
4. To accommodate the County's fair share of regional growth projections and affordable housing while encouraging those activities that comprise the basis for the County's customs, culture, and economic stability;
5. To oversupply residential and non-residential land use designations in order to provide market and landowner flexibility to more feasibly accommodate the market;
6. To concentrate and direct urban growth where infrastructure is present and/or can be more feasibly provided;
7. To recognize that funding limitations for infrastructure and services will result in lower levels of service while the County improves employment and housing opportunities;
8. To conserve, protect, and manage the County's abundant natural resources for economic benefits now and for the future;
9. To encourage infill development that more efficiently utilizes existing infrastructure and minimizes land use conflicts while avoiding the premature development of noncontiguous lands where direct and life cycle costs are greater;
10. To accomplish the retention of permanent open space/natural areas on a project-by-project basis through clustering;
11. To minimize down planning and/or down zoning where feasible.
12. To improve the jobs-to-housing ratio by giving preference to the development of high technology and value-added employment centers, and regional retail and tourism uses

In addition to General Plan consistency, it should be noted that Town and Country is only partially compliant with El Dorado County's recently updated Vision Statement: *"Our vision: Exceptional quality of life with a strong sense of community, historical heritage, rural character, managed growth, and opportunity for all."*

OPINION 3: BASS LAKE HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN ISSUES & INCONSISTENCIES

Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Conflicts: Town & Country introduces high-density housing and commercial uses that were never contemplated in the original BLHSP. It undermines the plan's goals for rural separation, viewshed protection, and clustered low-density development.

The Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, adopted on November 17, 1995, set forth an area development vision and allowable land uses. In the Final EIR, staff strongly suggests that the amendments to the Plan for the Town and Country proposal were relatively minor. I contend that the proposal could result in significant changes to the fundamental vision and land use designations. The following points summarize noncompliance with BLHSP:

- ✓ BLHSP is designed for rural residential developments; commercial and high-density housing was not contemplated
- ✓ Inconsistent with the vision statements and goals of the BLHSP regarding viewshed from US 50 and retaining the rural character of the area
- ✓ Fails to retain the BLHSP objective of visual and spatial separation of the EDHs and CP communities
- ✓ Impacts on adjacent Cameron Park community services is ignored
- ✓ BLHSP never contemplated increasing residential units by over 30%
- ✓ BLHSP objective of providing low-density clustered homes with adjacent open space is negated by the insertion of 704 townhouse units
- ✓ Concentrated townhouse building along US 50 in full view of travelers along US 50 with the BLHSP and General Plan
- ✓ Town and Country proposal is inconsistent with the significantly increased water usage, enhanced fire vulnerability, additional hotel/conference center traffic, and unknown new pressures of EDH and CP community services
- ✓ BLHSP did not contemplate a significant commercial zone or highly traveled tourism center

OPINION 4: UNRESOLVED ISSUES, QUESTIONS & CONCERNS

Unresolved Public Service and Infrastructure Issues: The proposal lacks verified water, fire safety plans, school and law enforcement impact analysis, and equitable fiscal treatment of adjacent communities like Cameron Park.

In this section, I offer additional concerns with the proposal and process that are outside CEQA and General Plan considerations. No attempt is made to rank the issues that remain inadequately resolved in importance.

- ✓ TENTATIVE MAP PROVIDES ENTITLEMENTS FOR UNVETTED PROGRAM AREA
 - Rationale for parcel division insufficiently justified
 - No further CEQA or other Conditions can be applied
 - Housing could go forward without the completion of the hotel complex
- ✓ FISCAL BURDEN PLACED ON ADJACENT CAMERON PARK CSD & FIRE
 - EDHCSD receives disproportionate benefit fees (such as \$10 million ++ on park impact fees) and property taxes
 - EDHFD disproportionate benefit fees and property taxes
 - Cameron Park has unified park and fire responsibilities, but receives no tax/revenue benefit despite the proximity to the new hotel/homes
 - Cameron Park financial woes (including possible closing of a firehouse) will increase the need for added services burden without compensation

- Fiscal failure of a special district could require County intervention
- ✓ IMPACTS ON SCHOOLS NOT IDENTIFIED
 - No input from local schools was provided despite the increased students
- ✓ NO IMPACTS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EMERGENCY SERVICES
 - No analysis of required impacts on law enforcement and emergency services for hotel and conference center operations or special events
 - No analysis of impacts from the multiple-family and tiny home residences
- ✓ CREATES NEW PRECEDENTS FOR HOUSING TYPES
 - A cluster of 600 square/ft tiny homes is sought for employee housing and vacation rentals (Compare specs with Grizzly Flats)
 - 56 units advertised as providing affordable housing are deed-restricted to only employees. No labor law practices identified
 - Proposal calls for the addition of 56 additional 600 square/ft vacation rental residences as part of the hotel operation
- ✓ PUBLIC FINANCING PLANS AND REQUIREMENTS NOT COMPREHENSIVE
 - Lack of verification of water, sewer, septic, and public utilities suggests the revised Public Facilities Financing Plan may have gaps
- ✓ NO HOTEL HIGH RISE, RESIDENTIAL, WILDLAND FIRE PLAN
 - 65-foot height is over 50-foot limits; no verification from EDH Fire or Cameron Park Fire was provided on high-rise fire mitigation requirements and capabilities
 - No wildland fire analysis provided for the high-risk fire zone
 - Specific requirements of tiny homes and multi-family not submitted
 - 112 tiny home units lack fire-safe defensible space designs and setbacks
- ✓ PARTIES OF INTEREST AND SPECIFIC EXPERTS INPUT WAS OMITTED FROM THE PROCESS
 - Direct input was not forthcoming from potentially relevant sources like EID, school districts, LAFCO, Sheriff, emergency services, PG&E, EDH/CP/CAL Fire, Health and Human Services, other special districts, etc.
- ✓ FAILURE TO ESTABLISH MINIMAL COMPLIANCE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 - This proposal lacked verified water and sewer systems, septic specs, significant roadway enhancements, fire suppression, shared resources, and other baseline requirements that should have been defined in conditions of approval.
 - No timing requirements, no enforcement, no non-performance established
 - No guaranteed hotel/conference center will be built before housing
- ✓ EIR METHODOLOGY RESULTED IN BIASED AND INCOMPLETE FINDINGS
 - Staff selected to use EIR types of “Project” and “Program”, resulting in incomplete analysis and granting of entitlements without vetting.
 - Among the available types under CEQA, a comprehensive analysis would occur using EIR type 15165 for “Multiple and Phased Projects” OR 15167 “Staged EIR”
- ✓ IMPACTS OF ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS IGNORED
 - Cumulative traffic circulation and roadway infrastructure impacts were not modeled to provide variable analyses
 - Cumulative water resources impacts were not presented
 - Cumulative services and resources impact of special districts, utilities, economic and physical contingencies were not reviewed
- ✓ PROPOSAL POSSIBLE SHELL GAME FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
 - Applicant’s public outreach focused on the benefits of a hotel, conference center, museum, and Lincoln Highway preservation
 - Details on 814 residential units relegated to unvetted program entitlements
 - J6 proposal included plans for additional housing on adjacent lots
- ✓ BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN PATH PLANS ARE UNFUNDED
 - Applicant has promoted the concept of enhanced bike and pedestrian pathways enhancements, including a possible bridge over Bass Lake Road
 - None of these are included in the formal proposal document and are unfunded

✓ COUNTY CODE 130.56 NOT FOLLOWED

- The proposal failed to provide a comprehensive identification of the proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of public and private infrastructure and facilities for transportation, sewage, storm water drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, education, fire protection, or other essential modes proposed

SUMMARY

In reviewing this minority report, please understand that I have tremendous respect for my other Commissioners and their level of dedication. Likewise, I also have high praise for the staff's many hours of work. I also appreciate the applicant for years of solid public outreach and a history of contributions to this region. All those aside, my vote to vote in the negative is based on the available facts and the inability to complete the hearing review process fully. I have confidence in the decision of the Board of Supervisors.

As a final note, I am concerned that this Specific Plan amendment represents only one of six additional Specific Plans proposals. Creekside, Marble Valley, and Lime Rock Specific Plan proposals are actively pending in the next several months. Taken together, these proposals will be transformative and significantly alter the General Plan. Historically, between 1995 to 1999, six Specific Plans were approved in rapid succession. In reaction, the current General Plan of 2004 was adopted by the vote of El Dorado County residents. EDC is now at a similar crossroad.

This is not just one project—it's the first of six major Specific Plan proposals under consideration that could reshape our County. I urge the Board to consider the cumulative impact and procedural integrity before certifying this amendment.

I respectfully request that my public comments be included in the official record and considered in your deliberations. Thank you for your attention to this request and for your continued commitment to open and transparent governance.

Sincerely,

Robert Williams, El Dorado County Resident
6512 Primavera Lane
El Dorado Hills, California 95762



Outlook

Town and Country project

From Naomi Lurey <naomilurey@yahoo.com>

Date Wed 10/22/2025 10:37 PM

To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Do not approve the Town and Country Project. How is it improving or benefiting El Dorado Hills by bringing in more congestion, more traffic and more people to our quiet community.
Naomi Lurey
El Dorado Hills resident
Sent from my iPhone

October 20, 2025

**Ande Flower,
Planning Manager
County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane, Building A
Placerville, CA 95667**

2025 OCT 22 PM 4: 05

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Email: Ande.Flower@edcgov.us

Subject: In Support of the Town & Country Village Project

Dear Mr. Flower

The following letter was mailed by my wife to all five supervisors individually.

Thank you for reading this letter.

Honorable Supervisor

As a long-term resident of El Dorado Hills, I want to express my strong support for the Town & Country Village project. I have followed this proposal closely, and I truly believe it represents thoughtful, responsible growth — the kind of development our community needs to stay vibrant and economically healthy.

So much of the opposition I've seen seems rooted in fear of change. But growth, when managed responsibly, is not the enemy of our community — it's a sign of vitality. The Town & Country Village plan includes housing options for local workers and seniors, a high-quality hotel that will finally allow visitors to stay and spend money locally, and new shops and services that will reduce the need for residents to drive to Folsom or Sacramento for everyday needs.

The project's design also respects the character of El Dorado Hills. Traffic, water, and environmental concerns have been studied carefully, and mitigation measures are already built into the plan. This is not "sprawl" — it's smart planning that balances progress with preservation.

It's important that we, as residents, look beyond the noise and see the long-term picture. Saying "no" to everything is not a strategy for the future — it's a recipe for stagnation. Our children and grandchildren deserve a community that adapts, evolves, and creates opportunity.

I live in Serrano, just a short distance from the proposed development, and I can say with confidence that this project will enhance, not harm, our area. I appreciate the vision behind it and the professionalism with which it has been planned.

Please don't allow a small but vocal group to drown out the many of us who quietly support balanced, forward-looking projects like this one. The Town & Country Village project is a step in the right direction for El Dorado Hills — practical, well-planned, and much needed.

Thank you for your time and for your service to our community.

Respectfully,



Desiree Prins-Evenhuis

Resident, Serrano – El Dorado Hills

1167 Villagio Drive

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Desiree@ymail.com

650-646-8811

Agenda item #25-1703 - Town & Country Village El Dorado - 10.28.2025

From kevinwmccarty@pm.me <kevinwmccarty@pm.me>

Date Thu 10/23/2025 2:52 PM

To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Cc BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>

 1 attachment (242 KB)

Town & Country Village El Dorado - Public Comment Letter - McCarty - 10.23.2025 - Signed.pdf;

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

ATTN: Clerk, Chair, and Members of the Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County,

I hope you are all doing well.

Attached is a letter submitted as public comment for Agenda Item #27, file #25-1703, regarding the Town & Country Village El Dorado development project (General Plan Amendment GPA22-0003 / Specific Plan Revision SP-R21-0002 / Rezone Z21-0013 / Planned Development Permit PD21-0005 / Tentative Subdivision Map TM22-0005 / Conditional Use Permit CUP23-0008).

Please ensure this public comment is added to the record and included for consideration at the Board meeting set for next Tuesday, October 28th, 2025.

Regards,

Kevin W. McCarty

(775) 240-3055

forti et fideli nil difficile

"to the brave and faithful nothing is difficult"

Kevin W. McCarty
5600 Omo Ranch Rd
Somerset, CA 95684

October 23, 2025

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: *Public Comment in Support of Town & Country Village El Dorado*
(Project No. GPA22-0003 / SP-R21-0002 / Z21-0013 / PD21-0005 / TM22-0005 / CUP23-0008)

Dear Chair and Members of the Board,

I write in strong support of the proposed *Town and Country Village El Dorado* project (General Plan Amendment GPA22-0003 / Specific Plan Revision SP-R21-0002 / Rezone Z21-0013 / Planned Development Permit PD21-0005 / Tentative Subdivision Map TM22-0005 / Conditional Use Permit CUP23-0008). This is precisely the kind of visionary, high-quality development El Dorado County needs to reinvigorate its tourism economy, celebrate its cultural heritage, and create local opportunities for both residents and visitors.

1. Aesthetic and Design Excellence

Unlike much of the sprawling, disconnected suburban design that has come to dominate El Dorado Hills, this project embraces our county's natural beauty and rural charm. As documented in the applicant's presentation and photo simulations, the architecture and site plan are artfully integrated into the landscape, with use of natural materials, open-space buffers, and drought-tolerant landscaping. The visual outcome will be an iconic landmark — a resort village that complements, not competes with, the surrounding hillsides.

2. Honoring Heritage and History

The inclusion of a museum and interpretive trail system dedicated to El Dorado County's historical legacy — from the Gold Rush to the Lincoln Highway and the agricultural renaissance of Apple Hill — demonstrates exceptional civic foresight. This element will make the project a living monument to the people and stories that shaped our county's identity. Few private developments undertake this level of cultural investment.

3. Community Events and Cultural Vitality

With the County's restrictions on Ranch Marketing events, our communities have lost most of their local venues for weddings, fundraisers, proms, and other celebrations. The proposed event and wedding center, coupled with open spaces for community use, will fill that void and once again give our residents a place to come together for life's milestones. As the project drawings and presentations show, the facilities will be elegant yet accessible — a genuine public asset.

4. Workforce Housing and “Affordability by Design”

The planned 112 residential cottages, with 56 designated for on-site employee housing, represent a model of *affordability by design* — not through state mandates, but through thoughtful planning. This approach directly reduces commute traffic, supports local hiring, and addresses our chronic shortage of attainable housing for the local workforce. The applicant's inclusion of workforce housing should be commended as a responsible and forward-thinking contribution to the county's long-term livability.

5. Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Benefit

According to the Final Fiscal Impact Analysis prepared by EPS (August 2025), the project will generate an annual net fiscal surplus of approximately \$2.47 million to the County General Fund at buildout, plus \$121,000 to the County Road Fund, \$312,000 to the El Dorado Hills Fire Department, and \$157,000 to the CSD. These figures speak for themselves — the project will not only pay its own way, but will substantially strengthen the County's financial position, supporting essential services for decades to come.

6. Traffic and Infrastructure Improvements

The Local Transportation Analysis (TKear, 2024) found that while the project generates modest daily trip increases, its required mitigation measures — including intersection expansions, signalization, and Bass Lake Road widening — will improve safety and capacity for all users. The project also extends Class 1 bicycle trails and introduces trail connectivity through the historic “Old Country Club Drive” alignment, supporting the County's broader transportation and recreation goals.

7. Respectful Collaboration and Community Engagement

The project team has demonstrated a genuine commitment to public input, as evidenced by their multi-year outreach to the Cameron Park CSD, the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC), and surrounding residents. Both agencies provided thoughtful letters outlining infrastructure and service concerns, and the applicant has indicated clear willingness to coordinate development fees and phasing to align with community needs. This kind of collaborative approach exemplifies the best of responsible development.

8. Long-Term Vision and Countywide Benefit

At its core, *Town & Country Village* is not merely a commercial enterprise — it is an economic and cultural catalyst. It will:

- Revitalize El Dorado County's tourism base through high-value hospitality offerings;
- Generate new tax revenue without burdening existing ratepayers;
- Provide housing and jobs within the same footprint; and
- Create a central gathering space that embodies our county's natural and historic character.

Conclusion

The Planning Commission's 3-2 vote for approval reflects legitimate diversity of opinion, but the objective record — fiscal, environmental, and cultural — overwhelmingly supports this project. The Board now has the opportunity to send a clear message that El Dorado County welcomes smart, sustainable, heritage-based investment.

I urge you to certify the EIR, approve the project entitlements, and adopt the staff recommendations as presented. This project will be remembered as a defining success story in our county's economic and cultural renaissance.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kevin W. McCarty". The script is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Kevin W. McCarty