



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## We are all not going to agree

1 message

---

**Mina \*** <aahora\_mina@yahoo.com>  
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Thu, Feb 8, 2018 at 10:52 PM

To all whom it may concern

We are all not going to agree.

We moved to this area because it's not crowded and it's definitely family oriented. Please please please DO NOT BUILD THE APARTMENTS IN TOWN CENTER. We don't want a regular neighborhood like Folsom or Sacramento. Honestly, living in this neighborhood is safe and pleasure. We are 100% agree with this statement "The apartments in a Town Center are a bad idea on so many points. Traffic, crime, parking. The area was zoned for a boutique hotel and...".

Thanks in advance

Sent from my iPhone



Mercedes-Benz

Mercedes-Benz of Sacramento  
Mercedes-Benz of El Dorado Hills  
Mercedes-Benz of Rocklin

February 1, 2018

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

**Re: Town Center Apartments**

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

On behalf of Mercedes-Benz of El Dorado Hills, I am writing to express our support for the approval of the Town Center Apartments. Our family is devoted to preserving the quality of life in El Dorado County by providing and promoting a strong, healthy and diverse business community.

I urge you to support the Town Center Apartment project and bring a different type of housing to El Dorado Hills. We are thrilled that the project will provide its own parking, not have an adverse impact on services and most importantly will bring life to the Town Center.

Construction of these apartments is essential for further business development. These new residents will support the businesses in Town Center along with other El Dorado County businesses that need customers to succeed. This project is critical for our businesses to not only survive but thrive. Approval of the Apartments will bring much needed jobs to the community, new buyers for local businesses and new revenue for your County budget.

We urge you to support this project to show that we are business friendly and welcome investors that are interested in making major financial commitments in El Dorado County.

Thank you,

George Grinzewitsch, Jr.

George Grinzewitsch Jr.  
Owner President & CEO

**VON HOUSEN**  
AUTOMOTIVE GROUP  
*Family owned since 1958.*

1810 Howe Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
Phone: 916.924.8000  
Fax: 916.924.6718  
www.vonhousen.com



February 8, 2018

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

Re: Town Center Apartments

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

On behalf of Gold Country Run + Sport, I am writing to express our support for the approval of the Town Center Apartments. As an independently owned and operated retail business in Town Center focused on inspiring active and healthy lifestyles, we are passionate about preserving the quality of life in El Dorado County by providing and promoting a strong, healthy and diverse business community.

I urge you to support the Town Center Apartment project and bring a different type of housing to El Dorado Hills. We are thrilled that the project will provide its own parking, not have an adverse impact on services and most importantly will bring life to the Town Center.

Construction of these apartments is essential for further business development. These new residents will support the businesses in Town Center along with other El Dorado County businesses that need customers to succeed. This project is critical for our businesses to not only survive but thrive. Approval of the Apartments will bring much-needed jobs to the community, new buyers for local businesses and new revenue for your County budget.

We urge you to support this project!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. Shahinian".

Leon Shahinian  
Co-Owner



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

## El Dorado Hills Apartments Hearing A16-0001 Legistar #18-0193

1 message

**El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee** <info@edhpac.org> Fri, Feb 9, 2018 at 12:17 PM  
 To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>  
 Cc: "tjwhitejd@gmail.com" <tjwhitejd@gmail.com>, "hpkp@aol.com" <hpkp@aol.com>, "jjrazz@sbcglobal.net" <jjrazz@sbcglobal.net>, "jdavey@daveygroup.com" <jdavey@daveygroup.com>, Ellison Rumsey <aerumsey1@gmail.com>

Hello,

The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Committee would like to have the included documents attached to the new Legistar file #18-0193 for the A16-0001 El Dorado Hills Apartments Hearing, scheduled for the February 13, 2018 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Thank you,  
 John Davey







2018 El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee 2nd Vice Chair.

Attached:

0\_APAC Letter To BOS A16-0001\_Feb-9-2018.pdf  
 1\_APAC\_EDH\_Apt\_Vote\_Letter\_Aug-9-2017.pdf  
 2\_EDH\_Apartments\_TCE\_Subcommittee\_report\_FINAL.pdf  
 3\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response\_email\_Jan-5-2018.pdf  
 4\_EDH\_APAC\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response.pdf  
 5\_EDH-APAC-August-9-2017-Meeting-Minutes.pdf

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee  
 1021 Harvard Way  
 El Dorado Hills CA 95762  
<https://edhpac.org>  
[info@edhpac.org](mailto:info@edhpac.org)

### 6 attachments

-  **1\_APAC\_EDH\_Apt\_Vote\_Letter\_Aug-9-2017.pdf**  
291K
-  **2\_EDH\_Apartments\_TCE\_Subcommittee\_report\_FINAL.pdf**  
84K
-  **3\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response\_email\_Jan-5-2018.pdf**  
91K
-  **4\_EDH\_APAC\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response.pdf**  
906K
-  **5\_EDH-APAC-August-9-2017-Meeting-Minutes.pdf**  
115K
-  **0\_APAC Letter To BOS A16-0001\_Feb-9-2018.pdf**  
62K





**El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee**  
1021 Harvard Way  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2017 Board Chair  
Tim White  
Vice Chair  
John Raslear  
Secretary  
Kathy Prevost

August 9, 2017

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

Attn: Mel Pabalinas  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA. 95667

**Subject:**

El Dorado Hills Apartments Project Draft Environmental  
Impact Report SCH No. 2017042017  
General Plan Amendment A16-0001 /rezone Z16-0004 Specific Plan  
Revision SPD 86-0002-R3 /Planned Development Revision  
PD94-0004-R3 – El Dorado Hills Apartments

Dear Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and County Staff,

At the August 9, 2017 El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee meeting, APAC reviewed the El Dorado Hills Apartment Project DEIR APAC Subcommittee report, in conjunction with a presentation from representatives of the project proponents/developers, the Spanos Corporation.

Following the presentation, and a question and answer session with representatives of the Spanos Corporation and El Dorado Hills residents, EDH APAC voted on the Subcommittee's recommendation of non-support for the project.

EDH APAC voted 7-0 in favor of non-support of the El Dorado Hills Apartment Project.

EDH APAC wishes to extend sincere gratitude to the Spanos Corporation for their commitment to meeting with El Dorado Hills residents, and EDH APAC, in presenting their project plans in detail at our meeting.

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions please contact Tim White , 2017 APAC Chair at [tjwhitejd@gmail.com](mailto:tjwhitejd@gmail.com) , John Raslear, Vice Chair at [jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net) , Secretary Kathy Prevost at [hpkp@aol.com](mailto:hpkp@aol.com)

Sincerely,

John Davey  
EDH APAC Subcommittee Chair.

2017 APAC Committee Chair  
Cc: EDCO Planning Commission  
EDCO BOS  
APAC read file



**El Dorado Hills Apartments Project Draft Environmental  
Impact Report SCH No. 2017042017  
General Plan Amendment A16-0001 /rezone Z16-0004 Specific Plan  
Revision SPD 86-0002-R3 /Planned Development Revision PD94-0004-  
R3 – El Dorado Hills Apartments**

The El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center Project seeks the following project approvals:

The project site is currently designated General Commercial-Planned Development (CG-PD) in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP). As the proposed project would develop housing on the project site and would have a density of approximately 47 du/ac, the project applicant has applied to the County for **the following four entitlements** for the proposed project:

- 1. General Plan Amendment** adding a new Policy (Policy 2.2.6.6) under Objective 2.2.6 (Site Specific Policy Section) **to increase the maximum residential density** allowed in the General Plan from 24 dwelling units per acre **to a maximum of 47 dwelling units per acre** specifically for the 4.565-acre project site within the TCE Planned Development area identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 121-290-60, 61, and 62.
- 2. El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Amendment** incorporating multi-family residential use, density, and related standards for the project site. The project site would be designated as "Urban Infill Residential" within the Village T area of the EDHSP Plan.
- 3. Rezoning** of the project site from General Commercial-Planned Development (CG-PD) **to Multi-Family Residential-Planned Development** (RM-PD) and revisions to the RM-zone district development standards applicable to the proposed 214-unit apartment project
- 4. Revision to the approved Town Center East Development Plan** incorporating multi-family residential use, density, and related design and development standards for the proposed 214-unit apartment project within Planning Area 2 of the TCE Plan area (see Figure 3.0-4, Village T Planning Area Locations in Chapter 3.0).

**The APAC El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center Subcommittee members (EDH APT Subcommittee) believe the project's DEIR proposed mitigations are inadequate specifically in regards to the Traffic, Land Use, and Aesthetics components.**

As with the previous Project from 2014, the EDH APT Subcommittee believes this would result in significant short and long term problems for the Town Center



retail and hotel components, as well as the immediate surrounding residential and commercial areas. **As a result, the EDH APT Subcommittee recommends non-support of the project as proposed.**

Listed below are some of the major concerns that the EDH APT Subcommittee has with the project as currently proposed:

#### 1. **TRAFFIC**

The 214 unit apartment project would cause a major traffic impact in the Town Center East Planned Development Area and major roads of the El Dorado Hills community, primarily Latrobe Road, El Dorado Hills Blvd, and White Rock Rd, as well as Highway 50 at the El Dorado Hills Blvd/Latrobe Rd. interchange, and further north on El Dorado Hills Blvd at both Park Dr and at Saratoga Way. The DEIR finds that before the construction and build out of the EDH Apartment project, that these are the current existing conditions on these specific roads:

- **Town Center Boulevard - Post Street** intersection is measured at **LOS E** for the peak PM hour
- **White Rock Road - Vine Street - Valley View Drive** is measured at **LOS D** for the peak PM hour
- **Latrobe Road - Town Center Boulevard** is measured at **LOS D** for the peak PM hour

In **4.8 Transportation, Table 4.8-12, Intersection LOS and Delay – Near Term Plus Project Conditions (4.8 Transportation page 40)**, the DEIR finds that:

- **Town Center Boulevard – Post Street** intersection will operate at **LOS B** and **LOS F** in the peak AM and PM hours, respectively, in the Near-Term (without the project)
- In the Near-Term Plus Project, the **Town Center Boulevard – Post Street** intersection will operate at **LOS C** and **LOS F** in the peak AM and PM hours.

The Project proponent has indicated a desire to include intersection signalization at the Town Center Boulevard and Post Street intersection, but only after peak hour intersection analysis every two years indicates that the intersection has reached LOS F, and applicable traffic warrants are satisfied. [4.8 Transportation [http://edcapps.edcgov.us/Planning/ProjectDocuments/4 8%20Transportation A16-0001,Z16-0004,PD94-0004-R3,SP86-0002-R3.pdf](http://edcapps.edcgov.us/Planning/ProjectDocuments/4%20Transportation%20A16-0001,Z16-0004,PD94-0004-R3,SP86-0002-R3.pdf) Page 41]

If the Project were to be approved, the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee would request that the County would require making signalization of the Town Center

Boulevard – Post Street intersection a **condition** of approval **before** construction of the Town Center Apartments could begin. This is a small cost to the owner of the Project property, and to the Project proponent, The Spanos Corporation, in exchange for receiving the 4 entitlements requested, which would allow the owner of the Project property to sell it for residential use, and allow The Spanos Corporation to build and operate the apartment complex..

The APAC EDH APT Subcommittee does note with concern that even with this suggested mitigation via signalization on the private road at the eastern entrance to Town Center East, that the DEIR still projects *the best case result* is **LOS E** at the Town Center Blvd and Post Street intersection.

Town Center Boulevard, Post Street, and Vine Streets are private roads inside the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area. As such, LOS falling into unacceptable levels does not require mitigation under current El Dorado County General Plan. However, the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee believes, should the project be approved, that the Project **be conditioned to provide traffic mitigation measures**, even on the private roadways inside TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area, as these private roads each access public roads in El Dorado Hills and have a direct impact on the LOS of those public roads. Additionally, roads at operating at poor LOS can have a negative impact on the public's overall perception of the conditions and the experience inside inside the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area, and their desire to visit shops and businesses in Town Center East, with shoppers potentially preferring to cross the county line and visit Folsom shops instead.

In **4.8 Transportation, Table 4.8-15 Long-Term Cumulative Conditions – Study Intersection LOS Summary (Transportation 4.8, page 48)**, the DEIR indicates that for the Long-Term Cumulative Conditions, the Latrobe Road and White Rock Road intersection will:

- Reach **LOS E** in the Peak AM hour **with or without** the project
- Reach **LOS D** in the peak PM Hour **without** the project
- Reach **LOS E** in both the peak AM and PM hours with the project

Latrobe Road, White Rock Road, and Valley View Drive are all El Dorado County maintained roads – If the Project were to be approved, the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee feels that the negative impacts on these roads by the El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center Project **should be mitigated as a condition of approval**.

## **2. LAND USE PLANNING**

Despite downsizing from the previous 2014 Town Center Apartment project, the dwelling unit density is nearly twice the County General Plan allowance for multi-family housing and would create traffic impacts to one of the County's largest retail and hotel centers on the Western Slope, as well as roads in the immediate vicinity in El Dorado Hills. Granting this Multi-Family Residential Dwelling Unit per Acre Standard exception is a precedent, despite the project proponents' statements to the contrary. The DEIR has a provision to raise the multi-family residential dwelling units per acre for the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area ONLY [Policy 2.2.6.6, under Objective 2.2.6] to a maximum of 47 dwelling units per acre. As this is a doubling of the county standard, this is not a small exception to grant. If the County chooses to grant this once, then what would prevent a similar request from another project? Even by limiting this loosening of the standard to the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area by statute, it opens the door for more multi-family residential projects of increased dwelling units per area density, not only in El Dorado Hills, but in any unincorporated area of El Dorado County. If granted, it calls into question what the basic intention of the 24 dwelling unit per acre multi-family residential standard is, and why it is permissible to waive the standard for one project, but not allow it for any other? Granted once, it can be granted again. If this amendment is granted for the specific project in El Dorado Hills, why would it not be reasonable to change the standard in totality to allow Multi-Family Residential 47 Dwelling Units per Acre in communities such as Cameron Park, Georgetown, Myers, Placerville, Pollock Pines, or Shingle Springs? What is the benefit to El Dorado Hills, or to El Dorado County, for lowering these standards, as they are currently defined in the El Dorado County General Plan?

## **3. MARKETING AND DEMOGRAPHICS**

As the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee believed in the previous 2014 Town Center Apartment project, apartment units for this project could suffer a high vacancy rate and rents could be lowered to attract tenants that would not be ideal for the EDH Town Center and cause a loss of retail shops and restaurants.

The project proponents have suggested that they will be marketing these units as "Luxury Apartments", while at the same time suggesting that these units will meet an affordable housing component needed both in El Dorado Hills, and El Dorado County. These two concepts seem to be at odds.

Project proponents suggest that employees or business owners in the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area, as well as the El Dorado Hills Business Park, would be potential residents of the Town Center Apartment project - the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee is curious if a marketing survey of this

specific population has been completed that indicates a desire or need for this housing in the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area, and if that identified population could even afford leasing a unit for the eventual monthly rates established at the El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center.

The APAC EDH APT Subcommittee still has a concern that the increase of approximately 400 additional residents in proximity to Town Center East businesses would have any more positive impact on the vitality of the TOWN CENTER EAST Planned Development Area than the nearly 700 homes already completed in the nearby Blackstone development, with over a thousand more homes in the Valley View Specific Plan approved, and projected for the near future. If the goal of this project, and more pointedly this General Plan Amendment, is to revitalize Town Center East, the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee believes that this goal should be the responsibility of the owners of Town Center East, in adherence to their vision of creating a retail/commercial downtown for El Dorado Hills, and should not be borne by the residents of El Dorado County via an amendment to the County General Plan, and the doubling of the Multi-Family Residential Dwelling Unit Per Acre standard. The Town Center East Project was approved to be a retail/commercial center – a residential component was not included *as a feature* of the project.

Additionally, project proponents suggested at the Project Scoping Meeting in April 2017 to APAC Subcommittee members that project residents would be driving to jobs, as the closest job center would be the El Dorado Hills Business Park. An observation was made by the Project proponents at the Scoping Meeting that the majority of the jobs of the future residents of the Town Center Apartment Project would be located elsewhere, in Folsom, Rancho Cordova, Sacramento, and Elk Grove, which eliminates a major component of the focus of the Project – a residential community that is centered around the concept of live-work-shop.

#### **4. NOISE**

As with the previous 2014 Town Center Apartment Project, noise generated by the commercial and retail component will impact the residents of the apartments. Unbuffered noise from Highway 50, as well as from commercial and retail sources, retail center automobile traffic, and Town Center East Outdoor Events will impact apartment residents. By qualifying the Project as Urban Infill Residential, the project proponents seek to limit or reduce environmental noise as a measure of impacts for the residents of the Project in the DEIR – thereby creating a second, lower, environmental noise standard for residents of the El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center, while the balance of El Dorado Hills residents enjoy the benefits of the higher environmental noise standard.

#### **5. COUNTY INCOME**

As the APAC EDH APT Subcommittee believed in the previous 2014 Town Center Apartment Project, El Dorado County could lose a significant potential future income from sales taxes and Transient Occupancy Taxes if the parcel is converted from commercial to residential use.

## **6. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS**

As with the previous 2014 Town Center Apartment Project, the economy is experiencing a slow recovery and the loss of commercial and retail sites will further contribute to sales tax leakage out of El Dorado County. In the past several years, El Dorado County has already rezoned several properties from Commercial to Residential, in spite of the County's stated preference to build a jobs base over building more rooftops. Frequently the proponents of these commercial to residential rezone requests have fortified the reasoning for these rezones by insisting that less commercial/retail space is needed – but there are still several commercial/retail projects proposed in the immediate vicinity of Town Center East, many of which are scheduled for development well after the proposed construction period of the El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center, demonstrating that commercial demand still exists in proximity of Town Center East.

## **7. AESTHETICS**

To better accommodate the commercial nature of Town Center East, this Project should require vertical Mixed Use applications, as done in most other commercial/residential mixed use communities, with the enclosed apartments above the first floor allowing retail at the street level.

Several APAC EDH APT Subcommittee members are concerned that even with the aesthetic changes from the previous 2014 El Dorado Hills Apartment Project that this project would not be consistent with the “Guidelines for the creation of: “A character appropriate and in keeping with -----its historic building type” and commercial use , as defined in the Town Center Design Guideline April 25 1995

Relative to the design, the proposed four story building towers over the boulevard negatively impacting the retail/dining experience of other Town Center East shops. The two buildings across the street on Town Center Blvd. are two and three story, with the three story building having a step back on the third floor. The proposed project also should be stepped back on the third and fourth floor levels to create a more pleasing street environment.

## **8. COMMUNITY EVENTS**

In a comment letter from the Mansour Company submitted on Oct 8 2014 about

this project, it stated they would not support any project that may “—Jeopardize any of our existing or newly planned outdoor events---“ (SEE <https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=3390403&GUID=5D0BD9B0-9E14-4367-9C87-CBBDC28FAD0C> )

Events such as the 4<sup>th</sup> of July Fireworks Show, Outdoor Concerts , Farmer’s Market, El Dorado Hills Fire Department Santa Run Parade, or other events, effectively force the closure of the major two lane Town Center Blvd and significantly impact all regional roads.

# El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center A16-0001


## El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee

Fri 1/5/2018 8:01 AM

To: rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us <rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us>; charlene.tim@edcgov.us <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>;  
planning@edcgov.us <planning@edcgov.us>;

Cc: bosone@edcgov.us <bosone@edcgov.us>; bostwo@edcgov.us <bostwo@edcgov.us>; bosthree@edcgov.us <bosthree@edcgov.us>;  
bosfour@edcgov.us <bosfour@edcgov.us>; bosfive@edcgov.us <bosfive@edcgov.us>; james.williams@edcgov.us  
<james.williams@edcgov.us>; jvegna@edcgov.us <jvegna@edcgov.us>; jeff.hansen@edcgov.us <jeff.hansen@edcgov.us>;  
gary.miller@edcgov.us <gary.miller@edcgov.us>; brian.shinault@edcgov.us <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>; roger.trout@edcgov.us  
<roger.trout@edcgov.us>; tjwhitejd@gmail.com <tjwhitejd@gmail.com>; jjrazz@sbcglobal.net <jjrazz@sbcglobal.net>; hpkp@aol.com  
<hpkp@aol.com>; aerumsey@sbcglobal.net <aerumsey@sbcglobal.net>; jdavey@daveygroup.com <jdavey@daveygroup.com>;

Bcc: edhacpac@gmail.com <edhacpac@gmail.com>;

 1 attachments (906 KB)

EDH\_APAC\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response.pdf;

Hello Mel,

The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee would like to submit the following responses and comments pertaining to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the El Dorado Hills Apartments project [ General Plan Amendment A16-0001, Specific Plan Amendment SP86-0002-R, Rezone Z16-0004, Revision to Planned Development Permit PD94-0004-R ] to the El Dorado County Planning Commission in advance of their January 11, 2018 hearing, as well as to Planning Staff, and the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors.

EDH APAC appreciates the extra time provided to further study the FEIR, and this opportunity to provide comments and questions from both our Committee, and El Dorado Hills residents, regarding this project.

Warm regards,

John Davey  
EDH APAC Subcommittee Chair

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee  
1021 Harvard Way  
El Dorado Hills CA 95762  
<https://edhacpac.org>  
[info@edhacpac.org](mailto:info@edhacpac.org)



**El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee**  
1021 Harvard Way  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2017 Board Chair  
Tim White  
Vice Chair  
John Raslear  
Secretary  
Kathy Prevost

January 05, 2017

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

Attn: Rommel Pabalinas  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA. 95667

**Subject: El Dorado Hills Apartments A 16-0001**

Dear Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and County Staff,

The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee would like to submit the following responses, comments, and observations to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed El Dorado Hills Apartment Project at Town Center A 16 0001, prior to the review of the project by the El Dorado County Planning Commission, and the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors. At the August 2017 APAC meeting, the project applicants generously made a presentation regarding their project, and engaged in a question and answer session with APAC members, as well a very large audience of El Dorado Hills residents. Following this presentation, an APAC Subcommittee studying the El Dorado Hills Apartment Project submitted a report to the full voting membership of APAC, recommending non-support of the project. The final vote was 7-0 for non-support. As the public comment period for the DEIR was about to close, APAC submitted the Subcommittee Report as their comments to the DEIR. Some of the report findings were not environmental in nature, but APAC felt that it was important to have as many comments, questions, and concerns submitted as possible.

To that end, APAC would like to provide the following comments, concerns and observations, in response to the findings of the FEIR, for consideration as the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors evaluate the project, and before a final decision is reached.

From the responses made in the FEIR for the El Dorado Hills Apartments project A16-0001

Master Response 2: Land Use Consistency

*The determination whether the proposed project is consistent with applicable local land use plans ultimately rests with the decision makers who have authority to approve the project. Here, the County Board of Supervisors will make that determination. Under state law (Court of Appeal decisional authority):*



*The rule of general plan consistency is that the project must at least be compatible with the objectives and policies of the general plan. State law does not require precise conformity of a proposed project with the land use designation for a site, or an exact match between the project and the applicable general plan. Instead, a finding of consistency requires only that the proposed project be compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the applicable plan. The courts have interpreted this provision as requiring that a project be in agreement or harmony with the terms of the applicable plan, not in rigid conformity with every detail thereof. To reiterate, the essential question is whether the project is compatible with, and does not frustrate, the general plan's goals and policies.*

*. . . . It is beyond cavil that no project could completely satisfy every policy stated in a [ ] general plan, and that state law does not impose such a requirement. A general plan must try to accommodate a wide range of competing interests and to present a clear and comprehensive set of principles to guide development decisions. Once a general plan is in place, it is the province of elected [ ] officials to examine the specifics of a proposed project to determine whether it would be 'in harmony' with the policies stated in the plan.*

*Naraghi Lakes Neighborhood Preservation Association v. City of Modesto (2016) 1 Cal.App.5th 9, 17-18 [internal quotation marks, citations, and ellipses omitted].*

*The project site is currently designated for commercial uses. As the proposed project would develop housing on the project site and would have a density of approximately 47 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) the project applicant has applied to the County for a number of entitlements, including (1) an amendment to the General Plan; (2) an amendment to the EDHSP; (3) a rezone of the site; and (4) a revision to the TCE planned development area. CEQA is concerned with the physical changes that these new entitlements may have on the environment. The Draft EIR evaluates and discloses the environmental effects of proposed changes in land use and density on the project site and provides analysis and supporting evidence to demonstrate that the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental effects that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.*

EDH APAC believes that allowing a **doubling** of County approved Multifamily residential density standard flies in the face of responsible planning, as well as undercuts the trust and expectation of County residents in County governance in regards to honoring the intent of the Voter Approved County General Plan. Seeking a small increase in multifamily residential density might be appropriate to consider, but in seeking to double allowable density the applicant ignores the will of County voters – if granted, it calls into question the reasoning of establishing the County multifamily residential density standard to begin with.

### Master Response 3: Proposed Density Increase

*Several comments were received with respect to how the proposed change in density on the project site could be viewed as creating a precedent for future multi-family residential projects in the County. The maximum density for multi-family projects allowed by the County's General Plan is 24 dwelling units per acre. As discussed above in Master Response 2, the proposed project would have a density of 47 units per acre and thus would require an*

*amendment to the General Plan. As discussed on page 3.0-28 of the Draft EIR, the proposed General Plan amendment increasing the density on the project site is limited to the project site and would not apply to any other parcels in the County. Moreover, even with the increased density, the proposed project would not exceed the total residential unit allocation under the EDHSP, and the analysis in the Draft EIR shows the increased density would not result in significant environmental impacts. Lastly, please note that the County retains the authority to approve or disapprove subsequent projects at locations other than the project site that request an increase in residential density. Land development approvals are based on the totality of information a lead agency has before it for a given project, at the time of project approval. For these reasons, the proposed increase in density of the project site is not precedent setting, either in terms of being legally binding at other sites or constraining the County's discretion with respect to approval of projects at other sites.*

EDH APAC responds by observing that allowing this density increase in one project, even by limiting the multifamily residential density standard increase via ordinance to these *specific* parcels (Policy 2.2.6.6), **does** set a precedent that any other multifamily residential project could cite, when seeking an alternate density allowance at any other location, in any community in the County – by definition, permitting this multifamily residential density standard allowance to occur for the first time is, in fact, a precedent (*something done or said that may serve as an example or rule to authorize or justify a subsequent act of the same or an analogous kind*). In granting this entitlement for this project, any project could seek a similar ordinance/Policy by citing the example of this project. Is the County prepared to grant individual ordinances on a project by project basis?

Master Response 3 also advises that we “*note that the County retains the authority to approve or disapprove subsequent projects at locations other than the project site that request an increase in residential density.*” EDH APAC would remind the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors, that the County also has the authority to approve or disapprove **this** project at **this** time. The applicants are seeking to benefit from an entitlement – EDH APAC would ask that there be a zero-sum benefit whenever an entitlement of this *significance* (**doubling** of the multifamily residential density standard) is sought: a benefit for the applicant, and a benefit to the County and the local community before essentially *waiving* a standard for land zoning established in the Voter approved General Plan. EDH APAC believes that granting this entitlement benefits solely the applicant, at the expense of the El Dorado Hills community, and residents of the County.

#### Master Response 4: Jobs-to-Housing Ratio

*Several comments were received with respect to how the proposed project would affect the County's jobs-to-housing ratio. Commenters assert that the proposed change in land use designation of the project site from commercial to residential would result in loss of future retail/commercial jobs that would have been added if a commercial use was developed on the project site. Commenters also assert that the project would result in the addition of more housing to a county that has more housing than jobs. It is true that El Dorado County as a whole and the community of El Dorado Hills have jobs-to-housing ratios that are not balanced. Both areas have more housing than jobs. Implementation of the proposed project would add a small number of housing units to El Dorado Hills and to the County's housing stock, and the project would increase the imbalance slightly.*

EDH APAC observes - From the DEIR 2.0 Executive Summary, page three "2.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT"

**Assist in increasing the housing supply in El Dorado County to improve the job-housing imbalance, including housing that is more affordable;**

-this response (Master Response 4) is directly contradictory to the stated project objectives in the DEIR.

Master Response 4 continued...

*However, it is noteworthy that, despite the overall quantity of housing in the El Dorado Hills area, the community still has a need for the multi-family rental housing that would be provided by the proposed project. A recent marketing survey of four similar apartment complexes in the El Dorado Hills area found that the occupancy rates for each apartment complex ranged from 95 to 98 percent. Therefore, while the project may worsen the jobs-to-housing ratio slightly, it would increase the rental housing stock and satisfy the need for rental housing in this part of the county. With regard to concerns about the jobs that the project would displace, as discussed on page 5.0-9 of the Draft EIR, a previous commercial land use proposal estimated that a total of 74,350 square feet of retail could be provided on the project site. Based on a rate of one employee per 344 square feet of retail (SCAG 2001), the previous proposal would generate approximately 216 jobs. In 2016, El Dorado County had 54,600 wage and salary jobs, and employment is expected to grow at an average rate of 1.1 percent per year between 2017 and 2022 for a total of approximately 3,000 jobs over the five year period (Caltrans 2017). The loss of future jobs that could be generated on the project site under a commercial land use proposal is minor in comparison with total forecasted future employment in the County over the next five years, and does not take into account jobs that would be generated as a result of the proposed project (including those related to services that will need to be provided to project residents at the apartment complex, as well as jobs created at nearby businesses that will be frequented by project residents).*

Master Response 4 agrees that the project would **increase** the **jobs-housing imbalance**, but provides no proof that jobs would be created at nearby businesses that would be frequented by project residents. Further, while this project suggests that it will provide additional rental housing inventory, EDH APAC believes that the project as proposed is in conflict with the current commercial planned development zoning, as well as with the Voter Approved El Dorado County General Plan.

Master Response 5: Socio-Economic Impacts

*Several comments were received that related to the type of tenants that would be accommodated by the proposed project, the affordability of the proposed housing, and potential occupancy of the proposed units. Other comments expressed concern about the loss of future sales and transit occupancy taxes that could be generated if the project site were developed under its existing commercial land use designation.*

*Finally, a number of comments were received that related to the potential for the proposed project to deter shoppers from patronizing existing businesses and concerns regarding a potential conflict between the project and the existing community uses/events in the TCE*

*area. All of the concerns are social or economic in nature and are not related to the environmental impacts of the proposed project. CEQA does not require an evaluation of social and economic impacts of a project unless those socio-economic concerns could lead to a physical effect on the environment. All of the issues listed above would not result in any physical impacts on the environment. Therefore, these issues are outside the scope of CEQA.*

These concerns are of a social or economic nature, and do not need to be addressed via the FEIR - but they still, in fact, are legitimate concerns that should be weighed prior to the final approval decision of both the Planning Commission, and the Board Of Supervisors.

#### Letter No 4: El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee Response 4-1

*The commenter's request that the County require the signalization of the Town Center Boulevard/Post Street intersection prior to construction of the proposed project will be provided to the decision makers for their review and consideration prior to any approval action on the project. However, the County cannot approve such a condition at this private intersection without the project applicant's consent. As discussed on page 4.8-49 of the Draft EIR, the project applicant and the owner of the right-of-way (ROW) of this intersection have voluntarily agreed to mitigate the impact at this private intersection to below the County's threshold of significance applicable to County-maintained facilities. As a private facility, this intersection is not subject to the County's CEQA thresholds of significance mandating LOS E or better be maintained on County roadways, and operation of this intersection is not anticipated to significantly affect operations of the County-maintained transportation system. In addition, increased traffic contained within a private development is generally not considered an adverse impact on the environment under CEQA. (See, e.g., Walters v. City of Redondo Beach (2016) 1 Cal.App.5th 809 ("The Guidelines and case law clarify that traffic impacts for CEQA purposes relate to the flow of vehicles in public spaces."); Parker Shattuck Neighbors v. Berkeley City Council (2013) 222 Cal.App.4th 768, 782 ["In general, CEQA does not regulate environmental changes that do not affect the public at large"].) As discussed on pages 4.8-33 to 4.8-35 of the Draft EIR, the intersection of Town Center Boulevard/Post Street would operate at acceptable levels under existing plus project conditions. As a result, conditioning the project to install a signal at the Town Center Boulevard/Post Street intersection prior to project construction would not be required under CEQA, even if the County's thresholds of significance were applicable at this intersection*

The response cites that "The County cannot approve such a condition at this private intersection without the project applicant's consent." – However, it **is** within the discretion of each Planning Commissioner or County Supervisor to cast their vote to approve or deny a proposed project based on **their** assessment of the **cumulative impacts** and effects of mitigations to the County, and to the community. The applicant has demonstrated a generous example of goodwill in offering to install signalization at the private intersection- EDH APAC suggests, should the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors approve the project, that the applicant reinforce that goodwill offer by mitigating the degradation of LOS **before** it occurs, not by monitoring the LOS condition at the private intersection **and waiting for it to occur**. LOS at the private intersection is *already currently at LOS E* in the peak PM hour. The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors cannot require this action, but

EDH APAC asks – is it improper to ask the applicant if they would be willing to provide this signalization to begin the project?

#### Response 4-3

*The commenter's request that impacts to Latrobe Road, White Road, and Valley View Drive from traffic generated by the proposed project be mitigated as a condition of approval will be provided to the decision makers for their review and consideration prior to any approval action on the project. However, none of the study intersections along Latrobe Road, White Road, and Valley View Drive would be significantly affected by project traffic under all study scenarios, including the long-term cumulative (2035) conditions because, as shown in Table 4.8-15 of the Draft EIR, all County-owned intersections would continue to operate at LOS E or better even with the addition of project traffic. As there would be no significant impacts to these roadways, conditioning the proposed project to mitigate the impact of project traffic on these roadways is not required under CEQA. (Also see Response 7-4 regarding the updated 2035 cumulative traffic analysis. That analysis also shows that the project would result in less than significant cumulative traffic impacts under 2035 conditions.)*

EDH APAC finds the updated traffic analysis findings to be somewhat specious- from the updated traffic analysis:

*As the updated table below shows, for all five intersections the revised LOSs are better than the LOSs reported previously in the Draft EIR. With regard to the changes in average delay, the table shows that in some cases the intersection delay is lower than previously reported. In some instances, the delay is greater than previously reported in the Draft EIR, but the LOS remains unchanged for the intersection. Therefore, these changes do not affect the results of the analysis reported in the Draft EIR. As reported there, the proposed project would result in less than significant cumulative impacts under long-term (2035) conditions.*

This updated traffic analysis includes the potential impact of the John Adams Academy, and the proposed Montano de El Dorado Phase II project – but other projects in the area continue to be proposed, including a re-envisioning of the El Dorado Hills Business Park to include up to 1600 residential units, and the proposed SA 17-0004 Carson Creek Specific Plan Rezone Request, for a new Age Restricted Community of up to 2040 residential units.

When representatives of Valley View Specific Plan projects spoke at a recent EDH APAC meeting, they indicated that the road/traffic improvements that have been installed along Latrobe Rd/ El Dorado Hills Blvd, and White Rock Rd for facilitating projects in the Valley View Specific Plan, the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, and the Carson Creek Specific Plan, had already fully accounted for the traffic impacts of these numerous projects over the course of more than 20 years, as well as future impacts at project(s) build out – yet EDH APAC and El Dorado Hills residents continue to ask the County: why do we *currently* experience LOS D/E/and F on these road segments, if the improvements are in place *now*, with thousands of residential units left to be completed before build out? EDH APAC volunteers, and area residents, are by no means traffic or planning experts, but we experience these impacts, and endure them in our daily activities here in our community around Town Center. These are real world impacts to residents, with significant consequences in our community, not empirical numbers from abstract traffic studies, regardless of the strength of the standards applied.

#### Response 4-4

*See Master Response 2 for a discussion of the project's consistency with applicable land use plans. The Draft EIR evaluates the environmental effects of proposed changes in land use and density on the project site and provides analysis and supporting evidence to demonstrate that the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental effects, including traffic impacts, which cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. The commenter is incorrect in stating that the proposed project's request to increase the maximum density allowed in the General Plan from 24 dwelling units per acre to 47 dwelling units per acre would apply to the entire TCE area. As stated in the proposed language for General Plan Policy 2.2.6.6 found on page 4.5-13 of the Draft EIR, the proposed density of 47 dwelling units per acre would only apply to the parcels that comprise the 4.56 acre project site. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the proposed density increase and why it would not set a precedent, should the project be approved by the County. The commenter's concern is nonetheless noted and will be provided to the decision makers for their review and consideration prior to any approval action on the project.*

EDH APAC would again remind County Planning Commissioners, and County Supervisors, that this entitlement request is not minor, and is of significant consequence not only to the El Dorado Hills community, but to **any community in El Dorado County** where multifamily housing projects could be considered – communities such as Cameron Park, Shingle Springs, Diamond Springs, Rescue, Camino, Pollock Pines, or Myers. Regardless of the insistence from the project applicant to the contrary, this sets a precedent for seeking a density entitlement that doubles current land use standards as established by the Voter Approved County General Plan – not a 5% increase, nor a 10%, or even a 25% increase in density – this project **doubles** multifamily residential density, as currently established in the Voter Approved El Dorado County General Plan.

#### Response 4-5

*The issues raised by the commenter are socio-economic in nature and are not related to the physical impact the proposed project would have on the environment. As a result, these issues are outside the scope of CEQA (see Master Response 5). A response is nonetheless provided below for informational purposes only. The commenter provides no evidence that the proposed project could suffer a high vacancy rate and that rents would be lowered to attract tenants that would not be ideal for the TCE area. A recent marketing survey of four similar apartment complexes in the El Dorado Hills area found that rents for one and two bedroom apartments in these complexes ranged from \$1,375 per month for a one-bedroom apartment unit to \$2,175 per month for a two-bedroom unit. In addition, the occupancy rates for each apartment complex ranged from 95 to 98 percent. The high rates of occupancy affirm that the demand for similar types of apartment units in the area does exist, and it is feasible for similar levels of rent to be charged for the apartments built under the proposed project. It is unlikely that rents would need to be lowered to attract tenants. In addition, it is also unlikely that the proposed project would result in a loss of shops and restaurants in the TCE area, as the project would add approximately 492 residents to the area who would have convenient access to surrounding retail shops, restaurants, and services, and thus would*

*increase demand and revenue for these establishments. The commenter's assertion that the proposed project is intended to meet an affordable housing component needed in both El Dorado Hills and El Dorado County is not correct. None of the proposed units would be designated or marketed as affordable (i.e., rent-controlled or otherwise offered at below market rental rates). However, the proposed units would meet existing rental housing demand in El Dorado Hills and El Dorado County, and thus could result in existing units in the community becoming more affordable through an increase in supply and a subsequent lowering of rents. As discussed above, a marketing survey conducted by the project applicant does show that there is a demand for the types of apartments proposed as part of the project. The project applicant cannot control who will reside in the proposed apartments. However, the proposed project would increase the housing supply within the TCE area and would provide an option for those who work in the TCE area to reside in the area.*

These concerns are of a social or economic nature – and do not need to be addressed via the FEIR - but these remain legitimate concerns that *should* be weighed prior to the final approval decision of the Planning Commission, as well as the Board of Supervisors.

Further, the applicant cites the possibility that the project provides a housing supply for potential residents who might work in the TCE area – yet at the August 2017 EDH APAC meeting, the applicant's representatives suggested that the expected minimum annual salary threshold for potential residents of the project would be \$60,000. This would seem to exclude the majority of TCE area employees from qualifying to rent residential space in the project, which would nullify one of the project's **stated objectives**:

*Develop a sustainable community that incorporates smart-growth elements, places higher-density housing in close proximity to job centers*

#### Response 4-6

*The concerns raised by the commenter are socio-economic in nature and are not a CEQA issue. As a result, these issues are outside the scope of CEQA (see Master Response 5). A response is nonetheless provided below for informational purposes only. Impact Sciences, Inc. 1269.001 El Dorado Hills Apartments Project Final EIR November 2017 3.0-33 17-0846 20 57 of 210 3.0 Comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments Please note that the project objectives found on pages 3.0-2 and 3.0-9 of the Draft EIR **do not include revitalization of the TCE area as a goal of the project**. That said, the project would add approximately 492 residents<sup>1</sup> to the TCE area who would have convenient access to surrounding retail shops, restaurants, and services, and thus would increase demand and revenue for these establishments. The Draft EIR evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed General Plan Amendment, along with other entitlements, and provides analysis and supporting evidence to demonstrate the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental effects that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level (see Master Response 2). In addition, with regard to the intersection of Town Center Boulevard/Post Street, the project applicant and the owner of the right-of-way (ROW) have voluntarily agreed to implement an improvement to ensure that the intersection operates below the County's threshold of significance applicable to County-owned facilities*

From the DEIR 2.0 Executive Summary, page three "2.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE

## PROPOSED PROJECT”

***Provide a residential population to support commercial development within the Town Center East Planned Development area;*** - Response 4.6 is directly contradictory to the stated project objectives.

While the FEIR need not address socio-economic concerns, the concerns expressed are still valid, and merit inclusion and study as part of the cumulative decision process regarding the project, by both the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors.

### Response 4-7

*The project applicant cannot control who will reside in the proposed apartments or where they will be employed. However, the proposed project does provide an option for those who work in the TCE area to reside in the area. In addition, by locating the proposed project within the TCE area, the project applicant is providing future residents with the option of working in the area or in the nearby El Dorado Hills Business Park (which is anticipated to have 10,257 employees at buildout).*

The suggested annual income threshold of \$60,000 to lease residential space in the project seems to indicate that the existing TCE area employee base is not capable of supplying potential residents who qualify. Therefore, the majority of the potential residents would not be working in the TCE area, adding more traffic impacts, and further clouding the project’s traffic study data.

The EDH Business Park has been in a stagnant growth pattern since the economic downturn of 2007/08, and is, in fact, currently studying a concept of converting currently R&D zoned land to residential use, and adding 1600 low, medium, and high density residential housing units *in* the Business Park itself, due to the lowered growth forecasts.

### Response 4-9

*The issues raised by the commenter are socio-economic in nature and are not related to the physical impact the proposed project would have on the environment. As a result, these issues are outside the scope of CEQA (see Master Response 5). A response is nonetheless provided below for informational purposes only. The commenter provides no evidence that the loss of sales tax due to the project would result in physical effects on the environment. While it is true that development of the project site as an apartment building would result in the loss of hypothetical future sales tax and transient occupancy tax revenues that could result if a hotel were developed on the project site, the project would still generate property taxes for the County. In addition, as the project would add approximately 492 residents who would have convenient access to nearby shops and restaurants, it is expected that sales tax receipts at those establishments would increase as well.*

It is true that the concern regarding the loss of sales tax or TOT are outside the scope of the environmental issues addressed in the project FEIR. Regardless, the concerns themselves are still valid, and merit consideration in the project decision making process. The observation regarding the potential loss of sales tax and/or Transient Occupancy Tax requires no evidence – the current zoning in the TCE PD is in place to permit these commercial/retail and hotel activities – changing the approved zoning for the project would



eliminate the ability for the project site to generate those sales tax or TOT revenues. The applicants offer that property taxes are an adequate trade, in lieu of sales taxes generated on the site. However, property taxes are rather static by nature, as future increases in assessed value are limited to an annual inflation factor of no more than 2%. Whereas sales taxes can increase with a growth in business activity, as well as with an increase of the county sales tax rates, or TOT rates.

Currently, there are several thousand homes approved in El Dorado Hills via the Valley View Specific Plan, the Carson Creek Specific Plan, the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, and the Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan. Even more homes are proposed for the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, the Marble Valley Specific Plan, and the Lime Rock Valley Specific Plan – the addition of 492 residents provided by this project pales in comparison to the sales tax receipts that will be realized by these already approved projects shopping in the TCE PD. Sacrificing zoned commercial/retail land use for unneeded housing diminishes the TCE PD commercial draw, and is unnecessary when considering the amount of approved residential development already in the pipeline. EDH APAC believes that the addition of 492 new residents in proximity to TCE PD Area businesses does not merit a General Plan Amendment, a Specific Plan Amendment, or the other entitlements the applicants seek for this project. Town Center was designed from inception as a commercial/retail project – as the central shopping district of El Dorado Hills, which prior to 1995, had inadequate retail zoning. The lack of a residential component was intended – indeed it was a primary feature that the Town Center PD applicants based their Planned Development concept around. The applicants worked hard to craft their proposal to garner that entitlement, to establish a distinction for their Planned Development, to separate it from the massive residential build out occurring in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. The concept was to build a 'commercial downtown', a retail center that El Dorado Hills lacked. In granting this zoning, El Dorado Hills residents expected the concepts and tenets established in the TCE planned development would be adhered to.

Lastly, a quick review of the Project objectives:

From the Project Objectives  
DEIR – 2.0 Executive Summary Page3

## **2.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

*The objectives of the project are to develop a well-designed, economically feasible residential community that consists of a variety of residential unit types and incorporates smart growth elements. The key objectives for the proposed project are to:*

- *Implement the County's General Plan by directing growth to areas that are already developed with existing access to services, schools and transportation systems in order to preserve agricultural land and open space;*

What residential Services currently exist in the TCE PD area?

- *Implement goals and objectives of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan;*

From the 1988 EDHSP

### **1.4 Policies of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan**

#### **1.4.1 General Policies**

c. The major commercial activities within the Plan Area shall be concentrated in locations

from which the community may be served, and shall be protected from noncomplementary, competing land uses.

- *Provide a residential population to support commercial development within the Town Center East Planned Development area;*

In the FEIR responses, the applicant states that supporting commercial development within the TCE PD area is **NOT** a goal of the project – but includes it **directly** as the third listed goal here in the Objectives of The Proposed Project

- *Assist in increasing the housing supply in El Dorado County to improve the job-housing imbalance, including housing that is more affordable;*

This project doesn't improve the jobs-housing imbalance, it **adds** to the Jobs housing imbalance. The County cannot correct the housing imbalance in El Dorado Hills/ El Dorado County by increasing housing – El Dorado Hills needs to grow employment opportunities.

While more affordable housing is needed in El Dorado Hills, does it make sense to trade currently zoned commercial space – in a commercial center no less, for residential development, when El Dorado Hills currently has a residential housing imbalance? More employment opportunities will correct the housing imbalance. Removing currently zoned commercial space from the equation makes correcting the housing imbalance more difficult by removing zoned land from potential employment opportunities.

- *Implement smart growth principles by developing underutilized properties with higher density housing projects.*

This is a goal of the project/applicant – not necessarily the goal of El Dorado Hills/El Dorado County

- *Develop a sustainable community that incorporates smart-growth elements, places higher-density housing in close proximity to job centers, and complements adjacent commercial uses;*

Where are the jobs centers? The EDH Business Park is not expanding, and is considering a re-visioning concept to add 1600 new residential housing units inside the business park itself. Town Center has a high vacancy rate, and a high rate of tenant loss since 2007.

- *Create a residential development that maximizes density with accessibility to alternate transportation modes, and integrates pedestrian, bicycle, transit, open space and outdoor uses to encourage active centers*

What are the alternate Transportation modes? Walking and biking require nearby destinations. The EDH Business Park is not adding significant levels of new jobs – the jobs that are being added are not in the \$60,000.00 annual salary range cited by the applicant at the EDH APAC August 2017 meeting as the minimum required income needed to lease/rent an apartment unit in the proposed project. Likewise, there is not a significant pool of potential Town Center employees in the \$60,000.00 annual income range.

The applicant has a list of project objectives and goals, but how do those project objectives

meet and mesh with county objectives? How does the project benefit the immediate community of El Dorado Hills, or El Dorado County, in trade for sacrificing Voter established land use standards? The applicant is seeking a General Plan Amendment, that is not only **not minor** in nature, but **is a significant departure** from the multifamily residential standard established in the Voter approved General Plan, as well as seeking amendments to the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, and two other entitlements. EDH APAC feels that the word '*entitlements*' is all too apt as applied to this project. It is the sentiment of EDH APAC that this project is proposed for the wrong location, with conflicting Land Use concepts, that provides benefits solely for the applicant, at the expense of El Dorado Hills residents and El Dorado County.

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions please contact Tim White , 2017 APAC Chair at [tjwhitejd@gmail.com](mailto:tjwhitejd@gmail.com) or John Raslear, Vice Chair at [jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net).

Sincerely,

John Davey  
Subcommittee Chair

Tim White  
2017 APAC Committee Chair

Cc: EDCO Planning Commission  
EDCO BOS  
APAC read file

El Dorado Hills Area  
Planning Advisory Committee  
APAC 2017 Board

Timothy White, Chair tjwhitejd@gmail.com  
John Raslear, Vice Chair jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net  
Kathy Prevost, Secretary hpkp@aol.com  
1021 Harvard Way, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

AGENDA FOR MEETING: August 9, 2017, 7:00 PM

Held at: LOCATION for this MEETING: Community Room- El Dorado Hills Fire Department, 1050 Wilson Boulevard, EDH, CA. 95762

1. Call to Order  
Tim White - Welcome. A brief history of APAC -
2. Adoption of Meeting Agenda
3. Public Comment - Full slate to cover: No Public Comment
4. Guest Speakers: None
5. Supervisor Communications: Supervisor John Hidahl (10 Minutes)

BOS1 John Hidahl: EDH Community Council next meeting Monday August 14 at the CSD Pavilion in EDH- Schools presentation by El Dorado County Schools Superintendent Ed Manansala. Committee reports from the Community Council Leadership Team.

6. APAC Projects

a) 12+ ACRE PARK at the corner of Serrano Parkway and Bass Lake Road. Kirk Bone and Andrea Howard of Parker Development Company will preview the preliminary plans and drawings for this Park, which will connect to the existing Bass Lake Park and Sellwood Field. The Park will be owned and operated by the EDHCSD. This is the development of Lot H, in Village J. (25 Minutes)

Guest Presentation by Kirk Bone and Andrea Howard

41 single family 7K Sqft to 17K sqft

Obligation to provide 28 1/2 acres of park - Lot H is the last 12 1/2 acres. \$3 million in Mello Roos. Will work with the CSD on design of the park. Parker seeks to build homes on 41 adjacent lots.

Public Comment: Does all of EDH pay the Mello Roos fees?

Kirk Bone - Only Serrano residents.

Original EDHSP was to develop a K-8 school with the Lot H Park. Rescue USD was not ready to proceed.

QUESTION: Tim White - Timelines on 41 homes?

Kirk Bone - Not certain, but typically it takes 18 months for residential projects at the County.

Kirk Bone asks for some comments about the park timeline and design concepts from CSD General Manager Kevin Loewen

CSD GM Kevin Loewen - Number of factors. Lot H has geographic challenges. EID property purchase of 14 acres is pending. 160 acres from Rescue is something CSD would like to discuss. 40 acre County property is in play. Entrance at Penniman Dr/Greenview Dr Serrano Pkwy intersection. Active uses near Sellwood Field. Outdoor education building is one idea. Passive on the east side. Timing is several years. 6 months escrow min for EID property. EID might move their operations from Bass Lake to their Wastewater treatment plant in EDH. Would lease back Bass Lake space until they are ready to move. Please follow the process at the parks meetings.

b) EDH FIRE DEPARTMENT TRAINING CENTER – Mike Lilienthal, EDHFD Deputy Chief – Operations, will present the preliminary plans and drawings for the proposed EDH Fire Department Training Center, to be built on a 5 acre site in the EDH Business Park, adjacent to Station 87. (30 Minutes)

Approved several years ago - final plans going before the EDH Fire Board

Deputy Chief Lilienthal

INTRODUCES Special Guest - Lt Stover New commander at the Placerville CHP HQ. Used to live in EDC, but now resides in Folsom.

Facility is 20 acres next to Station 87. Four 5 acre parcels.

Project timeline 15-20 years

Original discussions started around 2003

Special Use permit was issued 2009 - expires in 2018

Recession put plans on hold.

Changed to a EDH training facility - not a regional center

Cost Control

Original cost was \$20-25 million. For the same design today, the cost would be \$27 Million

Scaled back to focus on EDH Firefighter training.

Working on the official numbers right now to finalize costs

Concrete costs are higher now due to Oroville Dam demand. Equipment requires 6 inch thickness minimum. Changed design from all concrete to road network to save costs due to less concrete usage.

Limit grading to match natural EDH Terrain

Off road driving course constructed from dirt removed - will stay on site. This will save on building costs.

Storm water Retention in ponds on site.

Hydrants aren't in all areas. When assigned to fires in remote areas with no hydrants, EDH Fire uses water stored on site (like ponds). The retention ponds will help EDH Fire crews train for these events.

Training on regular water handling will recycle water to retention ponds

5 acres will remain untouched - other future uses or development will be possible.

Steel Tower instead of concrete structure.

Easier to build than concrete - more affordable

Usually the most expensive feature is the cost of concrete

Concrete tower about \$5 million

Steel tower about \$2 million

Steel will last longer due to fire effect on concrete and cracking

Brick veneer to match area design

#### Community Enhancements

Back up emergency Operations Center, instead of in Placerville

Storage building designed for possible Apparatus repair in the future.

Classroom training

Pushed to back of property

Concrete wall to shield from public view along Golden Foothill Pkwy

Outside class offering for other agencies up to 400 - 500 students a year for 5 day long classes

Revenue for hotels and restaurants

#### Financial

Public Comment - Folsom or Rancho Cordova have facilities?

Not in Folsom or Rancho Cordova - there is a Sac Metro facility at Mather Field but it more for specialized natural disaster training, and they are still trying to obtain funding.

Roseville and Cosumnes have facilities.

Public Comment: Does EDH Fire have the money?

Mike Lilienthal: Some money will come from EDH FIRE Development fees. Have to be spent on this specific project

Public Comment: Landscape around block walls?

Mike Lilienthal Designers are working on a landscape plan

Public Comment: Vacant Lot at Carson Crossing - Very ugly not maintained

Mike Lilienthal - Not owned by EDH Fire

John Raslear: Could the facility be uses Cooling Center in emergency?

Mike Lilienthal - it makes sense and should be discussed. Currently the EDH Library is identified as the emergency cooling center. Mike also thinks station 85 could be a cooling center.

John Raslear - current senior population is expanding. What about heat emergencies at assisted living locations?

Mike Lilienthal - Assisted living facilities would transfer out of EDH to other assisted living facilities

Public Comment: Why not a larger facility to generate revenue

Mike Lilienthal - Even the smaller facility will generate some revenue.

Public Comment: How could this expand?

Mike Lilienthal - With Sac Metro building at Mather for technical training, there probably won't be a demand for a larger facility in EDH. But extra 10 acres adds flexibility.

Public Comment: What is the staffing plan?

Mike Lilienthal - They are looking at plans - no initial staffing at first. Current Chiefs have the flexibility to manage.

Tim White - Current Firefighters go to Roseville, requires EDH FD to backfill/overtime to cover staff training.

Mike Lilienthal - Training time out of area is on overtime. SO this could limit the amount of overtime

Public Comment: Is there a figure for annual costs of the training facility?

Mike Lilienthal - Working on the plan and gather details from other agencies with training facilities.

Public Comment: EDH Structures are wood framed - is steel building training a detriment?

Mike Lilienthal - special designs allow training for wood and Class A fire fighting training in the steel tower

Public Comment: How much training is needed for EDH FD?

Mike Lilienthal - 60 firefighters on average, including admin, and classroom.

Public Comment: Target date for completion?

Mike Lilienthal - no, but wants to start next year. Special Use permit expires by then.

c) EL DORADO HILLS (TOWN CENTER) APARTMENT PROJECT- The Draft Environmental Impact Report is available at <http://edcapps.edcgov.us/Planning/ProjectInquiryDisplay.asp?ProjectID=20754> Representatives from The Spanos Corporation will discuss their plans for a 214 unit, 4 story apartment building complex to be built on a 4.565 acre vacant lot currently zoned for Commercial Use. This project requires an EDC General Plan Amendment (to increase allowed residential density from 24 to 47 units per acre), a zoning amendment (from commercial to residential) and amendments to the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. Traffic issues will be discussed. A subcommittee of APAC has read the Draft EIR and will present its analysis and findings. (55 Minutes)

Guest Presentation by Jeff Morgan, Spanos Division Manager from Spanos  
Karen Garrett Development Manager Spanos  
John Binder Kephart Architects  
Chris Schultze  
Dave Robertson Traffic Studies

250 unit project was approved, then appealed in court.  
Now 214 units - planned as Luxury Apartments  
Significantly smaller in scale - A 15% reduction in density.  
Building footprint reduction - substantial  
1/2 acre parcel of open space will remain with the new plan. Might deed it to community or to Town Center  
Internal discussion if they wanted to continue to pursue the project - they do.

Architectural changes - Old world look.

John Binder  
2 parking spaces per apartment - all parking is internal to the site  
100 2 bedroom units  
Target Demo: Easier lifestyle. People who like to rent. Move down buyer, Young professionals in neighborhood, or commute to Sacramento. When at home, will walk to local Town Center shops.  
Living in Town Center is the draw to attract renters.  
3 court yards - 1 with pool and spa, 2 are more passive. Fitness area. Gathering lounge. Work Share space for telecommuters.  
Parking - 5 level garage. park on the level you live on.  
4 stories in two building - elevators in each corner.  
Trash disposal. - 2 zones / trash chutes. Both on Vine.

Architectural - empty lot has been there a long time. Designed to pick up the character of the area. Not a flat facade. Porches and decks to engage the street. Some units have patios at the street level. 3 different styles of Architecture. Materials the same, but color elements are different in specific areas around the project. Meant to fit in with the existing styles.



Public Comment - how many guest parking spaces?

John Binder - 1 parking spot for a guest for every 4 apartments. Also some street level parking

Public Comment - overflow parking in Town Center is a concern.

Jeff Morgan- Many years of doing this - but 54 guest spots is very good coverage, very substantial. No problems with parking at other projects.

Chris Schultze- 425 parking spots more than 1 space per bedroom. Meets County code for parking spots for multi-family.

Karen Garrett- we have a very professional property management team - lives on site.

Public Comment : In Sacramento, have you built 4 story apt buildings?

Jeff - we haven't

Public Comment - Feels the project is a better fit for downtown Sacramento.

John Binder - Spanos has built 4 stories in many locations nationwide. Premium floor is the top floor. draws higher rents.

Public Comment - Denser higher, more compact than anything else in the area. In Sacto people can go anywhere because there are more options for mixed used in that area.

John Davey -have target rents been finalized

Jeff - Not yet. Will be competitive.

Public Comment : Wayne Haug - Does not fit with the Town Center Area

Public Comment : 22 Motorcycles? Noise Levels can get to 110 - 120 decibels. All the traffic does not fit the Town Center.

Jeff Morgan - Will research the data. Space in the garage corners making use of available space. Electric charging, ride share, things evolving. The space was there, so designers took advantage to make it usable.

The Community design standard for a garage over 100 spaces- 5% must be for Motorcycles.

Public Comment : Jeff - just moved here June 22 2017. From the bay area. Livermore - residents would leave to dine and shop. Livermore has a similar apt center - is thriving. Benefits outweigh the negatives. Is a business owner, wants to see this succeed

Public Comment : Lenny - loves EDH lived here 15 years. Spoke to board about Dixon Ranch. These are neighborhoods, we are tired of having to justify our opposition to developer projects. No more General Plan Amendments

Public Comment: Joe Bursin lived here 6 years. Project is a bad fit. Too many amendments - tipping point.

Public Comment: Has lived here for 40 years. Bad fit for EDH - will destroy TCE. 400 residents will have friends. Will be too crowded.

Public Comment: John Davey - Jeff, can you explain the DIER process -  
Tim White- County drives process, selects DEIR Consultant. The Developer does not pick the consultant

Public Comment: Has been here 25 years - lives in Park Village, enjoys the quiet. White Rock Village is a good example of Apartment design for the area - 160 low income units - spread over a much larger space.

Tim White - This is an Urban infill project. Tim wanted to find a way to see that this is a good infill projects. Looked for Benefits - The property owner got a deal on the property because they purchased it out of foreclosure, and will benefit with a sizable profit. Spanos Corporation builds great projects, and they will benefit by making a profit on the project (as they should). What does EDH or EDC see as a benefit? Tim believes there isn't a benefit for EDH or the County. All the sacrifice is shouldered by the community and the county. Tim will vote for non-support of the project. Because all of benefits reward the proponents, and not the community.

Public Comment: Nation wide search for property - this is ideal for urban infill, but that isn't EDH. It fits Sacramento. Four stories is required to make the project economically successful, but this does not fit Town Center in EDH.

Public Comment: Scott - Will this be a long term ownership?  
Jeff - Family business. Staff doesn't know the long term plans.

Short summary of the EDH APAC Subcommittee report on El Dorado Hills Apartments DEIR, presented by Subcommittee Chair John Davey

**Subcommittee Summary Finding:**

The APAC El Dorado Hills Apartments at Town Center Subcommittee members (EDH APT Subcommittee) believe the project's DEIR proposed mitigations are inadequate specifically in regards to the Traffic, Land Use, and Aesthetics components. As with the previous Project from 2014, the EDH APT Subcommittee believes this would result in significant short and long term problems for the Town Center retail and hotel components, as well as the immediate surrounding residential and commercial areas. As a result, **the EDH APT Subcommittee recommends nonsupport of the project as proposed.**

Final Subcommittee Report - See:

[https://edhapac.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/EDH\\_Apartments-\\_TCE\\_Subcommittee\\_report\\_FINAL.pdf](https://edhapac.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/EDH_Apartments-_TCE_Subcommittee_report_FINAL.pdf)

Public Comment: Scott - Moved here in 1988 has seen excess suburbanization. 1.25% is the maximum ad valorem property tax rate. It can go up 2% a year. When inflation rates returns, county residents won't be able to afford to live here. Excessive residential development taxation cannot keep up with inflation. County needs sales tax income, not property taxes. And does not need urbanization

Public Comment: 1/2 acre not Being developed - Wouldn't the density be higher if the 1/2 acre goes unused for this project, and gets used for another project?

Chris Schultze - Not a separate parcel - still considered part of the acreage

Jeff We don't know what will happen with the 1/2 acre.

Public Comment: Have you looked at the numbers if the project were to be approved for 24 dwelling units per acres

Jeff Morgan - It won't work

Public Comment: Joel - lived here since 1985. Has heard \$1700 - \$2800 -per month for lease rates. Would require \$5000 per month of income, or \$60,000 per year. Town Center employees can't afford that.

Jeff Morgan - that makes sense. People are telecommuting. Has been building for 25 years, thousands of units built. Telecommuters are an increasing need.

Public Comment: Joel - there aren't people working in town center that can live there

Jeff - there will be a few, but the demographic is wide spread. This is smart sensible growth.

Would you rather have a transient population on that parcel? It will take an income of over \$60K per year to afford EDH Apartment lease rates.

Public Comment: Sue Taylor - Is the County requesting that the project be defined as urban infill?

Kathy Prevost - The Urban infill designation is being sought to allow a lower environmental noise standard, Otherwise the project would exceed allowed residential environmental noise standards.

Public Comment: Sue Taylor - is concerned that this sets a precedent. The project allows the developers to create their own design standards. Violates numerous County policies. This is a legal process, County has to respond to concerns.

Public Comment: People recognize traffic impacts in Folsom and also in TCE with Mc Donalds and Wells Fargo. Doesn't think traffic is a significant issue. County growth is only 1.5% per year. Town Center is hurting, this project will help TCE. It is zoned for a hotel 140 -180 rooms, but traffic for a hotel is worse than this Apartment project. The Holiday Inn in Town Center is 100% occupied. We need to have an open mind, project should be viable. Would be 100% positive for TCE

Public Comment: Larry Brilliant - 3K people lived here 30 years ago, 40K now. The problem is changing the general plan. Larry is opposed to changing the General Plan. If the modification benefits all of EDH Larry would support it, but it sounds like it won't benefit anyone but the developer, and the property owners.

Public Comment: Wants to agree because it easier to agree. For 2 years they looked all over CA, but fell in love with EDH. Preferred it to high end places in Bay Area, and So Cal. Is sad because everyone seems to be so negative about it.

Public Comment: Richard Ross - Has EDH Fire department approved the plans for fire access? Deputy Chief Mike Lilienthal - the project is designed for access of fire equipment.

Public Comment: Wants to get rid of the notion that Town Center East is bankrupt and failing, and that this project will fill it up. This will not bring life into Town Center East.

A motion was made by APAC Vice Chair John Raslear to accept the APAC Subcommittee's recommendation of Non-Support of the project. The motion was seconded by Ellison Rumsey

MOTION: Move to accept the EDH APAC Subcommittee's recommendation of Non-Support of the El Dorado Hills Apartment Project as currently proposed:

**VOTE: 7 affirmative - 0 negative**  
Motion for **Non-Support** passes.

**Ayes**

Ellison Rumsey  
John Raslear  
Kathy Prevost  
Tim White  
Lenny Patane  
Larry Brilliant  
John Davey

**Nays**

None

7. Adjournment.

NEXT MEETING – Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at the CSD. Topics may include:

- Montao de El Dorado Phase II Master Plan
- John Adams Academy - 12 acre. Building already exists. Traffic would be the APAC concern. 1500 students and staff 7AM - 9AM.

Courtesy Notice: Anyone wishing to record any segment of an APAC meeting shall express their intent to do so before they start recording.

NOTE - APAC announces our new website at <http://edhapac.org>. This is a *volunteer* effort, with information on current APAC projects, and links to El Dorado County information on proposals and hearings. APAC volunteers will be working to gather archival APAC documents and data to place on the website. We are working to build this out, so be patient as we develop the site further.

*Additionally*, you can keep up with breaking EL Dorado Hills planning and development news on our APAC Facebook and Twitter pages. Facebook – <https://www.facebook.com/EDHAPAC/>.  
Twitter- <https://twitter.com/EDHAPAC>



**El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee**

1021 Harvard Way  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2018 Board Chair

Tim White

Vice Chair

John Raslear

Secretary

Kathy Prevost

2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair

John Davey

February 9, 2018

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

Attn: El Dorado County Supervisors  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA. 95667

**Subject: A16-0001, Z16-0004, SP86-0002-3, PD94-0004-R-3**

Dear Board of Supervisors,

In reviewing the posted Meeting Details and Agenda of the February 13, 2018 Board of Supervisors meeting, and specifically Agenda item 31 [ HEARING – To consider the recommendation of the Planning Commission on the El Dorado Hills Apartments project (General Plan Amendment A16-0001/Rezone Z16-0004/Specific Plan Revision SP86-0002-R-3/Planned Development Revision PD94-0004-R-3) ], El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee members were concerned to find the previously used Legistar project file number 17-0846 changed to new Legistar project file number 18-0193, with none of the public comments submitted prior to January 30, 2018, attached.

The APAC Executive Board would like to make certain that APAC's previously submitted comments and reports are attached for review to the new file number 18-0193 – we have included these as electronic attachments to this letter.

To recount EDH APAC's history with the current project:

EDH APAC members attended the project Scoping Meeting in April 2017.

EDH APAC formed a subcommittee to research and review the project. The subcommittee report, recommended non-support of the project as proposed.

[Attached: 1\_APAC\_EDH\_Apt\_Vote\_Letter\_Aug-9-2017.pdf ]

At the August 9, 2017 APAC meeting, Project applicants generously took time to make a

**El Dorado Hills APAC - Non-partisan Volunteers Planning Our Future**

presentation and answer questions about the project to the El Dorado Hills Community. Following this presentation, and a review of the subcommittee report, the full APAC committee voted 7-0 to accept the subcommittee recommendation of non-support. Following the meeting, APAC submitted its vote of non-support, along with the detailed subcommittee report, to the El Dorado County Planning Commission, El Dorado County Planning Services Dept, and the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, and offered the report as a response to the project's Draft Environmental Impact Report.

[Attached: 2\_EDH\_Apartments \_TCE\_Subcommittee\_report\_FINAL.pdf ]

Upon the release of the project Final Environmental Impact report in December 2017, EDH APAC offered additional comments to the EDC Planning Commission and EDC Planning & Building Services Dept. concerning both environmental, and non-environmental issues not addressed by the FEIR.

[Attached: 3\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response\_email\_Jan-5-2018.pdf ]

[Attached: 4\_4\_EDH\_APAC\_A16-0001\_FEIR\_Response.pdf ]

On January 11, 2018 the El Dorado County Planning Commission reviewed the project and voted 3-2 to approve the project as proposed.

EDH APAC members feel that the Planning Commission, as well as the Final Environmental Impact Report, didn't adequately address the major concern – a General Plan Amendment allowing the doubling of the 24 dwelling units per acre multi-family residential standard to 47 dwelling units per acre for this project. The apparent answer in the FEIR is that the Applicant chooses to designate the parcels and the project itself as Urban Infill, then establishes their own standards and goals as justification for the higher density allowance.

EDH APAC members ask: if the standard exists, why is it reasonable to grant an amendment to double it? This is not a minor change to the standard, it is significant.

What benefit does it generate to the County, and more pointedly to El Dorado Hills? EDH APAC members see this as no minor variance, and that entitlements this significant, granted to a single project, should be balanced with benefits to El Dorado County, and to the El Dorado Hills Community. EDH APAC members don't see a benefit to the County, or to El Dorado Hills. The sole benefit is that the project applicant will be allowed to build their project.

EDH APAC members ask: Is this justification enough to amend the Voter Approved General Plan? EDH APAC members feel that the General Plan is a tool that exists to benefit El Dorado County residents, not as a tool to benefit a single development project, at the expense of residents.

As to the merits of the debate if it is better to allow the project site to stay vacant, or to move forward with this current project as proposed, EDH APAC members counter that the original proponents of the Village T Town Center East Planned Development sought in the early 90s to be rewarded with an alternate land use to what was previously established in the 1988 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan: a commercial center. They were rewarded with zoning to that effect. EDH APAC members suggest that the impacts of failure to develop these parcels in this development as granted by the 1995 approved PD94-0004, shouldn't be forced to be borne by the El Dorado Hills community, or by the El Dorado County General Plan. Vacant or developed, the property has the zoning that was requested, and the ability to develop it rests with the owners, and the Town Center East Planned Development. If this project was seeking some simple, minor, modifications to develop the property, that would merit consideration – but a General Plan amendment is never minor. EDH APAC members don't

believe the project merits a General Plan amendment based on the benefits it seeks for itself, in lieu of the lack of benefit to the County, and El Dorado Hills.

During our outreach efforts with El Dorado Hills residents, the overwhelming sentiment of the community has been opposition to the project as proposed. At our August 9, 2017 meeting, of well over 30 community attendees, only 3 spoke in favor of the project.

[Attached: 5\_EDH-APAC-August-9-2017-Meeting-Minutes.pdf – Project review starts at page#5]

The project applicant mentioned at the January 11, 2018 Planning Commission hearing that they were volunteering to contribute to the proposed County Intelligent Transportation Systems Program, further suggesting that this would be through an undefined Development Agreement, as well as suggesting it could be a condition of approval. Shouldn't these details be disclosed, to allow adequate review by the public, prior to being accepted as a condition of approval?

Another set of questions, recently raised, relates to the approximately half acre of unused space at the northern end of the project site, along Mercedes Lane. There have been some suggestions by the project applicant that this could be set aside as a community area that can be used by the public for passive recreational uses. In checking with the El Dorado Hills CSD, they report no interest in programming the space as part of their park/recreational programs. If the space is to be used as an amenity of the Town Center East PD, will it become a gathering space for events? Will there be environmental impacts from such use (traffic/parking, public safety, noise standards)? Has any study been completed to address these issues as part of this project? If the approximately half acre of open space is later deeded to either the Town Center East PD Area, or another entity, doesn't that reduce the over-all project acreage to approximately 4.065 acres, and thereby further increase the dwelling unit per acre project number to 53 dwelling units per acre?

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions please contact Tim White , 2018 APAC Chair at [tjwhitejd@gmail.com](mailto:tjwhitejd@gmail.com) or John Raslear, Vice Chair at [jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net).

Sincerely,  
Tim White

2018 APAC Committee Chair  
Cc: EDCO Planning Commission  
EDCO BOS  
APAC read file





EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Project A16-0001, El Dorado Town Center Apartment: Public Comment**

1 message

---

**Simon Thomas** <SThomas@hga.com>

Fri, Feb 9, 2018 at 1:20 PM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Dear Clerk of the Board and Supervisors,

I have not read all the information about this project but as a relatively new resident of EDH, I share the concerns detailed in documents I read from the Advisory Boards. In addition, I feel that EDH needs to develop Town Center as a community hub, as it is now, with ample opportunity to expand services that support the community that already exists in EDH. Whether that is additional retail or community space (such as a larger amphitheater for the very successful events already promoted by Town Center), I do not believe that residential development at this scale is the highest and best use for this piece of property.

Your decision as to what will be allowed on this site is an important one. It is not a property that we drive by or never see. Town Center acts as a true center of life in EDH. With so many of us closeted behind our gated communities this is the one place where we come together to watch movies, see Santa, and stroll around the water. The development of this property can enhance an already wonderful community resource by adding services that bring existing residents in to the Center or creates an environment that makes a visit to Town Center less attractive and pushes people away.

As an architect, I am also sensitive to the proposed apartment site plan and have concerns about the development taking away opportunity to create more community spaces that front the water. In general, I think the development that already faces the water is poorly executed. This, in my view, is the biggest asset for Town Center and is what distinguishes it from retail centers in our area, notably Palladio and Broadstone. Currently, the perimeter of the water has community uses that face the water (excluding the pathway) of about 30%. It would be a terrible forfeiture, in my opinion, to lose almost another 30% of the frontage to this private development.

I look forward to the increasing opportunities for Town Center as the Folsom Ranch development come on line and this center offers an attractive alternate shopping/entertainment/community amenities destination to Folsom and EDH. There is no doubt that more diversity in residential housing are needed but not in this location. I would therefore register myself as opposing this development.

Thank you for the opportunity to add a voice to this important discussion.

Simon

1069 Bevinger Drive,

El Dorado Hills

**Simon Thomas**

Senior Medical Planner

HGA Architects and Engineers  
1200 R Street, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95811  
Direct 916.787.5118 | Mobile 916.805.3456  
sthomas@hga.com | hga.com

---

 **EDH Town Center Water Development.pdf**  
4657K

LIMITED WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT FOR COMMUNITY/PUBLIC USE



WALKING PATHWAY  
 PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT  
 POTENTIAL APARTMENT FRONTAGE  
 COMMUNITY SPACE





EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Town Center Apartments

1 message

---

**Katie Jane Huff** <katiejane.huff@gmail.com>

Fri, Feb 9, 2018 at 3:22 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

I think it is a good thing to develop the area in Town Center for the apartments. I am all for development and the apartments/commercial space to bring more to the area.

However, I do feel like the traffic has not been addressed properly and should be re-evaluated. Just the back-up to get onto the freeway going towards Folsom when most people from Blue Cross get off at 4pm is tragic enough.

It would nice to see an express bus go directly from EDH to the capital in downtown.

Katie