

Public Comment # 16
BOS Recd. 10/10/23

From: BOS-District I
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 4:24 PM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: FW: Board of Supervisors Agenda item 16 October 10, 2023

LATE DISTRIBUTION

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530) 621-5650
[Link to Facebook page](#)
[Link to Nextdoor](#)
[Link to Supervisor Hidahl's webpage](#)



From: LINDA CAMPBELL <lcampbell03@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 3:53 PM
To: 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>
Subject: Board of Supervisors Agenda item 16 October 10, 2023

I am writing to request that this item be removed from the consent calendar. Due to the complete rejection by the Planning Commission of this project, it is in the communities best interest to have additional details on why this work is being requested.

I tried to find the exact guidelines on what can be on the consent calendar, but was unable to locate clear information on the El Dorado County Government site. Any guidance on where that is documented would be appreciated.

According to The Institute for Local Government, below is information on what should be on a consent calendar (<https://www.ca-ilg.org/resource/concept-consent-calendar>)
To expedite meetings and reserve time for matters that need to be discussed, many local agencies have a section on their agendas labeled as the "consent calendar."

Items on the consent calendar are generally non-controversial items that do not require much, if any, discussion.

The consent calendar allows decision-makers to group such items together under one heading and decide them at one time.

Local agencies typically have a procedure for removing an item from the consent calendar for separate discussion.

This enables the item to be considered and voted upon separately if discussion is needed or if a decision-maker needs to not vote on that item because of a disqualifying conflict of interest.

I would say due to the nature of the CEDHSP initiative, it would fall into the controversial category. The public should have full view of work that has been done since the planning committee rejection, prior to any additional work or funds being approved towards the project.

Regards,

Linda K Campbell - El Dorado Hills Resident

From: Maychad <maychad@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 5:32 PM
To: BOS-District I; BOS-District II; BOS-District III; BOS-District IV; BOS-District V; BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: Item #16 on Tuesday's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

Board of Supervisors

Please pull item #16 from the Consent Calendar and do the right thing and just-deny the CEDHSP!
Your attention to this is very important to many of us who now live in this community.

Maynard and Donna Chadwick
3421 Brittany Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

From: Kabirinassab, Soodabeh@HCD <Soodabeh.Kabirinassab@hcd.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 10:57 PM
To: BOS-District I; BOS-District II; BOS-District III; BOS-District IV; BOS-District V; BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: FW: Multi-density housing on the Old Golf Course property - Open Space ED, Inc.

Good evening Board of Supervisors,

When Serrano was first approved, 3 golf courses were marketed in that plan. This old public golf course was leveraged as a 3rd course. Its existence helped the developer to build and sell thousands of new homes. We are pleading with you to help us preserve the golf course because that recreational open space truly belongs to the community. We must save our vanishing recreational & open space.

Respectable members of the board, please pull this item from the Consent Calendar and stop the movement forward for this project by denying this item! The Parker's plan has not been sent back to the Planning Commission. The public needs to have time to evaluate changes and the changes must go through the Planning Commission for proper review.

Please do the Right Thing—just deny the CEDHSP! The property is open space as was known to the developer when he purchased it, and much of that was used as mitigation for past projects. Second, that area does not have the legally required road capacity to facilitate such a project, and third, it is not legal for the developer to be moving parcels that are currently in Serrano without the vote of the HOA.

Good governance includes making good decisions in their constituents best interests. It is not only District One voters who strenuously object to this proposal, it is opposed throughout the entire county.

Regards,

Khossrow & Soodabeh Kabirinassab

Serrano residents