

Public comments

# 22 25-1408

Bos Revel 8/26/25

ing

8/26/25

## Agenda Item #22 Legistar #25-1408 Hearing

From Sue Taylor <suetaylor530@gmail.com>

Date Tue 8/26/2025 2:01 PM

To BOS-District I <br/>bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <br/>bosfive@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <br/>bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <br/>Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Cc Kirk McKillop <captkirk23@hotmail.com>; Larry Rolla <rollaskate@gmail.com>

## This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Our 2004 General Plan was approved by El Dorado County voters with promises to protect and preserve our rural way of life. Those that instigated and promoted this plan never intended to implement those barriers that provided those protections. Since 2006, when the plan was released from the Courts these developers, realtors, the El Dorado County Chamber and others have lobbied against these policies being implemented and instead pushed to remove the few barriers that residents have counted on to protect their sense of place.

Now this Board of Supervisors is allowing the Planning Director to unilaterally make development decisions that have no regard for our zoning ordinance and General Plan. Planners are telling applicants to not only go to the maximum allowed with zoning, but to increase those numbers even more. If the County hits a barrier that is preventing an incompatible project from moving forward, and is being challenged by the neighborhood, the county changes the rules in order to side step the law. Then just last week the Board voted to violate and hide a requirement for 30 foot setbacks on parcels 1 acre or more. This is a State Law put in place in order to prevent catastrophic fires from running through rural neighborhoods.

The Mixed Use Ordinance on only Commercial property with Commercial being primary and required to be developed either first or consequentially with residential, was sold to the public as a cute downstairs business with a dwelling unit above, much like our downtown Placerville. County setbacks and the floor area ratio was still in place that protected adjacent properties from an overbearing project. Then around 2008 the Board of Supervisors increased the Floor Area Ratio from 25% to 85% in which it showed that El Dorado County does not have the resources (water among one) to support that much density of development. Soon after the County modified the Mixed Use Ordinance to allow residential to be built first and separately from commercial and even be located on a different parcel, with zero lot setback, no parking and on and on with horrible consequences for the communities these are being located.

Communities have stood up against these types of projects and those that can afford to have brought in legal council to stop the county from taking these actions in their neighborhoods.

So now the majority of the Board is allowing the Planning Director to jam these projects into the Diamond Springs, El Dorado Historic townsites because they are a demographic that either cannot

afford or are not prone to challenge the unlawful actions of the Board and its staff. Their District Supervisor 3, that promised to correct his actions when he previously served as Supervisor, has not only NOT met that promise, but has been pushing to facilitate actions to locate these mega projects into his district. This even though he has admitted Pleasant Valley Road, needed for many communities to escape a fire, is listed as one of the most dangerous fire exit roads in the State.

Also the Director of Transportation has stated publicly that Pleasant Valley Road has maxed out its road capacity, yet he continues to sign off on these mega projects. Then there is a local fire district that could also curtel the density, but instead, not only sign off on required exit roads, but allow setback reductions.

On that note Save Our County and the Diamond Springs El Dorado Community Coalition object to the Planning Director determining that this project complies to SB35.

First the project is located in one of the most congested sections of Pleasant Valley Road. Complying with the Transportation Element is an objective standard requirement that this project must meet, which it does not. According to the study performed on the Diamond Springs Village Apartments when that project was approved they could not meet the level of service, and even if they provided mitigation the location would still be at level of service F. Community Regions are required to sustain Level of Service D. This project does not meet those standards.

From Road Study for the Diamond Springs Village Apartments in 2017 and 2018. Since this project approval there have been numerous other large projects also approved near this location:

intersection	Mitigation	Control	faktinş			Existing Plus Project			Existing Plus Fraject with Mitigations					
			ÄM		Po		a).		PM		BAR		PM	
			Desay!	tos	Duley's	LOS	Dolay	LOS	Delay*	104	Beiry*	LÓS	Deiny1	LD
1 Harrison trailing Association quality	Dalfet Segrad Commit	esse	26	1	198	E	ži	ŧ	2,000	e	ч	ŧ	16	
1 Ministed Valley Asset/Recopust Way	Stack Wide Committees	9XSC	15	ı	191	*	Tà	ţ	2.200	£	u	E	117	#
Managem Pist Resear/Chrys Gooden Regis	Reservated Acress	SSSC	45	ŧ	ERM.	3	49	1	ш	£	23	٤	24	(
where while we would strap current, hard C o :  For expension and all-may deep controlled votes many memories follow in reported in seconds for each indicator i DS which deep equationing it follows follow is Places, 2013.	enticipal mariage maria o par unticip for the cours	cións delay ot s si ontensecuça	epinted as s worst mov	erare.	par zakupe k Alf mants pr	er vin ça	d to the ne	ream Ko	vet	eci stada s	tipet dag		. vterted	-

The staff report briefly discusses concerns about consistency with Measure E, and dismisses the concern by simply concluding that "the project is required to mitigate the impacts to the worsened intersections as seen in the Conditions of Approval", but there is nothing in the Conditions of Approval that mitigates Measure E. Mitigation 1 proposed in the Traffic Study for the intersection of Pleasant Valley Road/Racquet Way indicates that the LOS would be B with the installation of a signal, and then proposes the alternative of providing a public road connection to Diamond Road, by way of Black Rice Road (which is a *private* road) would reduce impacts. It does not say to what LOS. Then the graph shows that this intersection will remain at LOS F even with mitigation. The same is true for Mitigation 2 for the intersection of Missouri Flat Road/China Garden Road. This analysis is inadequate. (Traffic Study, p. 40=41.)

Second, this project does not meet the parking standards. The apartments require 24 spaces and Commercial 10 spaces. The project provides only 8 spaces that require a min. of 12' behind the space and only has 10'.

Third, this parcel is in the Historical District and this design definitely does not meet the Historical Design Guidelines. The County has to pick a standard for this project and it's definitely not clear as to which of the many standards manuals this project is complying to ... Any lay person can see that this project is not compliant to any guidelines or standards adopted by the County.

Fourth, I am sure this does not meet the Fire District's Standards for development in such a location. The access to the building is inefficient during a fire or rescue event. That alone should disqualify this project for SB35.

Without the necessary documents for decision making I am sure there are more objective standards within our General Plan and Zoning Ordinance that this project is not complying to.

This project must be denied by the Board of Supervisors as a qualifying SB35 project. There are too many objective standards that have not been met.

Thank you,
Sue Taylor
Save Our County
Diamond Springs El Dorado Community Coalition