



PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION

<https://www.edcgov.us/Government/Planning>

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

Phone (530) 621-5355, Fax (530) 642-0508

Date: May 20, 2025

To: Board of Supervisors (Agenda Date: July 29, 2025)

From: Ande Flower, Planning Manager, and Cameron Welch, Senior Planner

Subject: **Serrano Village M-5 (TM24-0001, Z24-0001, PD24-0001)**

Planning Commission Recommended Action for the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) Deny the Serrano M5 Project, Tentative Subdivision Map TM24-0001, Planned Development Permit PD24-0001, and Rezone Z24-0001; and
- 2) Authorize the Chair to sign Resolution XXXX, denying Tentative Subdivision Map TM24-0001, Planned Development Permit PD24-0001, and Rezone Z24-0001, based on the Findings as recommended by the Planning Commission (Attachment E). (Supervisory District 1)

Project Description

The proposed Tentative Subdivision Map, Rezone, and Planned Development includes the following:

1. Subdivision of an existing 8.42-acre lot into 20 residential lots ranging in size from 7,000 square feet to 19,763 square feet, four (4) landscaping lots ranging in size from 435 to 3,485 square feet, and one (1) open space lot of 1.99 acres (86,685 square feet), with multiple phases presented for final map filing;
2. Rezone from R20K to R1-PD on 6.42 acres and OS (Open Space) on 1.99 acres;
3. Planned Development to add the -PD overlay to the requested Rezone and establish modified development standards for the Village M5 site; and
4. Design Waivers requested for the following County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM):
 - a. Modification of Standard Plan 101B and 114 for roadway right-of-way and improvement widths (including sidewalks, curbs and turnarounds) as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map.

- b. Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median.
- c. Reduction of standard lot frontage width of 60 feet to a minimum width of 36 feet.
- d. Exceedances of 3:1 lot width to depth ratio for Lots 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, and 15-19 per DISM Volume II, Section 2:A.2.
- e. Creation of a flag lot for Lot 1 per DISM Volume II, Section 2:B.7.

Project History

TM24-0001, Z24-0001, PD24-0001 was heard by the Planning Commission on March 13, 2025. Public comment was received on the project, including concerns about adhering to the specific plan, compatibility with the existing neighborhood, traffic and car queuing issues, the local Lighting and Landscape District (LLAD), the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (EDHCSD) and parks, and CEQA. A motion was made Commissioner Spaur and seconded by Commissioner Hansen to recommend denial of the project by the Board of Supervisors, based on the following reasons:

- The project is not consistent with the specific plan.
- Increased density is not appropriate for the area.
- Concerns of compatibility with the neighborhood.

By a vote of 3-1 with one absent, the Planning Commission recommended that the Tentative Parcel Map, Rezone, and Planned Development permit be denied by the Board. Further details related to these concerns are listed below.

The Planning Commission report documentation, and written comments are available from the Legistar data, listed as item #25-0387 and the record of the public hearing is available at the Legistar menu for Planning Commission on March 13, 2025.

Discussion Items Regarding Proposed Project from Planning Commissioners:

The Planning Commission noted public comments focused on vehicle stacking and associated line of sight issues at Sangiovese gate directly across from project site on Appian Way, specifically in the morning. Evacuation questions were raised relative to nearby development proposals that would also access Silva Valley Parkway. There were questions about neighborhood compatibility. The Planning Commission mentioned they may reconsider a revised project with 10 single-family lots at the project site. Commissioners suggested that since within El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, Village M was initially reserved for the largest possible lots, Ranch Estate or RE, that this application should be handled as a specific plan amendment.

Subsequent to March 13, 2025 Planning Commission

Subsequent to the March 13, 2025, Planning Commission, the applicant wishes to revise the project to align with comments to better fit in with the existing neighborhood and surrounding area, which could include reducing the number of proposed lots from 20 to 10 and withdrawal of the requested Rezone and Planned Development permits. Therefore, rather than have the Board of Supervisors make a decision on the current project that was recommended for denial by the Planning Commission, the applicant is requesting that the project be remanded to the Planning Commission to a date uncertain so the applicant may bring a revised project back to the Planning Commission for re-consideration. Staff is in agreement with this request and supports the remanding of a future-revised project to Planning Commission to a date uncertain for further consideration.

Conclusion

Based on the information received subsequent to the March 13, 2025, Planning Commission, it is the recommendation of the staff that this project be remanded to Planning Commission to a date uncertain so the applicant may revise the project and have the revised project heard and considered at a future Planning Commission date as detailed in the attached resolution.