

5/17/2019

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0009/El Dorado Senior Resort

PC 5/23/19

#4

4 pages

Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>



---

## Fwd: Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0009/El Dorado Senior Resort

---

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>  
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Thu, May 16, 2019 at 9:32 AM

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

From: **Monique Plubell** <monique\_plubell@hotmail.com>  
Date: Thu, May 16, 2019 at 9:23 AM  
Subject: Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0009/El Dorado Senior Resort  
To: planning@edcgov.us <planning@edcgov.us>


To Whom It May Concern,

Please see attached letter regarding the Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0009/El Dorado Senior Resort. If I could please receive a response that this email was received, I would appreciate it.

Thank you,  
~Monique Plubell

Sent from Outlook

---

 **CUP 18-0009 Senior Housing Resort.pdf**  
287K

Monique Plubell / Christopher Philipps  
5531 Crossbill Ln.  
El Dorado, CA 95623  
(530) 295-0158

May 16, 2019

County of El Dorado  
Planning and Building Department  
2850 Fairlane Ct.  
Placerville, CA 95667  
**RE: Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0009/  
El Dorado Senior Resort**

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing this letter to address our concerns regarding the proposed development of the El Dorado Senior Resort. Although we recognize the need for affordable senior housing in El Dorado County, we are **strongly opposed** to the plan and development of the El Dorado Senior Resort in the location proposed.

We have been residents of the subdivision off Koki Ln. since June of 2004 and feel that our quality of life will be indefinitely changed should this development be approved. Having lived in El Dorado County for my entire life, I was able to experience the country life that many people can only dream of. My husband on the other hand moved to El Dorado County from the Bay Area to get away from the hustle and bustle of City life to enjoy the little piece of heaven that we have today. The home that we currently live in is our first home together. It was a major purchase for us and now 15 years later we finally have some equity in it. We fear that a development such as the one proposed would negatively impact the property value of not only our home, but those of our neighbors, many of whom are young working families who have worked hard and have purchased homes in our specific neighborhood for the small piece of the quiet country life that is affordable. Many of us can't afford to relocate nor do we want to especially if our property values are decreased. We have limited options in the County and we bought in this specific area for a reason. Please don't take away what we have all worked so hard for.

We moved into this community for the peace and quiet understanding that there would be some minimal noise associated with Union Mine High School of which we have accepted the fact that there are at times loud football games and other events, traffic on Koki Ln, and graduation once a year where it's often times impossible to get home as you have people parking up and down Koki Ln. and Pleasant Valley road. All of this noise created from the High School is **temporary** and not 24/7 as the proposed El Dorado Senior Resort will be. We want to be able to enjoy sitting outside or opening our windows to the peace and quiet and we fear that that will all be a thing of the past.

The noise that a 24/7 community will bring to our area is a hard thing to process. The studies show that the noise level will be minimal but honestly how can that be determined until the project is finished and up and running. We do not want the added noise that a community such as the one proposed will inevitably bring. This goes back to quality of life and that fact that we bought this home based off of location and the fact that the noise is minimal.

In addition to the noise, we are very concerned about privacy and lighting and the fact that a 2-3 story building will be going in essentially next door. We don't want people looking in on our property or our neighbors and we don't see how this would be avoided with a 2-3 story facility. And besides that we don't want to look out our front windows to see a 2-3 story building with lights shining bright at night. Right now, we have a nice view of the oak trees during the daylight hours and at night it's peacefully dark.

Another major issue with the proposed development of the El Dorado Senior Resort is traffic and right now it's too much for our small subdivision to handle. Traffic is already an issue with Koki Ln. being the main access point to the High School. Each and every morning when I leave for work, I sit at the intersection of Crossbill Ln. and Koki Ln. sometimes up to 10 minutes before someone will stop to let me out. As I am turning left onto Koki to make my way to Pleasant Valley Rd. often times I can't even see a car coming from the school as there is too much traffic backed up. Every morning is a challenge just to get to work. I cannot fathom how Koki Ln. will be able to provide sufficient and safe access to not only the residents of the proposed development, but to our subdivision and to the High School. According to the plans, the entrance/exit is located in an area in which it's very difficult to see cars coming from the school. I have seen all too many times the teenage drivers driving in excess of what they should be. I have even seen traffic collisions in the straight away areas of Koki Ln. I fear that we may see on onset of accidents due to the fact that you are mixing elderly drivers with young inexperienced drivers on a two lane narrow road. I understand that there will be another point of access other than Koki Ln. for fire and medical personnel to access however I am sure at times they will need to access the facility through Koki Ln. In addition, what about delivery drivers, mail delivery, visitors, etc. Where are they most likely to access this community? I see this as an issue if they are using the Koki Ln. entrance and exit especially during drop off and pick up times for the High School as Koki Ln. is heavily congested. It is inevitable that you will find that Koki Ln. is not able to handle the additional usage and quite frankly, if this is a 24/7 facility there will be fire and medical personnel coming and going at all hours of the day and night causing additional noise nuisances. As mentioned earlier, a majority of our subdivision are hard working families many of whom work during the day and depend on a good night's sleep. If we are forced to deal with the sounds of fire and medical personnel accessing the facility at all hours of the night, this will cause many of us lack of sleep and thus the possibility of low productivity at work.

One last thing regarding the traffic issue is the concern about fire and the fact that there is one way out on Koki Ln. This is a terrifying thought considering what we witnessed in 2018 with the fires in Butte County specifically the town of Paradise. I want to know that I will be able to safely evacuate should the need arise. I can't even imagine the gridlock

that will be created if not only our subdivision, but the residents of this rather large community are only able to exit utilizing one exit. I strongly feel this would be too big of a risk to too many lives that just isn't worth taking.

Another area of concern is the complete removal of several varieties of trees, including many oaks that have been here for years. Most of the families in our subdivision moved here because of the beauty in the natural landscapes that surround us. By removing all the trees and stripping the land of all vegetation in order to build this senior resort, to me seems extreme. Why not build another subdivision such as ours with affordable single family homes. There are many families within the County that would benefit from such a housing development and many of the oaks could be saved. We have many oak trees that are still standing and they are a part of the beauty and charm of our small neighborhood.

We ask that the County of El Dorado Planning Commission consider the enormous negative impact that this proposed development of the El Dorado Senior Resort will have on the current residents of our Community. I don't want to see our quality of life be diminished for many of the reasons stated above and I truly hope that each and every one of the residents of our Community is heard with an open mind.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Monique Plubell and Christopher Philipps

5/17/2019

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comment Letter - El Dorado Senior Resort - El Dorado County

PC 5/23/19

#4

10 pages

Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>



---

## Fwd: Comment Letter - El Dorado Senior Resort - El Dorado County

---

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>  
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Thu, May 16, 2019 at 1:33 PM

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

From: **Michael Goolsby** <michael@better-neighborhoods.com>  
Date: Thu, May 16, 2019 at 12:10 PM  
Subject: Re: Comment Letter - El Dorado Senior Resort - El Dorado County  
To: planning@edcgov.us <planning@edcgov.us>  
Cc: Ed McCabe <ed@better-neighborhoods.com>

Mr. Sanchez,

Please see attached comment letter. Better Neighborhoods is an interested party with respect to this matter. Please acknowledge receipt and put me on your notice list.

Thank you,



J. Michael Goolsby, CEO

Better Neighborhoods, Inc.

17901 Von Karman Ave, Suite 600

Irvine, CA 92614

(949) 556-8714

[www.better-neighborhoods.com/](http://www.better-neighborhoods.com/)

5/17/2019

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comment Letter - El Dorado Senior Resort - El Dorado County



**051619 Comment Ltr - Seniors Resort - El Dorado County.pdf**  
216K



17901 Von Karman Ave, Suite 600  
Irvine, CA 92614  
(949) 556-8714  
[www.better-neighborhoods.com/](http://www.better-neighborhoods.com/)

May 16, 2019

Mr. Efren Sanchez, Assistant Planner  
El Dorado County  
2850 Fairlane Court,  
Placerville, CA 95667  
Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

Re: El Dorado Senior Resort/ CUP 18-0009 (the "Project")

Dear Mr. Sanchez,

Thank-you for the opportunity to provide questions and comments regarding the proposed townhouse condominium development referenced above.

Better Neighborhoods Inc. is an organization established to help people have a voice in local development decisions as prominent as that of planners and developers. Our aim is to encourage smart growth consistent with the needs of the community while protecting the natural environment and places of historic and aesthetic significance, supporting California's need for affordable housing, and balancing the desire for growth with the need for features that make cities livable.

The Applicant appears to have 'jumped the gun' on all of us by omitting key requirements of the planning process. There is no full and complete Project description even. We only learn about features, such as an onsite restaurant and community garden, from vague references in the appendices. There is virtually no discussion of medical emergency services available to serve residents at the care facility – just assertions that medical care would be available. What is the availability of local ambulance service? The Report doesn't say. There is no business plan as required for the storage and use of medical equipment and supplies. There is no explanation regarding services to be offered in either of the two commercial buildings aside from a restaurant. We learn from the Fire Plan that the Project site is in a 'Moderate Fire Severity zone,' a designation that is not explained. Nor are fire safety measures set out in the Fire Plan included in the Mitigation Measures Agreement executed on April 15, 2019 in Attachment 8.

Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 2

There are no computer-generated drawings to give us an impression of what the Project would look like so there is no way to assess whether and how it might blend with the community.

We know that the fate of the Project rests on the discretion of the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to approve annexation of the two land parcels intended to form the Project site. Absent annexation approval, there will be no sewer and water service, yet there is no discussion of the requirements for such a crucial approval hence no way to assess whether Applicant complies.

Much more information is required on all of these issues before the Mitigated Negative Declaration (the "MND" or "Report") and Project could possibly be approved.

### **Project Description:**

Applicant seeks a conditional use permit for an age-restricted, 55 and older senior living development on 8.2 acres to include a 74-unit assisted living/memory care facility; a 64-unit independent living apartment complex with club house; 9 single family homes; one 5,000 square feet (SF) commercial building; a second 2,500 SF commercial building; undefined open and recreational space; 228 parking spaces, 128 underground, as well as wall and monument signage. The proposal also includes 10 % affordable housing units.

The development may or may not be handicapped accessible or barrier free. The Report doesn't say. One would have expected discussion of special features for memory care but this was not provided. Nor was there any information regarding licensing or other requirements for such use, including medical services to be provided onsite. Are there adequate ambulance services available to the Project site? The Report doesn't say.

A staff of 34 employees is anticipated, including 3 administration staff, 14 nursing staff, 3 janitorial staff, 2 maintenance staff and 12 culinary staff. How does this comport with licensing requirements for such a facility? The Report doesn't say.

Water and sewer service would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) subject to annexation approval by the El Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), the requirements for which are not provided, explained or discussed in any way. Why might the LAFCO withhold approval, one wonders?

### **Aesthetics**

Buildings would be shingle siding depicting a craftsman architectural style exterior with roofing and siding colors to blend with the earth tone color. There are no drawings provided so it's not clear what is meant by 'craftsman architectural style.' A cursory Internet search quickly reveals the phrase means different things to different people.



Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 3

The assisted living/memory care facility, a three-story building, will be the tallest building on the project site at a height of 37.5 feet. The other buildings would be two stories. According to the Report, "The project has been designed for consistency with the applicable development standards and zoning district standards," whatever they might be. Similarly, "the buildings will conform to the prescribed setback and landscaping requirements." We are referred to the architectural site plan, Attachment 7, but there are no computer-generated drawings to show what is meant.

According to the Report, the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the proposed Project at their November 15, 2018 meeting and expressed their support. They offered no comments about the aesthetic or visual design of the Project, but "felt" that the Project would have less traffic impact than most other uses under consideration at the site. What other uses? Under consideration by whom?

The proposed craftsman architecture is consistent with El Dorado County Historic Design Guidelines of two or three-story commercial buildings – no photos or descriptions? Attachment 7 included in the Fire Plan is just a scale map with no computer-generated drawings.

The mysterious Commercial Building #2 would shift north to accommodate a 10-foot landscape buffer between commercial and residential parcels. Uses anticipated in the commercial buildings #1 and #2 are described only as restaurant and professional office. All we know is that both will be open to the public. There would be outdoor activity areas in the northern part of the site. What activities, one wonders?

### **Landscaping/ Biological Resources**

The proposal calls for the "replacement of oak trees" without ever explaining whether or how the trees might be spared and/or relocated on or off site as per Attachment 1. The Oak Resources Technical Report reveals that the Project site contains 7.69 acres of existing oak canopy. County's Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) regulates removal of individual oak woodlands and oak canopy. The Project would remove 7.12 acres of oak woodland along with six heritage trees. Could there be a project more likely to appreciate the many benefits of old trees, which may shelter a wide assortment of wildlife? Could the Project be reconfigured to save the heritage trees? Have alternative designs to incorporate the trees been contemplated? A Google search May 12, 2019 revealed images showing the work of at least 12 architects who found creative ways to incorporate living trees.

Appendix A El Dorado Senior Resort Fire Safe Fuel Treatment Specifications contained in Attachment 5 Wildland Fire Safe Plan, advises further:

"Within The Designated Fuel Treatment Areas 1. **Leave live trees where possible.** (emphasis added). 2. Remove all dead trees. 3. Remove all brush. 4. Prune all live trees of dead branches and green branches 8 feet from the ground as measured on the uphill side of the tree, except no more than 1/3 of the live crown is removed. All slash created by pruning must be disposed of by chipping, burning or hauling off site. Trees adjacent to the road shall

Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 4

be pruned up 15'. 5. Annually by June 1, reduce the grass or weeds to a 2 inch stubble by mowing, chemical treatment, disking or a combination of treatments.”

Again, none of the mitigation measures set out in the Fire Safe Plan are included in the Applicant’s undertaking at Attachment 8.

### **Surrounding Uses**

The Project site is surrounded by existing housing to the north, west and south, and an undeveloped commercial parcel to the east – so far, exclusively single-family residences but on land zoned for multifamily/commercial, commercial and high-density housing. How many housing redevelopment plans in the area are currently under review?

It would be far less attractive to seniors to live in a high-density area surrounded by new construction, traffic and noise.

How many commercial projects in the area are currently under review?

### **Light and Glare**

The Project would be a significant new source of light and glare not only from the residential and commercial buildings onsite but from the additional traffic such a large-scale development would create. The preferred approach would be to compare light and glare at a project of similar size and scope on the surrounding uses, especially on sensitive receptors. There is just not enough information to support the conclusion that this issue would be mitigated to a less than significant impact. How?

### **Utilities and Infrastructure**

The Report is strangely vague on such basic matters. “The project would be required to provide a safe and reliable water source at the time of building permit application, for all future development. Acquisition of these district services shall be subject to formal approval of annexation by LAFCO (Page 5, Initial Study/Environmental Checklist Form). What’s meant by *all future development*? What are the requirements to obtain LAFCO approval for annexation? Why wasn’t this information included?

Similarly, we learn that “County Department of Transportation reviewed and provided comments to the preliminary grading and drainage report. The Project will facilitate the reduction of flows on Pleasant Valley Road with the “construction of detention and/or retention measures to reduce post development peak flows and volumes, below existing levels.” Where are the comments and what detention and retention measures? The Report doesn’t provide or explain.

Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 5

### **Construction**

Incredibly, there is no estimated construction period provided. All we know is that construction would not be undertaken in phases but all at once.

### **Air Quality**

Certainly with so many new residents, visitors and customers and clients of the two commercial buildings coming and going, the Project would increase traffic and energy consumption. Unfortunately, there is insufficient information and analysis to say much more. We know that a Project would have a cumulatively significant impact if:

- The Project requires a change in the land use designation (e.g., general plan amendment or rezone) that increases ROG and NOx emissions compared to the prior approved use, and the increase in emissions exceeds the “project alone” significance levels shown above for ROG or NOx.

In this case, Applicant requires approval from another authority for annexation to obtain basic sewer and water access. How would this affect the air quality calculations for the Project?

The Project would also be considered to have a cumulatively significant impact if CO emissions combined with CO emissions from other nearby projects, would result in a “hotspot” that violates a state or national AAQS. Are there other developments planned in the area currently? Zoning of surrounding land for multifamily, high-density and commercial use strongly suggests redevelopment potential.

The Report also states that El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD) would require implementation of a Fugitive Dust Mitigation (FDM) plan during grading and construction activities in combination with the other applicable California Air Resource Board (CARB) rules. Such a plan would address grading measures and operation of equipment to minimize and reduce the level of defined particulate matter exposure and/or emissions, which are anticipated at least by the Applicant to be below a level of significance, but no such plan is provided. We are assured that with full review for consistency with General Plan Policies, impacts would be anticipated to be less than significant. Which policies and consistent how exactly? This kind of boilerplate frustrates rather than fulfills CEQA obligations for full and frank disclosure.

Lack of consideration is given to sensitive receptors, including Union Mine High School 0.3 miles south of the Project site. The Project itself would be a sensitive receptor. More information is required to assess the air quality impact of the Project.

### **Geology and Soils**

The Report fails to explain which potential seismic impacts have been considered and how they would be addressed through compliance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC). Nor does it

Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 6

explain how grading activities would comply with relevant laws and rules. Why weren't Stormwater and Soil Erosion plans provided?

At page 25, Initial Study/Environmental Checklist Form, under Expansive Soils: "The central portion of the county has a moderate expansiveness rating while the eastern and western portions have a low rating. Linear extensibility is used to determine the shrink-swell potential of soils. **No structures for human occupancy would be constructed as part of the proposed project.**" (emphasis added).

The question remains: Is the Project site on soil with moderate expansiveness and if so, what risk(s) does it pose to the Project? How would such risk(s) be mitigated?

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The Report asserts that the Project is not anticipated to involve the routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials such as construction materials, paints, fuels, landscaping materials, and household cleaning supplies. The senior living development may produce small amounts of household cleaners or other hazardous materials on a small scale. What about medical equipment and supplies at the care portion of the facility? What about medical and/or dental offices in one of the commercial buildings? Is Applicant even aware of the health and safety and business plan obligations regarding such use?

### **Wildfire Hazard**

The Report assures that the Project was reviewed by Diamond Springs El Dorado Fire Protection District, and Transportation Division and that both agencies recommended conditions of approval and agreed with the proposed construction of the main driveway and all Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA's) as identified in the Project site plan. Where are those comments and conditions?

Attachment 5 Wildland Fire Safe Plan, interestingly, describes 'a community garden area, recreation area and a native woodland open space' at the Project site. Why do we learn of these features only in the fire plan?

According to the Plan, the Project area is a Moderate Fire Severity zone. What does that mean in terms of risk especially to future residents? This is especially concerning when the Plan contains measures that must be maintained into the future to assure adequate wildfire protection. Why aren't those measures included in Attachment 8, the mitigation undertaking?

The Plan provides that yards and common areas will need to be landscaped and regularly maintained. The native woodland open space will be required to have a one-time cleanup of all dead and down limbs of the trees in the area. Trees must be limbed up 8' from the ground. The understory vegetation must be treated annually to maintain the dry grass to a 2" stubble by June 1. All bushes need to be kept free of dead limbs. All slash and brush piles created during the clearing and construction of the project must have 30' clearance around all piles and the piles must be

Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 7

disposed of within 30 days of their creation. The community garden area shall be kept free of dry grass at all times. All trees within the garden will need to be pruned up to 8' above the ground. Perimeter fencing shall be non-combustible and have a Fuel Hazard Reduction Zone of 5' along the exterior perimeter.

Assuming the measures are included in the undertaking, is the El Dorado County Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program available for monitoring by the public?

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

There is insufficient information to assess the Project's effect on water. Precondition to obtaining access has not been satisfied and there is neither a soil erosion nor a stormwater pollution prevention plan provided.

### **Land Use Planning**

Yes, the Project at such a size and scale would physically overwhelm and divide an established community of mostly single-family residences and vacant land, so the environmental impact would be significant. It would likely induce further new development at surrounding uses. It may attract new services aimed at seniors and at the new commercial buildings' uses.

### **Noise**

There is no estimated construction period so it's not clear how short-term construction would be, as the Report asserts. All we know is that construction would not be undertaken in phases but all at once. For a Project of this size and scale the period may not be short at all.

Mitigation measures described in Attachment 3 Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment concern only the placement of HVAC units. What about noise from all the additional traffic the Project would bring? Because the Project description is so incomplete there is no way to properly assess the noise impact either at the Project site or surrounding areas. Much depends on the actual features and activities especially in the two commercial buildings.

According to the study, where existing or projected future traffic noise levels are less than 60 dB Ldn at the outdoor activity areas of residential uses, an increase of more than 5 dBA Ldn caused by a new transportation noise source will be considered significant. Where are these areas of outdoor activity at the Project? Neither the study nor the Report says.

Table 7 at p. 14 of the attachment reveals a troubling number of near-threshold noise levels. Tolerable maybe if the Project is the only new development in the area contemplated, but this is unlikely. Zoning of surrounding areas strongly suggests the likelihood of high-density redevelopment. Can the city confirm or deny?

Mr. Efren Sanchez  
Re: El Dorado Senior Resort  
May 16, 2019  
Page 8

### **Population and Housing**

Yes, the Project would induce substantial population growth in an area directly by proposing new homes and businesses - 241.9 people would live within the proposed senior living development. Staff at the facility and in the commercial buildings might also want to re-locate closer to employment. Visitors, too, might want to live closer to relatives at the facility. The new residential community would also likely draw new services to the area and so on.

### **Public Services**

What is the response time of El Dorado Medical Services Agency's ambulance service to the area currently? How would this change with a sudden influx of new and vulnerable seniors? This section, too, is incomplete.

### **Transportation**

The Traffic Impact Study, Attachment 4, found that the Project would be expected to generate approximately 787 total new daily trips, with 41 new trips occurring during the AM peak-hour, and 62 new trips occurring during the PM peak-hour based on trip generation rates contained in the Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The study did not consider uses at the two commercial buildings at the Project site so any conclusions in the study are flawed. The preferred approach might be to compare the results at another senior facility of similar size and scope. The study also fails to consider public transit access. Is there any?

Mitigation measures to address traffic increases at one intersection involve the payment of fees and the installation of a traffic signal, which depends on Caltrans discretion. Is Caltrans disposed to install a traffic signal? Is the Applicant disposed to provide the improvement with reimbursement for costs that exceed the Project's proportional share? The Report provides no cost-benefit analysis so there is no way to assess which would be the preferred approach.

### **Mandatory Findings of Significance**

Yes, the Project could substantially degrade the environment if Applicant is permitted to remove six heritage oak trees and acres more of other oaks, which likely shelter an assortment of local wildlife.

There is insufficient information for the County to approve the Project at this time.

Sincerely,



J. Michael Goolsby  
President and CEO  
Better Neighborhoods, Inc.

5/17/2019

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: CUP18-0009/EI Dorado Senior Resort Letter attached

PC 5/23/19  
#4  
3 pages



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

---

## Fwd: CUP18-0009/EI Dorado Senior Resort Letter attached

---

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>  
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Thu, May 16, 2019 at 3:27 PM

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

From: **Dyanna L. SWEENEY** <dsweeney@berkeley.edu>  
Date: Thu, May 16, 2019 at 3:20 PM  
Subject: CUP18-0009/EI Dorado Senior Resort Letter attached  
To: <planning@edcgov.us>

Please find attached letter objecting to the development referenced above.

---

 **EDC Senior Resort\_05.23.19.pdf**  
286K

May 15, 2019

County of El Dorado Planning Commission  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Conditional Use Permit CUP18-0009/El Dorado Senior Resort

On behalf of myself and many of the homeowners and residents of Dorado Woods Development, we are disheartened to learn of the plans to build a large Senior Resort next door to our community. We feel there are tremendous downsides to our general quality of life here with the development of the "senior resort". The following include most of the concerns that comprise our objection:

1. **Reduced Home Values.** Many of the homeowners here that I've talked to are concerned that our property values will be stalled or worse with the construction of a large senior resort neighbor. This is one of our biggest concerns. If I was looking to buy a home, I wouldn't buy one with a senior facility next door.
2. **Construction:** The development and construction will likely go on for most of year, maybe more. Starting with the first bucket full of dirt and initial grading, noise and dust will have significant impact our community. Without the sound insulating foliage and trees that by now are permanently lost, tractor and large equipment work will be heard throughout Dorado Woods for months. We'll also clearly hear the traffic on Pleasant Valley Road as well as the garbage trucks, paramedics and firetrucks, which will frequent the Senior Resort.
3. **High School Noise:** Homeowners and residents here already endure the impact to our community of the high school next door. We hear the PA system most days, the start, ending and period bells. And heaven help you if you need to pull out onto Koki lane at 7:30 a.m. or 3 p.m. And, the traffic doesn't end at 3. Many days, there are events at the school that keep the traffic going until late in the evening. We hear busses, high-schoolers doing wheelies, spinning out, yelling, loud music blasting, concerts and other assorted disruptions that come with living next door to a high school. The point is, we already pay our dues with regard to



hits to our quality of life due to our unintentional but accepted proximity to our high school neighbor.


4. Traffic Congestion/Noise: It appears that the entrance to the “senior resort” will be from Koki Lane. I’ve already mentioned that with the high school, traffic on Koki Lane is difficult and even a burden to our residents on a nearly daily basis. Between the high school and other residents of Koki Ln., most Dorado Woods residents feel that Koki Ln. is already at maximum capacity usage. Incidentally, Koki Ln. is currently in need of repair.
5. Negative impact to Dorado Woods Development: Homeowners who purchased their home in Dorado Woods chose to live here for a variety of reasons. Affordability and general attractiveness of the neighborhood. In addition to the issues referred to above concerning the high school and related noises, these will be compounded as a result of construction of The Senior Resort. Many here will likely have to move. We chose to NOT live in the city.

I’ve owned my home since 2004. It’s intended to be the home I live out my life in. Now, I, and others, may need to make other plans. I really feel for the homeowners whose yards back up to the ‘facility’. I suspect many of them will be forced to leave their homes, especially during construction.

I strongly object to construction of the El Dorado Senior Resort. I don’t see an upside to residents of Dorado Woods supporting this venture. To us, it’s loss of property value and loss of quality of life. It means just more noise pollution, traffic pollution, population and wear and tear to Koki Ln. and adjacent streets and roads. There may even be a greater fire risk if any of the seniors or employees of the facility are smokers.

The only development I could possibly support would be a development of affordable, single family homes, similar to those in Dorado Woods. I understand the incentive to EDC and to Jim Davies, et al, to try to build the larger, more profitable facility. The impact would be too great on the residents of Dorado Woods and surrounding community. Please reconsider.

Yours truly,

  
Dyanna Sweeney

5573 Crossbill Ln,

El Dorado, CA 95623

5/17/2019

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Conditional use permit CUP18-0009/ El Dorado senior resort

PC 5/23/19  
#4



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

---

## Fwd: Conditional use permit CUP18-0009/ El Dorado senior resort

---

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>  
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Thu, May 16, 2019 at 3:53 PM

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

From: **Donna Neff** <donna3jkm@yahoo.com>  
Date: Thu, May 16, 2019 at 3:47 PM  
Subject: Conditional use permit CUP18-0009/ El Dorado senior resort  
To: <planning@edcgov.us>

Regarding Conditional Use permit CUP18-0009/El Dorado Senior Resort.

I am a homeowner at 5508 Crossbill Lane, El Dorado. I would like to submit my concerns over the proposed El Dorado Senior Resort.

1. My main concern is the invasion of privacy for myself and my neighbors. The proposed two-story commercial and three-story residential buildings are not consistent with existing structures and aesthetic of the area.
2. The removal of existing trees (especially at the fence line on Crossbill) will exacerbate the issue of privacy mentioned above. These trees are also essential in reducing traffic noise from Pleasant Valley Road and Koki lane.
3. I am also concerned with traffic within the Koki Lane area. This area is already severely impacted during school activities, and a development of this size will add a significant amount of traffic in the area.
4. I am concerned with light pollution in my backyard and back windows due to the street lighting and facility illumination this development will need.

Due to the concerns listed above, I must oppose the development of the El Dorado Senior Resort.

Donna Neff