



(Distributed during hearing
by staff)

PC 4/28/16
#3, #4 #5
Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>
6 pages

**Re: April 28, 2016 Agenda Projects – Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan - 16-0195 –
Hawk View/16-0198 – Bell Ranch/16-0199 – Bell Woods**

hpkp@aol.com <hpkp@aol.com>

Wed, Apr 27, 2016 at 4:17 PM

To: tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us, rich.stewart@edcgov.us, gary.miller@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us,
jeff.hansen@edcgov.us, james.williams@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us,
bostthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us,
aerumsey@sbcglobal.net, Hidahl@aol.com, jrazz@sbcglobal.net, hpkp@aol.com

Attn: Tiffany Schmid, Planner
Planning Commissioners – Rich Stewart, Gary Miller, Brian Shinault, Jeff
Hansen, James Williams
Board of Supervisors – Ron Mikulaco, Shiva Frentzen, Brian Veerkamp, Sue
Novasel, Michael Ranalli
Clerk of the Board – Charlene Tim

Good Afternoon:

I have attached a copy of my comment letter for the BLHSP projects which are
on the Planning Commission agenda tomorrow.

Thank you,

Kathy Prevost
Bass Lake at WoodRidge
1080 Jasmine Circle
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

 **BLHSP Comment letter 4-27-16 - 1.doc**
42K

April 27, 2016

El Dorado County Community Development Agency
Development Services Department, Planning Division

Attn: Tiffany Schmid, Planner
Planning Commissioners – Rich Stewart, Gary Miller, Brian Shinault, Jeff Hansen,
James Williams
Cc: Board of Supervisors – Ron Mikulaco, Shiva Frentzen, Brian Veerkamp, Sue
Novasel, Michael Ranalli
Clerk of the Board – Charlene Tim

RE: March 24, 2016 Agenda Projects – Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan - 16-0195 –
Hawk View/16-0198 – Bell Ranch/16-0199 – Bell Woods

RE: Proposed Actions submitted by BL Road, LLC and staff:

1) Adopt February 2016 Addendum to the 1992 Bass Lake Road Study Area Final Program Environmental Impact Report; (2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, incorporating the Mitigation Measures as presented; (3) Approve a one-year time extension to Tentative Map TM00 1371/TM96-1321/TM01-1380-E; (4) Approve Tentative Map Revisions for all three based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as presented.

Bell Woods also has a requirement to adopt a phasing plan consisting of Phase 1 and 2, pursuant to 120.28.010 of the EDC Subdivision Ordinance.

Comment:

The Planning staff and the developer propose major revisions to the BLHSP, Development Agreement and Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) because they believe they contain language which allows for flexibility as detailed in a Consistency Analysis. I believe the facts do not support this. By omitting major components spelled out in these documents as necessary for the infrastructure to support later projects, they have essentially defeated the original tenets of the PFFP. The BLHSP would need to be amended, the PFFP modified and new CEQA documents would need to be drawn because the current documents are all

based on the inclusion of the major elements proposed to be deferred by the proposed changes.

The PFFP says “One of the stated goals of the BLHSP is that the major infrastructure improvements in the plan area are to be constructed “concurrent with initial development”.” “The concurrency issue deals primarily with the construction of Bass Lake Road and Country Club.”

“In addition to Bass Lake Road improvements, the PFFP provides the following items will be **required** at the 300-unit critical mass level;

- Hwy 50 Interchange Project Study Report (PSR)
- Access road & infrastructure to the school site
- Sidewalks and the Class 1 bike trail along Bass Lake Road
- Acquisition of an 8.7 acres sports park
- Design of Sports Park
- Acquisition of 2-acres park-and-ride lot”

“The PFFP allows for two phases of construction for the Bass Lake Road improvements. The first phase will be constructed by the Hollow Oak Project (Phase 1). **The second phase (Phase 1A) will be completed by the next development project or group of projects, whether or not the next project or group of projects exactly equals 300 units.**

When approved in November of 1995, the purpose of the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan (BLHSP) was to facilitate the orderly and systematic development of the Plan area through the establishment of a comprehensive and coordinated planning program which was consistent with the EDC General Plan.

The PFFP set forth the strategy to finance infrastructure and other public facilities needed to serve the proposed land issues in the BLHSP. The PFFP required substantial road and infrastructure improvements with the first 300 dwelling unit (critical mass threshold) to address “concurrency” policies in the Specific Plan. Flexibility in the PFFP allowed for different combinations of the projects coming forward but all with one goal – to assure the majority of the infrastructure would be put in place by what they called “critical mass” with the Phase 1A projects.

The PFFP contemplated the first three projects to come forward as Phase 1A would be in the strongest position to complete the infrastructure. At this point, there is only one other project planned I am aware of in the BHLSP, Bass Lake North, and

the current proposed revisions are vague as to how and when the major components of the Phase 1A would be completed. The developers state **“improvements would become a COA to a future BLHSP project that has the requirement to construct Phase 1A improvements to Bass Lake Road.**

According to the EDC Community Development Agency, Development Services Division, Executive Summary dated August 16, 2013 (for an August 27, 2013 BOS meeting) regarding the BLHSP PFFP, “The adopted 2004 PFFP was structured to provide for the ultimate infrastructure needs and provided the phasing and potential over sizing for future phases. The cost of providing infrastructure was designed to place the burden of infrastructure development on the early phases, with the reimbursement to be provided by later phases. **If later phases never materialized, and reimbursement was not forthcoming, the risks would be borne by early developments, not the county”.**

This Summary, which was written by Gina Paolini, Senior Planner and Eileen Crawford, Senior Engineer to address a proposed revision to the PFFP (2013 Proposed Revision) by the developers to “reduce obstacles to development because improvements would only be required when needed” which is the antithesis of the 2004 PFFP and what is being suggested by the proposed changes today.

In their report, they suggested the elimination of the requirement of park sites in each village by the developer would trigger an **amendment of the Specific Plan** by the Board of Supervisors because it is a **requirement of the Plan.**

There are several relevant objectives and policies within the Specific Plan which address the concurrency of projects which is supported in the PFFP and led to the Board’s decision to adopt the Critical Mass Threshold based on the first 300 units and the second trigger based on the 600-unit threshold. **Example: “3.2.1 (Circulation Element – Concurrency) Ensure that safe and efficient transportation and circulation facilities are provided for concurrently with new development.”**

At the time of the submittal of the 2013 modified PFFP the developer expressed concern with developer payment of TIM fees and the requirement of also constructing TIM facilities although this is common County practice. Developments such as Serrano, Promontory and Valley View, etc., have all been subject to this situation.

When it was presented to the Board of Supervisors the developers were then and are now suggesting the new Conditions of Approval would place conditions requiring infrastructure necessary to serve the amount of development proposed. However, **the Board of Supervisor's "stated objective for the 2004 PFFP was to be certain that all necessary infrastructure and road improvements would be constructed concurrent with development"**.

The proposed revised 2013 PFFP failed by a vote of 3-2 in the BOS meeting of November 12, 2013.

If the Planning Commission moves forward with approving the current changes requested by the developer, I believe you need to require the completion Bass Lake Road to Hollow Oak despite what the developer hired experts' traffic study suggests. I believe there will be some unintended consequences for the Hollow Oak intersection that is already not safe. There have been a number of accidents at the intersection and a fatal accident occurred as a driver was attempting to exit Hollow Oak road.

By improving and realigning Country Club Road, you will be further exacerbating the conditions which currently exist at Hollow Oak Road. There is restricted line of sight for drivers when exiting from the road plus there is not a dedicated right hand turn lane. With the increased traffic from more development in Hollow Oak and the Bass Lake area it will become even more difficult for the residents (and guests who visit) to enter and exit the road safely.

Another area of concern relates to the lack of an integrated regional traffic analysis to assess the adequacy of the proposed changes for the interchange of Bass Lake Road and Highway 50. There are several other projects currently being proposed which will have substantial impacts on the interchange usage in the future. It would be the most cost effective and timely (and make the most sense) to have a County TDM in conjunction with the Marble Valley DEIR traffic analysis required to make sure the needed improvements are done correctly and performed in the right sequences.

Despite the extensive nature of the changes in the proposed Conditions of Approval, they are termed as minor in the documents provided. And yet in the Conditions of Approval dated March 24, 2016, for Hawk View, #23, the developer has totally eliminated **"This project shall comply with the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, the related Bass Lake Hills Development Agreement, and the Bass Lake Hills Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP)."**

In conclusion, the proposed infrastructure changes would require at the very least, an amended BLHSP, a modification to the PFFP and new CEQA documents should be drawn. The proposed changes would not facilitate the orderly and systematic development of the Bass Lake plan area, it would rather leave several infrastructure improvements incomplete until a future project or projects comes to fruition. If this does not happen, will El Dorado County be able step in to finish the infrastructure and where will they obtain the funds?

A solution needs to be found that meets the requirements of the BLHSP and the PFFP as well as the county needs.

Thank you for allowing me to comment,

Kathy Prevost
WoodRidge on Bass Lake Road
1080 Jasmine Circle
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
530 672-6836

4/28/2016

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: El Dorado County Planning Commission Agenda: Items 3-5



(Distributed during hearing
by staff)

Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

PC 4/28/16
#3, #4, #5
3 pages

Fwd: El Dorado County Planning Commission Agenda: Items 3-5

Rich Stewart <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Wed, Apr 27, 2016 at 7:19 PM

Just got this an hour ago. Please make sure it is available to everyone in the morning, including hard copies for the applicant and County Counsel.

Thanks. Rich

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

From: **Arvin Chaudhary** <arvin@chaudhary.com>

Date: Wed, Apr 27, 2016 at 5:51 PM

Subject: Re: El Dorado County Planning Commission Agenda: Items 3-5

To: tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us

Cc: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, jeff.hansen@edcgov.us, james.williams@edcgov.us, gary.miller@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, Kailash Chaudhary <kccnapa@yahoo.com>

We are the owners of three parcels in the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Area:

APN 119-100-10 ("Campbell")

APN 119-100-13 ("Greenwalt") 13.5 acres **Fronting on Bass Lake Road**

APN 119-110-14 8 acres **Fronting on Bass Lake Road**

We have owned these parcels for a decade and they were purchased based on the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan.

We supported the existing Conditions of Approval (COA) as approved for the three approved Tentative Maps which are now before the Planning Commission seeking amendments and changes to the approved COAs.

We were initially in support of these proposed Tentative Map amendments and replacement Conditions of Approval, as when information was presented to us prior to the March PC meeting it was our understanding that the applicant would be required to construct the access road from Country Club Drive to the Buckeye Union School site parcel (APN 119-100-11): As part of this design review we had negotiated in good faith with the applicant on the alignment and access driveways to our parcels. These access driveways would then be utilized instead of accessing the parcels off of Bass Lake Road.

We were surprised and shocked to learn at the March Planning Commission hearing that the School access road would not be built.

Therefore we regret to inform you that we are NOT in agreement with the new COAs as presented. The COAs infer that the applicant will obtain the necessary right of way for the future school road which requires dedications across our parcels and we are not willing to dedicate and encumber our land for a paper project with no benefit to us and **which will result in a significant decrease in the safe and proper access to our parcels.**

While we understand the needs and impacts of the realigned Bass Lake/Country Club intersection, the lack of a new access point to our parcels and the substantial increase in traffic volume and velocities on Bass Lake Road due to

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=b8659658af&view=pt&search=inbox&msg=1545aa9ab8ced334&siml=1545aa9ab8ced334>

1/3

these large subdivisions will exacerbate the current safety issues.

It is therefore our recommendation that the proposed COAs be modified by either:

1. *Applicant should improve Bass Lake Road from Hollow Oak to Highway 50 be such that the current sub-standard geometry (horizontal and vertical sight distance and shoulder width) be brought to current standards. There should be sufficient shoulder width at each driveway in this reach such that the current owners and tenants can access their homes and land in a safe manner.*

OR

2. *Applicant should be required to construct the School parcel access road as designed.*

OR

3. *Applicant should be required to meet the existing approved COAs which have already been fully vetted and agreed upon.*

I apologize for the very late comments as I was unavailable for a few weeks.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

Arvin Chaudhary, PE, PLS

Chaudhary & Associates Inc

Civil Engineering-Land Surveying-Construction Management-Storm Water Services
(QSD/QSP)

Napa - Fresno - San Francisco - Long Beach - Sacramento

www.chaudhary.com

Main Office 707-255-2729

ACEC-California Representative to the California High Speed Rail Business Advisory Council & Caltrans Small Business Council

On Wed, Apr 27, 2016 at 10:58 AM, El Dorado County <eldoradocounty@service.govdelivery.com> wrote:

You are subscribed to Planning Commission Agenda for El Dorado County. This information has recently been updated, and is now available.

Additional Attachments added to the Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

MEETING AGENDA DATE: April 28, 2016

- **Item #2 – Swansboro Verizon Wireless Cellular Tower (Mono-pine) project [S15-0001]**
 - 2G - Applicant-submitted Additional Information 04-26-16
 - Public Comment Rcvd 04-26-16

- **Item #3 – Hawk View project [TM00-1371-R/TM00-1371-E]**
 - 2B - Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Addendum Memo 04-06-16
 - Public Comment Rcvd 04-26-16

- **Item #4 – Bell Ranch project [TM96-1321-R-3/TM96-1321-E-2]**
 - 2B - Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Addendum Memo 04-06-16

4/28/2016

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: El Dorado County Planning Commission Agenda: Items 3-5

- Public Comment Rcvd 04-26-16

- **Item #5 – Bell Woods project [TM01-1380-R/TM01-1380-E]**
 - 2B - Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan Addendum Memo 04-06-16
 - Public Comment Rcvd 04-26-16



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Bass Lake Road Projects and Intersection Improvements

Erich Fischer <elf5@sbcglobal.net>

Thu, Apr 28, 2016 at 8:39 AM

Reply-To: Erich Fischer <elf5@sbcglobal.net>

To: "rich.stewart@edcgov.us" <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, "gary.miller@edcgov.us" <gary.miller@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, "jeff.hansen@edcgov.us" <jeff.hansen@edcgov.us>, "james.williams@edcgov.us" <james.williams@edcgov.us>, "tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us" <tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us>, "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I attended your meeting on March 24 regarding the projects in the Bass Lake Hills area. I spoke in favor of the projects because I believe the associated road improvements will be a major improvement to a currently dangerous and overly congested roadway segment and intersection where Country Club intersects Bass Lake Road.

Unfortunately, I cannot attend the meeting this morning due to work commitments. So I am writing to let you know that I continue to support these projects. The proposed changes will reduce local traffic congestion and improve roadway safety for the residents of Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills.

At the March 24 meeting, the developers indicated they could be ready to start work on building the new roads as early as the end of this year. I would like to see the project amendments approved now so that we can get our roads fixed.

Thank you for your consideration and for the time you spend on these matters.

Erich Fischer
Cameron Park Resident