
Comments for Planning Commission Hearing on Item #4 Serrano Village M rezone to townhomes zero lot line. Add new private to public road Apian Way. PROJECT 24-0001

From tara.mook@comcast.net <tara.mook@comcast.net>

Date Wed 3/12/2025 12:46 PM

To David Spaur <David.Spaur@edcgov.us>; Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>; jeff.wagner@edcgov.us <jeff.wagner@edcgov.us>; Andy Nevis <Andy.Nevis@edcgov.us>; Patrick Frega <Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us>; Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>; Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>; Rafael Martinez <Rafael.Martinez@edcgov.us>; BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>; Cameron W. Welch <Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

TO:

PLANNING COMMISSION

David.Spaur@edcgov.us

Bob.Williams@edcgov.us

Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us

Andy.Nevis@edcgov.us

Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us

PLANNING COMMISSION CLERK OF THE BOARD

Rhiannon Guilford, Clerk of the Planning Commission

planning@edcgov.us

EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING DIRECTOR

Karen L. Garner, Executive Secretary

Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us

COMMENTS ON SERRANO VILLAGE M-5 PROJ24-0001

1. **Zoning Change not requiring review, CEQA, and public input** - Developer Parker Development is requesting a change in zoning from 1/2 single family homes to zero lot line townhomes. Rezoning from a Zone Change from R20K to R1-PD and OS. Planned Development to add PD overlay to Zone Change. The response given by Parker Development states it's in an attachment, but attachment is not locatable on eTrakit. This significant and incompatible Zoning change from 1/2 acre parcels to high density down to 6000 sf parcels for townhouses supports that this land locked property to change zoning to the highest density is not be compatible with surrounding zoning and land use and therefore does not meet the Conditions of the Specific Plan Conditions to bypass CEQA project review. Certain Conditions must exist for the Specific Plan to not have to do a CEQA review with the necessary studies. This is just one of many conditions that are not met to bypass CEQA. This was not considered in the Specific Plan and the high

density Zero lot line was just introduced recently. This ZONING change to zero lot line town homes brings significant and unmitigable changes that must be studied and reviewed for the resulting impacts .

- This would bring allowable lot size down to 6000 sf lots surrounded by development of mostly 1/2 acre lots and some 1 acre lots. This infill is significantly incompatible with the surrounding zoning of 1/2 acre and larger lots. How is this allowed to circumvent CEQA review and public engagement. The Planner stated a number of times that this project was Statutorily Exempt and per Section 15182. In the last few days the County added to the Agenda * A Negative Declaration has been prepared to satisfy CEQA. But the County stated no Negative declaration or any CEQA documents has been done for this project.
- The request for Zoning change is significantly incompatible with existing zoning and setbacks - (0 and 5 ft setbacks side, 15ft set back front). 8.42 acres with proposed doubling of units from 10 to 20. This is not compatible with surrounding zoning on all sides of existing residential zoning. Why is this not required to go through CEQA review? This is not compliant with El Dorado County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. What in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan allows for incompatible zoning to take precedence over the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan and Safety Element?
- **VARIANCES are being given on this project that are not supported.**

Sec. 130.52.070 - Variance.

A. Content. This Section describes the process for County consideration of requests to modify certain standards of this Title (Title 130, Zoning Ordinance) when, because of special circumstances applicable to the property, including location, shape, size, surroundings, topography, or other physical features, the strict application of the development standards for the zone denies the property owner rights enjoyed by other property owners in the vicinity and in the same zone.

B. Applicability. A Variance may be granted to modify any development standards as set forth in this Title. A Variance may not be used to authorize a use or activity not otherwise allowed within the zone.

C. Approving Authority and CEQA. The Zoning Administrator shall have the review authority of original jurisdiction for a Variance authorization. The approval of a Variance is a discretionary project pursuant to CEQA.

D. Findings Required. A Variance shall be granted by the review authority only where all of the following circumstances are found to apply:

There are special circumstances or exceptional characteristics or conditions relating to the land, building, or use referred to in the application, which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to land, buildings, or uses in the vicinity and the same zone;

The strict application of the zoning regulations as they apply to the subject property would deprive the subject property of the privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and the same zone (California Government Code Section 65906);

A variance granted shall not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which such property is situated (California Government Code Section 65906); and

The granting of the Variance is compatible with the maps, objectives, policies, programs, and general land uses specified in the General Plan and any applicable specific plan, and not detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to the neighborhood.

Conditions of Approval. In approving a Variance, the review authority may impose any conditions deemed reasonable and necessary to ensure that the approval will comply with the findings required in Subsection D (Findings Required) above in this Section.

2. Cost Analysis - The project fails to provide full cost analysis of buildout, including utility build outs, pavement of streets and roads to lane line to lane line full width pavement, and identify all costs that will be paid for by the developer and what will be paid for by the tax payer.

3. Grading, Erosion, Drainage- The Project fails to provide minimal drainage and grading plans that gives the decision makers and the public minimal information to make informed decisions. The project fails to ensure the project improvement plans, drainage plans and grading plans conform to the County Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, Grading Design Manual, the Drainage Manual, Storm Water Ordinance (Ord. No. 5022), Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance, and all applicable State of California Water Quality Control Orders, the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards, Pedestrian Standards and the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Please provide complete Project plans so that decision makers and the public can make informed decisions based on complete and accurate information. There is significant concern that due to the steepness of the parcel the added coverage and the lack of drainage handling this would create a significant impact especially during heavy rain periods. The project fails in providing a complete and thorough hydraulic study and drainage plan.

4. Drainage Plan:

1. What is the size and capacity of the Proposed Hydromodification Basin. Show the direction of flow for all storm drains is accurate, it appears the 18" storm drain at far right of basin or far east of basin drains out and follows the topography North and across into the Highland View Subdivision, specifically onto the first Highland View residential lot after crossing lot C. Is that correct?
2. Where is the hydraulic study to show that hydromodification basin will not exceed capacity during high year storms and hence prevent flooding, erosion or seepage to the properties below? Has a complete downstream flood model been done for the project. There are a couple of pinch points that look like they could create drainage impacts and produce flooding.
3. Please provide complete Hydraulic Study and Drainage report and Drainage design for this development. This is a very steep terrain parcel which will produce fast and concentrated runoff. The drainage plans do not show how drainage is being addressed downstream and offsite. This is a significant concern and a very critical and fundamental planning item. Has evaluation been done specific to downslope existing homes. All downslope properties need to be assessed for how they are accepting runoff from this steep parcel development and how down stream lots will not be damaged or impacted due to flooding.
4. Where is the hydraulic study to show that hydromodification basin will not exceed capacity during high year storms and hence prevent flooding, erosion or seepage to the properties below? Please show downstream capacities will not be exceeded and no Highland View properties would be subject to flooding as well as when it enters Sterlingshire at the north end where drainage flows under Loch Way. There are potentially parcels that are at low elevations on that end. A Hydraulic study is need to verify will not flood as a result of added drainage into this tributary.

5. The drainage plans do not show how drainage is being addressed downstream and offsite. This is a significant concern and a very critical and fundamental planning item. Has evaluation been done specific to downslope existing homes, as well as runoff into the creek maintained by Highland View Subdivision and eventually Sterlingshire.
6. The majority of runoff of the lots on the north side appear to be funneled to Lot C and into the Creek that feeds into Highland View Subdivision. Has an analysis been done to determine if any flooding will be created downstream. This is critical due to the steepness of the project and the added coverage of the proposed townhouse project with zero lot lines. Will treated grey water (sewer water) be diverted into the creek from the landscaping runoff.

5. Utility Plans- There is only one Plan Sheet labeled "Tentative Grading and Drainage Plan". This plan sheet also shows Utilities. Is there a separate Utility Plan sheet? All Utilities need to be presented and represented accurately so that the decision makers and the public can be adequately informed. Are there any above ground utilities, Provide full plan sheets of new utility build, utility tie ins as well as utility studies of effected roads that will be impacted by added, modified or resized utilities.

6. Stormwater Management: Comply with the West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Storm Water Plan. Provide current SWPP for the proposed project.

7. Regulatory Permits and Documents: Identify all regulatory permits and agreements between the project and any State or Federal Agency into the Project Grading and Improvement Plans prior to the start of construction of What regulatory permits and documents have been required for this project? Is a 404 Water Quality Control Board Permit Required. It appears there are wetlands identified on Lot C of the Plans that will be modified and filled it. Has permitting been done. This again is another condition that negates the Specific Plan being called out as being able to omit CEQA Environmental review.

8. Grading or Improvement plans

- **Grading/construction of improvements may not proceed until the appropriate permits or agreements are obtained**, and the grading/improvement plans reflect any necessary changes or modifications to reflect such permits or agreements. Grading started 2 years ago with necessary permits not yet applied for.
- **Project conditions of approval** Per County Conditions and guidelines, project conditions of approval shall be incorporated into the Project Improvement Plans when submitted for review. Please provide all project conditions.
- **Electronic Documentation:** Upon completion of the required improvements, provide As-Built Plans to the County Engineer in TIFF format, provide final Drainage and Geotechnical reports, and structural wall calculations. Will these be made available in eTrakit under the project? All project plans and documents shall be sufficient in scope and design to the decision makers as well as the public enough information to make informed decisions. Projects shall not be approved then designed after approval or offsite improvements conditioned and designed after approval. This kicks the can down the road to the tax payer to pick up the cost of the offsite necessary improvements or traffic safety mitigations.

9. Transportation Impact Study (TIS) was required to evaluate traffic operations at the Silva Valley Parkway/Appian Way intersection. Why was an intersection study not done at Appian and Sangiovese? A Traffic Impact Analysis needs to be done for the proposed new 4 way intersection at the proposed Appian Way/ Sangeovese.

El Dorado County Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (Nov. 2014) says the following in Section II (2):

- *At a minimum, an On-Site Transportation Review is required for every project. The following information shall be evaluated and the findings stamped by a registered Traffic Engineer or Civil Engineer, and shall be included with the project submittal:*
- *Existence of any current traffic problems in the local area such as a high-accident location, non-standard intersection or roadway, or an intersection in need of a traffic signal*
- *Proximity of proposed site driveway(s) to other driveways or intersections*
- *Adequacy of vehicle parking relative to both the anticipated demand and zoning code requirements*
- *Adequacy of the project site design to fully satisfy truck loading demand on-site, when the anticipated number of deliveries and service calls may exceed 10 per day*
- *Adequacy of the project site design to provide at least a 25' minimum required throat depth (MRTD) at project driveways. Include calculation of the MRTD*
- *Adequacy of the project site design to convey all vehicle types*
- *Adequacy of sight distance on-site*
- *Queuing analysis of "drive-through" facilities*

10. Site Distance Calculations - Please provide the Traffic Geometric evaluation that is required at Appian/Sangiovese including site distance vertical, horizontal and corner-site distance. Provide any Geometric changes anticipated and study of conflicting traffic movements presently and at build out.

Was turn radius of all EDH Fire vehicles evaluated specific to Appian Way in and out of project location at this proposed new easement that would create a 4 way intersection? No where in the project documents does it state if the intersection is uncontrolled or controlled. This is a very critical element of the design and Traffic Impact Analysis.

General plan policy TC-X projects may be required to construct offsite improvements. This project needs to be evaluated for offsite improvements needed at first occupancy. It is concerning to many residents both in Serrano and Highland View how this location can be made worse with offsite intersection as stated adding a fourth leg with no review or analysis of this newly created intersection on a significant grade with limited site distance.

11. Gated access at proposed new easement for Village M-5 -across from Sangiovese also a gated easement. What is the anticipated back up on to Appian Way and how will all conflicting vehicle movements be addressed at this now newly created intersection?

- It states in the documentation supplied through eTrakit that a 4th leg would be created at this now T intersection at Appia Way and Sangiovese. Two legs private roads and two legs that are the existing thoroughfare public road Appian Way. This creates a 4-way intersection with significantly limited site distance. There is nothing on any of the Project

documents on eTrakit stating if this proposed 4-way intersection would be controlled or uncontrolled.

- These kinds of easements on a throughway create the environment for rear ends due to limited site distance, abrupt stops of traffic accelerating up the hill or decelerating down the hill, abrupt stops from deliveries, drop offs, unfamiliar with the easement location. Without shoulders to go around, as we see throughout El Dorado Hills, these kinds of easements create rear end potential. Netherdale Street just down the road is a classic example of this with a high rate of rear ends. Although Netherdale has site distance and a flat terrain, this proposed easement does not, making it an even higher potential for rear ends. This substantiates the project cannot meet existing Specific Plan conditions and introduces significant impacts that must be reviewed, studied and mitigated.

12. Specific Plan states on page 17 Silva Valley Parkway shall be designed to the full four lane section from the Western edge of Village P to Green Valley Road prior to the commencement of any development allowed by the Specific Plan. Please clarify. (Note: in Feb. 24th meeting, Parker confirmed they had provided dedicated right of way to the county for this expansion). Is this in county CIP?

13. El Dorado Hill Fire Department letter 7/1/2024 – When will these Fire Department Concerns and Documented omissions be resolved?

- Sufficient emergency water supply -No
- Comply with defensible space - No.
- Have WUI Fire Safe Plan - No

14. LRA vs SRA - Proposed project is in the EDHFD service boundary. Why is the project in the Cal Fire SRA and not Local Responsibility Area if it is in a local Fire jurisdiction boundary that services by EDHFD as well as paid for by the residents. Please Clarify.

15. The documents state Project is within the vicinity of federal land that is high risk of Wildfire .What Federal land is being identified? There is no specificity identified here. Please provide a specific distance and description of federal lands in vicinity.

16. Letter 5/15/24 Discuss or determine a public hearing date. The El Dorado County Planner stated their will be no public hearing due to the project being Statutorily Exempt by virtue of a Specific Plan.

Who made the environmental determination and on what basis?

What are the final proposed project conditions?

ETrakit letter refers to a public hearing date, please clarify.

17. The El Dorado County Planner stated no CEQA review will be done nor public notice and comment required based on Parker Development having a 1988 Specific Plan. The Basis for this is:

California Code of Regulations #15182, Section C, Item 1

The California Code 15182 states that a project proponent cannot circumvent CEQA if certain conditions apply. We believe the above questions, concerns and factual references reflect that certain conditions apply and the project must do a CEQA review of the project.

18. Incomplete Project Documents: Consistency with County Codes and Standards. Per County Code all applications must provide complete application and project plans that give enough information to the decision makers. tax payers and and the public. This Project fails in providing even the basic requirements of County Standards, MUTCD Guidelines, Complete and even near adequate Drainage Plans, Hydraulic Study. Geotechnical report, Traffic Impact Analysis for a new intersection, Cost Analysis of the infrastructure and utilities required for this build of a requested high density Zero Lot line Townhomes and basic Geometric evaluation of intersection being proposed at Appian Way/ Sangeovese which is significantly lacking in Site Distance and basic Geometric Standards. Both side streets into these gated developments will create stopped traffic and back up on and horizontal / vertical curve with significantly limited site distance. El Dorado Hills APAC subcommittee has asked DOT for the site distance calculations going on a month now since the sign acknowledging this project Village M-5 went up mid Feb. No response has been received from DOT on Site Distance Calculations.

We ask the Planning Commission to review all comments and require the developer provide full design, Traffic Studies and site distance calculations before recommending action on this Project 24-0001. These impacts identified will result in significant impacts to the surrounding existing uses. Asking the existing tax payers, residents to absorb the impacts, traffic delays, introduction of significant safety concerns at a proposed 4 way intersection either controlled or uncontrolled is not in conformance with the Project circumventing CEQA review because it has a Specific Plan from 1988 that does not take into consideration nor could not consider these significant and unmitigable impacts.

We are committed to good Planning and Good Governance. We only ask of our Planning Commission to look at these projects in a fair and transparent manner. All information should be provided to allow not only the Decision Makers and Stakeholder but also the public to be able to be informed and make informed decisions. We present that this project must provide a CEQA review for a discretionary project.

Tara Mccann, Committee Chair
Residents of The Green Valley Corridor
El Dorado County Residents

SERRANO VILLAGE M-5 PROJ24-0001

From Stephanie Hansen <gshansen@gmail.com>

Date Wed 3/12/2025 2:15 PM

To Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>; David Spaur <David.Spaur@edcgov.us>; Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>; Jeff Hansen <Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us>; Andy Nevis <Andy.Nevis@edcgov.us>; Patrick Frega <Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

SERRANO VILLAGE M-5 PROJ24-0001

Hi,

We are owners in Highland View. There are currently traffic and safety issues we encounter at Appian and Sangiovese gate entering/exiting our neighborhood.

We have identified a number of impacts from:

1. Proposed 4 way intersection at Sangeovese and Appian Way (controlled or uncontrolled?)
2. Site Distance at this easement and a needed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) to determine back up and conflicts.
3. Drainage
4. Utilities

Thank you.

Stephanie & Greg Hansen