

---

**Jan 27 Board of Supervisors meeting- Creekside Village project - a vote against re-zoning the land**

---

**From** F K <fkotch@live.com>  
**Date** Wed 1/21/2026 8:31 PM  
**To** BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>  
**Cc** F K <fkotch@live.com>

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Re: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors land re-zoning meeting on January 27 for Creekside Village housing project

Dear board members,

As a homeowner and resident of Heritage Carson Creek (HCC), El Dorado Hills CA, I humbly wish to submit my opinion and preference regarding the proposed re-zoning of a section of land located next to Heritage Carson Creek, scheduled to be discussed on January 27.

If the aforementioned land gains approval by the Board of Supervisors to be re-zoned as residential (for a new community with over 700 residential units by Winn/Lennar) I believe that there would be multiple negative impacts on HCC. These estimated impacts includes but is not limited to the following:

- Increased traffic congestion throughout the area, causing a potential need to develop additional roads connecting to/from Latrobe Rd, which would affect the ever-growing noise pollution throughout the region. One example is the recently proposed new road, possibly connecting Latrobe Rd to Payne Rd and then to White Rock Rd. That road alone would certainly cause excessive noise pollution for most of the residents of HCC, and negatively impact the wildlife which exists.
- Developing the virgin land would require heavy equipment to dig for infrastructure items and to grade/level the various lots, causing an unrelenting amount of construction noise for the residents of HCC for many months or years. Also, the noise pollution caused by the construction of the homes and building (lasting for many years) would negatively impact the residents of HCC.
- The development of additional housing in such close proximity to HCC, would most likely negatively impact the value of existing homes, relative to the basic theory of supply/demand real estate models.
- Water and sewage demands would most likely require enhancements to current infrastructure, causing increased costs for such utility services fees to all residents of El Dorado County, in nearby proximity to Latrobe Rd.
- Local shopping markets which are already very congested, would be further impacted.
- Additional housing in the area would trigger additional projects like a new high school, which would also cause excessive noise pollution throughout the area. This is an

especially important issue as it relates to its proximity to communities classified as “over-55” retirement communities.

- Respectfully speaking, as a property-owner and resident, living adjacent to the proposed project, I wish to urge the Board of Supervisors to decline the land-developers application to re-zone the aforementioned land, and to also decline the entire building-project for Creekside Village.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Fred Kotch

A resident and property owner of HCC

**OPPOSITION SUBMITTED TO THE EDC BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FROM  
RESIDENTS IN HERITAGE PHASE 4 - RE CREEKSIDE VILLAGE PROPOSAL  
SCHEDULED FOR HEARING JAN. 27, 2026**

As current residents in the new Lennar Heritage Phase 4 neighborhood, we **STRONGLY oppose** the re-zoning of the land which is the subject of the Creekside Village proposal adjacent to our neighborhood, for reasons including the following:

- We are residents of Heritage Carson Creek, the new Lennar community of 400 newly constructed homes. Construction began in 2024 and is still continuing through the present. A large number of homes still have yet to be sold. When we purchased our homes, many of us were told by Lennar that Creekside Village would NOT have any 55+ age-restricted homes. We relied upon this representation in purchasing our homes. (Winn Development admits in their proposal that the originally proposed project for Creekside was only for conventional, non age-restricted homes.)
- The current real estate market has been softening. Based on simple economic principles of supply and demand, increasing the local housing supply of 55+ homes will only continue to bring our housing values DOWN. Lennar has already brought down property values in the older Heritage 55+ neighborhoods by selling the new construction homes in Heritage Phase 4 at unusually low pricing, in order to sell inventory. It is anticipated this sales strategy will continue with the 613 age-restricted 55+ homes currently planned for the Creekside Village community.
- There will be considerably MORE traffic on local roads if Creekside Village is constructed. This is something that NO ONE in EDH wants. An additional 763 homes is a significant number of new homes! Ron Peters at the Planning Dept. has confirmed that the extension of Royal Oaks Dr., from Latrobe through the Creekside neighborhood, and into Heritage Phase 4, would need to be EXPANDED from the current plans, in order to accommodate more traffic. Again, this is not something that was disclosed when we bought our homes. The current plan for the road should remain. It should NOT be expanded to accommodate a community that should not be approved.

- The builder, Winn Communities, has made the argument that residents of Creekside Village will provide employment for the businesses in the Business Parks. This makes NO SENSE WHATSOEVER if the vast majority of the homes (613 of 763) will be purchased by people 55 years old and above, i.e., retirement age. The residents in this demographic won't presumably be looking for employment, in the business parks or elsewhere!
- Winn's argument that "active adult residents have disposable income for shopping, dining, and using local services, which supports local businesses" is frankly insulting. Many active adult residents are on fixed incomes and certainly don't want any builder to speak for them as to how they will spend their hard-earned money.
- Where's the evidence that "sensitive cultural resources found on the site" will be protected (as claimed by Winn)? Heritage residents enjoy and appreciate the natural preserves in the area. Again, it was a significant reason for the purchase of our homes. Much of the naturally preserved areas will be covered with cement and will drive out a variety of species of protected wildlife.
- Similarly, where's the evidence that water capacity will be sufficient for 763 additional homes (as claimed by Winn)? Not just a blanket statement from EID, where is the EVIDENCE?
- Last but not least, the Board should already be aware that a vein of tremolite (naturally occurring asbestos) runs down Latrobe in the area of Creekside Village. The containment of dust to a degree that would be sufficient to prevent any potential exposure to the residents in the surrounding communities (and especially to the homes with small children in the Creekside Village neighborhood) is essentially impossible.
- Re-zoning of the land in question from "research and development" only serves one purpose and one purpose only... continued profits to residential builders. There has been ENOUGH construction and re-zoning that has already taken place in EDH to serve this purpose for a while. The re-zoning request should be DENIED.



Nadine Lauren  
Nadine Lauren

583 San Sorrento St.

Robert Coughlin

333 SAN Sorrento St.

Chris C

Christina Coughlin

333 San Sorrento St.

Vickie Wilson  
Vickie Ronzone

897 Lucent St

Jeffrey Ronzone  
Jeffrey Ronzone

897 Lucent St

Kitty Volmer-Walley  
Kitty Volmer Walley

390 San Sorrento St.

Nancy Renee Wiegell  
NANCY RENEE WIEGEL

374 SAN SORRENTO ST.

Susan McNally  
SUSAN McNally

828 Bella Cara Street

Andy Laguna  
Andy Laguna

615 San Sorrento St

Lynda Munoz  
Lynda Munoz

SAN SORRENTO ST

Rachelle Neal  
Rachelle Neal

102 San Sorrento St.

Dave Araas  
Dave Araas  
Patricia Araas  
Patricia Araas

126 San Sorrento St

126 San Sorrento St.

Debbie John Martino  
Debbie John Martino

Basque St.

Tommy Crawford  
Tommy Crawford

673 CLIFFROSE CT.

Hilary Crawford  
Hilary Crawford

" Cliffrose St.

Bruce Bafford  
Bruce Bafford  
Kathleen Starr Vaght  
Kathleen Starr Vaght

873 Lucent St

Bonaire St.

Robert Costey  
Robert Costey  
Kathleen Costey  
Kathleen Costey

606 San Sorrento St.

606 San Sorrento St

Claudia Lyon  
Claudia Lyon

890 Lucent St.

Karen Lindsay  
Karen Lindsay

149 San Sorrento St

Linda Viggiano

Dol Lopez

Steve Nielsen  
Steve Nielsen

Cheryl Nielsen  
Cheryl Nielsen

Fernando Ureno  
Fernando Ureno

Fred Kotch

Linda Bure  
Linda Bure  
(Surrender-formerly)

Linda Ureno  
Linda Ureno

Sharon Palmberg  
Sharon Palmberg

284 Montego St

284 Montego St

582 San Sorrento St

582 San Sorrento St

625 Estaban St.

856 Nicola St.

545 Goleta St #14

625 Estaban St.

574 San Sorrento St.

---

**RE: 1/27/26 Board of Supervisor's meeting TOPIC: Creekside Village proposal**

---

**From** bzbergstrom@comcast.net <bzbergstrom@comcast.net>

**Date** Wed 1/21/2026 7:40 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](#)

**Please note our request that in regards to the Creekside Village proposal**

**This email is in SUPPORT of APPROVAL of the proposal as presented. An email stating that was sent to each member of the El Dorado County Supervisors**

At the BOS Meeting on January 27, 2026, we ask you to please **override the Planning Commission's recent decision** regarding the Creekside Village development by Winn Communities. We wholeheartedly DON'T want more warehouses! The local residents DON'T need or want the continued sprawl of warehouses at the southern end of the business park off Latrobe Road or the possibility of hundreds of diesel semi-trucks tearing up Latrobe Road which will pollute our air and lungs. Not to mention that John Adams school children are DIRECTLY next to this property.

Two years ago, we were part of the community that raised funds to protest and prevent the Amazon Warehouse project called Project Frontier due to the extreme levels of semi-truck traffic it threatened to bring along with the associated diesel fumes and particulate matter. That development or any warehouse property like it also threatens to negatively affect our home values. We still believe that more warehouses are NOT called for in this area of El Dorado Hills! The business park divested itself of those 200 acres years ago specifically because more industry was NOT warranted or justified.

Winn Communities has worked diligently with the local community members to create a 750-home housing project that will fit seamlessly into the area adjacent to Blackstone, Heritage and nearby Four Seasons. It will provide open green-space, parks and a reasonable number of homes.

The developer followed the county's requirements, and they met formally and informally with the county Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on multiple occasions. As I understand it, our District 2 Planning Commissioner has been supportive of the project since its inception but changed his mind when the issue came up for a vote. The Planning Commission, however, chose to oppose it in a 3-2 decision. Unfortunately, it appears that the Planning Commission has made a decision that DOES NOT reflect the best interests of the most locally effected residents. The developer may sell the property and there is, once again, the onerous possibility of warehouses being built next to multiple residential communities.

**PLEASE APPROVE the Creekside Village plan as proposed by Winn Communities.** Please listen to your constituent residents! We support the developer and their plans as proposed.



Thank you,

Bonni and Jame Bergstrom (Blackstone residents)

5153 Brentford Way

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

925-890-0702

---


**Re: BOS Hearing 1/27/26 - Opposition to Creekside Village Proposal/Re-zoning**

---

**From** Nadine Lauren <npllaw@sbcglobal.net>

**Date** Wed 1/21/2026 7:26 PM

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

 1 attachment (1 MB)

OPPOSITION to Creekside Village - 1.27.26 BOS Hearing.pdf;

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Kyra, I am re-submitting the attached, now that the Agenda has been posted. Please confirm that it will be attached to the official record.

Thanks again.  
Nadine

On Wednesday, January 21, 2026 at 08:43:57 AM PST, BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us> wrote:

Hi Nadine,

The agenda will be published today after 3:00PM.

Thank you!

Kyra Scharffenberg  
El Dorado County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
330 Fairlane Building A  
Placerville, CA 95667  
530.621.5654

---

**From:** Nadine Lauren <npllaw@sbcglobal.net>

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 20, 2026 8:31 PM

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

**Subject:** Re: BOS Hearing 1/27/26 - Opposition to Creekside Village Proposal/Re-zoning

Hi Kyra,

Do you have any idea as to when the Agenda will be published so I can re-submit the petition to be included in the official record?

Thanks again.  
Nadine

On Tuesday, January 20, 2026 at 12:49:50 PM PST, BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us> wrote:

Hi,

Public comment is welcomed and encouraged by the Board. To ensure transparency and proper documentation, please note the following: Public comment will be included in the official record starting when the Agenda is published and continuing up until the Board hears the item during the meeting. This helps make sure that all comments included in the record are timely and directly related to the topics being discussed. It also ensures that both the Board and the public have access to relevant input before decisions are made.

Comments submitted outside of the designated timeframe, whether before the Agenda is posted or after the item has been heard, will not be included in the official record. However, these comments are still valuable and will be forwarded to Board members and appropriate County staff for their review and consideration.

We encourage the public to participate within the established timeframe to ensure their input is formally recognized and preserved in the meeting record.

Thank you,

Kyra Scharffenberg  
El Dorado County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
330 Fairlane Building A  
Placerville, CA 95667  
530.621.5654

---

**From:** Nadine Lauren <npllaw@sbcglobal.net>

**Sent:** Monday, January 19, 2026 11:31 AM

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

**Subject:** BOS Hearing 1/27/26 - Opposition to Creekside Village Proposal/Re-zoning

Hello, please see attached. The new Heritage Carson Creek community is very opposed to this project/re-zone request. The attached is a sampling of signatures. I will look for the agenda to be posted, so this could be included in the public record as well. As of today, no agenda has been posted.

Thank you.  
Nadine Lauren

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

WARNING: This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

WARNING: This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

**OPPOSITION SUBMITTED TO THE EDC BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FROM  
RESIDENTS IN HERITAGE PHASE 4 - RE CREEKSIDE VILLAGE PROPOSAL  
SCHEDULED FOR HEARING JAN. 27, 2026**

As current residents in the new Lennar Heritage Phase 4 neighborhood, we **STRONGLY oppose** the re-zoning of the land which is the subject of the Creekside Village proposal adjacent to our neighborhood, for reasons including the following:

- We are residents of Heritage Carson Creek, the new Lennar community of 400 newly constructed homes. Construction began in 2024 and is still continuing through the present. A large number of homes still have yet to be sold. When we purchased our homes, many of us were told by Lennar that Creekside Village would NOT have any 55+ age-restricted homes. We relied upon this representation in purchasing our homes. (Winn Development admits in their proposal that the originally proposed project for Creekside was only for conventional, non age-restricted homes.)
- The current real estate market has been softening. Based on simple economic principles of supply and demand, increasing the local housing supply of 55+ homes will only continue to bring our housing values DOWN. Lennar has already brought down property values in the older Heritage 55+ neighborhoods by selling the new construction homes in Heritage Phase 4 at unusually low pricing, in order to sell inventory. It is anticipated this sales strategy will continue with the 613 age-restricted 55+ homes currently planned for the Creekside Village community.
- There will be considerably MORE traffic on local roads if Creekside Village is constructed. This is something that NO ONE in EDH wants. An additional 763 homes is a significant number of new homes! Ron Peters at the Planning Dept. has confirmed that the extension of Royal Oaks Dr., from Latrobe through the Creekside neighborhood, and into Heritage Phase 4, would need to be EXPANDED from the current plans, in order to accommodate more traffic. Again, this is not something that was disclosed when we bought our homes. The current plan for the road should remain. It should NOT be expanded to accommodate a community that should not be approved.



- The builder, Winn Communities, has made the argument that residents of Creekside Village will provide employment for the businesses in the Business Parks. This makes NO SENSE WHATSOEVER if the vast majority of the homes (613 of 763) will be purchased by people 55 years old and above, i.e., retirement age. The residents in this demographic won't presumably be looking for employment, in the business parks or elsewhere!
- Winn's argument that "active adult residents have disposable income for shopping, dining, and using local services, which supports local businesses" is frankly insulting. Many active adult residents are on fixed incomes and certainly don't want any builder to speak for them as to how they will spend their hard-earned money.
- Where's the evidence that "sensitive cultural resources found on the site" will be protected (as claimed by Winn)? Heritage residents enjoy and appreciate the natural preserves in the area. Again, it was a significant reason for the purchase of our homes. Much of the naturally preserved areas will be covered with cement and will drive out a variety of species of protected wildlife.
- Similarly, where's the evidence that water capacity will be sufficient for 763 additional homes (as claimed by Winn)? Not just a blanket statement from EID, where is the EVIDENCE?
- Last but not least, the Board should already be aware that a vein of tremolite (naturally occurring asbestos) runs down Latrobe in the area of Creekside Village. The containment of dust to a degree that would be sufficient to prevent any potential exposure to the residents in the surrounding communities (and especially to the homes with small children in the Creekside Village neighborhood) is essentially impossible.
- Re-zoning of the land in question from "research and development" only serves one purpose and one purpose only... continued profits to residential builders. There has been ENOUGH construction and re-zoning that has already taken place in EDH to serve this purpose for a while. The re-zoning request should be DENIED.

Nadine Lauren  
Nadine Lauren

583 San Sorrento St.

Robert Coughlin

333 SAN Sorrento St.

Chris C

Christina Coughlin

333 San Sorrento St.

Vickie Wilson  
Vickie Ronzone

897 Lucent St

Jeffrey Ronzone  
Jeffrey Ronzone

897 Lucent St

Kitty Volmer-Walley  
Kitty Volmer Walley

390 San Sorrento St.

Nancy Renee Wiegell  
NANCY RENÉE WIEGEL

374 SAN SORRENTO ST.

Susan McNally  
SUSAN McNally

828 Bella Cara Street

Judy Lagura  
Judy Lagura

615 San Sorrento St

Lynda Munoz  
Lynda Munoz

SAN SORRENTO ST

Rachelle Neal  
Rachelle Neal

102 San Sorrento St.

Dave Araas  
Dave Araas  
Patricia Araas  
Patricia Araas

126 San Sorrento St

126 San Sorrento St.

Debbie John Martino  
Debbie John Martino

Basque St.

Tommy Crawford  
Tommy Crawford

673 CLIFFROSE CT.

Hilary Crawford  
Hilary Crawford

" Cliffrose St.

Bruce Bafford  
Bruce Bafford  
Kathleen Starr Vaght  
Kathleen Starr Vaght

873 Lucent St

Bonaire St.

Robert Costey  
Robert Costey  
Kathleen Costey  
Kathleen Costey

606 San Sorrento St.

606 San Sorrento St

Claudia Lyon  
Claudia Lyon

890 Lucent St.

Karen Lindsay  
Karen Lindsay

149 San Sorrento St



Linda Viggiano

Bob Togni

Steve Nielsen  
Steve Nielsen

Cheryl Nielsen  
Cheryl Nielsen

Fernando Ureno  
Fernando Ureno

Fred Kotch

Linda Burk  
Linda Burk  
(Surrender-formerly)

Linda Ureno  
Linda Ureno

Sharon Palmberg  
Sharon Palmberg

284 Montego St

284 Montego St

582 San Sorrento St

582 San Sorrento St

625 Estaban St.

856 Nicola St.

545 Goleta St #4

625 Estaban St.

574 San Sorrento St.



---


## Letter of Support

---

**From** Kimberly Waite <kwaite@goldenhillsschool.net>

**Date** Thu 1/22/2026 9:20 AM

**To** BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>

 1 attachment (15 KB)

EDC Supervisors Comment Letter Contact Info.docx;

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Good morning Supervisor,

I hope this message finds you well. I wanted to take a moment to thank you for your continued service and dedication to our El Dorado Hills community. We truly appreciate the time, care, and thoughtful leadership you bring to the important decisions that shape our county.

I am writing on behalf of Golden Hills School to share our support for the proposed Creekside Village residential community in El Dorado Hills. As a neighboring member of the El Dorado Hills Business Park community, we believe this project represents a well-considered and community-centered use of the site and offers meaningful benefits to the surrounding area.

Attached please find our letter of support. We welcome the opportunity to share our perspective as an educational institution and community partner.

Thank you again for your service and for your continued commitment to our community. We appreciate your leadership and thoughtful consideration.

Warm regards,

**Kimberly S. Waite, Ed.D.**

*Interim Head of School*

Golden Hills School

1060 Suncast Lane

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

916 933-0100 x 103

[www.goldenhillsschool.net](http://www.goldenhillsschool.net)



District 1 Supervisor, Greg Ferrero  
Email: [bosone@edcgov.us](mailto:bosone@edcgov.us)

District 2 Supervisor, George Turnboo  
Email: [bostwo@edcgov.us](mailto:bostwo@edcgov.us)

District 3 Supervisor, Brian Veerkamp  
Email: [bosthree@edcgov.us](mailto:bosthree@edcgov.us)

District 4 Supervisor, Lori Parlin  
Email: [bosfour@edcgov.us](mailto:bosfour@edcgov.us)

District 5 Supervisor, Brooke Laine  
Email: [brooke.laine@edcgov.us](mailto:brooke.laine@edcgov.us)

Clerk of the Board  
Email: [edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Planning Department  
Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

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

County of El Dorado Planning & Building Department  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

---

## Public Comment Regarding Creekside Village Project

---

**From** Dave Scroggins <dscroggins@latrobesd.org>

**Date** Thu 1/22/2026 10:36 AM

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

**Cc** James Scot Yarnell <scotyarnell@sbcglobal.net>; James Yarnell <scot4schoolboard@gmail.com>; Jared Meredith <4jmeredith@gmail.com>; Janet Saitman <janet@janetsaitman.com>; Tracy Pearson <tpearson@latrobeschool.com>; George Carpenter <George@winncommunities.com>; Jennifer Fusano <jfusano@pusdk8.us>; Joy Worth <jworth@latrobeschool.com>

 1 attachment (166 KB)

Creekside Village Public Comment Latrobe School District.pdf;

---

### This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to submit the attached letter as public comment for the upcoming January 27 Board of Supervisors meeting.

The attached letter expresses support for the Reduced Impact Alternative for the proposed Creekside Village Project. This support is offered on behalf of myself, in my role as Superintendent of the Latrobe School District, as well as the Latrobe School District Board of Trustees, and outlines the reasons for that support.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment and for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dave Scroggins

--

**Dave Scroggins**

Superintendent/Principal

Latrobe School District

7900 South Shingle Rd

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

530-677-0260 ext. 301

F: 530-672-0463

[www.latrobesd.org](http://www.latrobesd.org)





# Latrobe School District

**Superintendent/Principal**  
*Dave Scroggins*

**Board Members**  
*Jared Meredith*  
*Janet Saitman*  
*Scot Yarnell*



January 22, 2026

Dear Members of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the Latrobe School District Board of Trustees, I want to thank you for your continued engagement regarding the Creekside Village project and the County's broader efforts to expand housing opportunities in El Dorado Hills. I appreciate the opportunity to share the careful analysis and thoughtful consideration that informed the District's support for the reduced-impact alternative presented by Mr. George Carpenter and Winn Communities.

I recognize and respect the County's desire to provide additional conventional housing. At the same time, I have a responsibility to carefully consider how growth aligns with the operational and infrastructure realities of our small, rural school district. With that responsibility in mind, the District spent considerable time evaluating whether we could reasonably accommodate students generated by the Creekside Village project and exploring potential alternatives.

As a starting point, we examined projected student generation. The original proposal included 918 single-family homes, which—using standard student generation rates of 0.3 to 0.4 students per home—would have resulted in approximately 275 to 370 new students. Even after the project was revised in 2024 to reduce the total to 763 homes, projected enrollment remained between 230 and 305 students. By comparison, Latrobe Unified School District currently serves approximately 130 students. Under either scenario, Creekside Village alone would more than double the size of our student population.

Given this significant impact, I worked closely with the Latrobe School District Board of Trustees and representatives from Winn Communities to carefully evaluate multiple potential options:

**Expansion of existing campuses:** Latrobe operates two small campuses—Latrobe Elementary (TK–3) and Miller's Hill (4–8). Serving the projected number of students would require a substantial expansion of facilities. Beyond the fact that developer fees cover only a portion of actual construction costs, both campuses face significant physical constraints, including limited land, reliance on well water with a constrained aquifer, and septic systems. Our resources for student services are also limited: we do not have a central kitchen and currently contract food service through Folsom Cordova School District, and Latrobe Elementary has only one male and one female restroom. In addition, traffic and safety concerns along Latrobe Road present further challenges. These combined limitations illustrate why the reduced-impact alternative, which limits the number of conventional homes, is the most responsible and feasible way to accommodate growth while maintaining the quality and safety of educational services for our students.

**Construction of a new school closer to El Dorado Hills:** We explored the feasibility of constructing a new K–8 campus. A school of that nature would require a student population of approximately 650 to operate efficiently. Even under the highest projections, Creekside Village would generate only about half of that number, and there is no other anticipated growth within the District to make such a campus financially viable.

**District reorganization or boundary adjustments:** Our school board and I carefully considered whether transferring territory to a neighboring district could help address enrollment impacts. While this approach might seem like a short-term solution, we believe it is our obligation to serve all students who live within the Latrobe School District. Deannexing portions of the District would not only undermine that responsibility, it could also create a precedent that would have long-term cumulative consequences for our ability to provide consistent, high-quality education. In addition to substantial procedural and policy challenges, removing territory could jeopardize the District's financial stability, which depends on property tax revenues from all areas within our boundaries. Rather than pursue boundary changes, we prefer to plan thoughtfully for growth as it occurs, ensuring that our small district can continue to meet the needs of our students and community in a sustainable and equitable way.

**Interdistrict transfers or temporary attendance agreements:** While these mechanisms can be useful in limited circumstances, they do not provide certainty. State law guarantees students residing within our boundaries the right to attend Latrobe schools. Any shift in enrollment back to the District would obligate us to serve students without the necessary land, water, septic capacity, or facilities to do so.

After thoroughly examining each of these options, I concluded—together with the Board—that none offered a viable or responsible solution at the scale originally proposed. As a result, we worked collaboratively with the developer to identify an alternative that would allow the County to move forward with housing while protecting the long-term viability of the Latrobe School District.

Limiting Creekside Village to approximately 150 conventional homes, with the balance designated as active adult housing, represents the most balanced and prudent approach. This reduced-impact alternative allows for additional housing while respecting the District's current limitations. For this reason, the Board supported and entered into a school mitigation agreement with the developer.

I appreciate the Board of Supervisors' efforts to balance housing needs with public infrastructure capacity and thank you for the opportunity to share our perspective. For the reasons stated above, the Board of Trustees of the Latrobe School District and I support the Reduced Impact Alternative before you.

Respectfully,



Dave Scroggins  
Superintendent  
Latrobe School District

---

## Public Comment Regarding Creekside Village Project

---

**From** Dave Scroggins <dscroggins@latrobesd.org>

**Date** Thu 1/22/2026 10:36 AM

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

**Cc** James Scot Yarnell <scotyarnell@sbcglobal.net>; James Yarnell <scot4schoolboard@gmail.com>; Jared Meredith <4jmeredith@gmail.com>; Janet Saitman <janet@janetsaitman.com>; Tracy Pearson <tpearson@latrobeschool.com>; George Carpenter <George@winncommunities.com>; Jennifer Fusano <jfusano@pusdk8.us>; Joy Worth <jworth@latrobeschool.com>

 1 attachment (166 KB)

Creekside Village Public Comment Latrobe School District.pdf;

---

### This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to submit the attached letter as public comment for the upcoming January 27 Board of Supervisors meeting.

The attached letter expresses support for the Reduced Impact Alternative for the proposed Creekside Village Project. This support is offered on behalf of myself, in my role as Superintendent of the Latrobe School District, as well as the Latrobe School District Board of Trustees, and outlines the reasons for that support.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment and for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dave Scroggins

--

**Dave Scroggins**

Superintendent/Principal

Latrobe School District

7900 South Shingle Rd

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

530-677-0260 ext. 301

F: 530-672-0463

[www.latrobesd.org](http://www.latrobesd.org)





# Latrobe School District

**Superintendent/Principal**  
*Dave Scroggins*

**Board Members**  
*Jared Meredith*  
*Janet Saitman*  
*Scot Yarnell*



January 22, 2026

Dear Members of the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the Latrobe School District Board of Trustees, I want to thank you for your continued engagement regarding the Creekside Village project and the County's broader efforts to expand housing opportunities in El Dorado Hills. I appreciate the opportunity to share the careful analysis and thoughtful consideration that informed the District's support for the reduced-impact alternative presented by Mr. George Carpenter and Winn Communities.

I recognize and respect the County's desire to provide additional conventional housing. At the same time, I have a responsibility to carefully consider how growth aligns with the operational and infrastructure realities of our small, rural school district. With that responsibility in mind, the District spent considerable time evaluating whether we could reasonably accommodate students generated by the Creekside Village project and exploring potential alternatives.

As a starting point, we examined projected student generation. The original proposal included 918 single-family homes, which—using standard student generation rates of 0.3 to 0.4 students per home—would have resulted in approximately 275 to 370 new students. Even after the project was revised in 2024 to reduce the total to 763 homes, projected enrollment remained between 230 and 305 students. By comparison, Latrobe Unified School District currently serves approximately 130 students. Under either scenario, Creekside Village alone would more than double the size of our student population.

Given this significant impact, I worked closely with the Latrobe School District Board of Trustees and representatives from Winn Communities to carefully evaluate multiple potential options:

**Expansion of existing campuses:** Latrobe operates two small campuses—Latrobe Elementary (TK–3) and Miller's Hill (4–8). Serving the projected number of students would require a substantial expansion of facilities. Beyond the fact that developer fees cover only a portion of actual construction costs, both campuses face significant physical constraints, including limited land, reliance on well water with a constrained aquifer, and septic systems. Our resources for student services are also limited: we do not have a central kitchen and currently contract food service through Folsom Cordova School District, and Latrobe Elementary has only one male and one female restroom. In addition, traffic and safety concerns along Latrobe Road present further challenges. These combined limitations illustrate why the reduced-impact alternative, which limits the number of conventional homes, is the most responsible and feasible way to accommodate growth while maintaining the quality and safety of educational services for our students.

**Construction of a new school closer to El Dorado Hills:** We explored the feasibility of constructing a new K–8 campus. A school of that nature would require a student population of approximately 650 to operate efficiently. Even under the highest projections, Creekside Village would generate only about half of that number, and there is no other anticipated growth within the District to make such a campus financially viable.

**District reorganization or boundary adjustments:** Our school board and I carefully considered whether transferring territory to a neighboring district could help address enrollment impacts. While this approach might seem like a short-term solution, we believe it is our obligation to serve all students who live within the Latrobe School District. Deannexing portions of the District would not only undermine that responsibility, it could also create a precedent that would have long-term cumulative consequences for our ability to provide consistent, high-quality education. In addition to substantial procedural and policy challenges, removing territory could jeopardize the District's financial stability, which depends on property tax revenues from all areas within our boundaries. Rather than pursue boundary changes, we prefer to plan thoughtfully for growth as it occurs, ensuring that our small district can continue to meet the needs of our students and community in a sustainable and equitable way.

**Interdistrict transfers or temporary attendance agreements:** While these mechanisms can be useful in limited circumstances, they do not provide certainty. State law guarantees students residing within our boundaries the right to attend Latrobe schools. Any shift in enrollment back to the District would obligate us to serve students without the necessary land, water, septic capacity, or facilities to do so.

After thoroughly examining each of these options, I concluded—together with the Board—that none offered a viable or responsible solution at the scale originally proposed. As a result, we worked collaboratively with the developer to identify an alternative that would allow the County to move forward with housing while protecting the long-term viability of the Latrobe School District.

Limiting Creekside Village to approximately 150 conventional homes, with the balance designated as active adult housing, represents the most balanced and prudent approach. This reduced-impact alternative allows for additional housing while respecting the District's current limitations. For this reason, the Board supported and entered into a school mitigation agreement with the developer.

I appreciate the Board of Supervisors' efforts to balance housing needs with public infrastructure capacity and thank you for the opportunity to share our perspective. For the reasons stated above, the Board of Trustees of the Latrobe School District and I support the Reduced Impact Alternative before you.

Respectfully,



Dave Scroggins  
Superintendent  
Latrobe School District



**TOWN CENTER EAST, L.P.**

**By: The Nagle Company**

**4370 Town Center Blvd. #300**

**El Dorado Hills, CA 95762**

**TO THE EL DORADO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

It is with great enthusiasm that the El Dorado Hills Town Center Ownership supports the development of Creekside Village, a 763 proposed neighborhood in El Dorado Hills. If approved, it would be the first development of its kind approved in over 10 years.

This development is led by a trusted and premier organization who understands the needs of our County-residential housing. Housing remains a massive shortage in El Dorado Hills and this will benefit many. The construction of 600 plus senior living residences will allow for some current residents to remain in the community who own residential properties in El Dorado Hills and open them up to others who wish to live here. The other 150 residential homes will assist in mitigating the shortfall of non age restricted homes. This neighborhood will have parks, trails, and open space which protects the open space we all enjoy in El Dorado Hills.

This residential development expansion will also assist in relieving the County of El Dorado's tax revenue shortfall it has been incurring in recent years. Because we lack an updated long term strategy on economic development and housing, this clearly benefits our community.

I support its development and ask the Board of Supervisors to endorse this by voting to approve Creekside Village.

Sincerely,

Kevin M. Nagle

Chairman and Owner of the El Dorado Hills Town Center and The Nagle Companies