

LATE DISTRIBUTION

38



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
2012 MAY -1 AM 11:58

2012 Board
Chair
John Hidahl
Vice Chair
Jeff Haberman
Secretary/Treasurer
Alice Klinger

April 30, 2012

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
Attn: John Knight District 1 Supervisor and Chairman
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: APAC Comments on the County's Resolutions of Intent to amend the General Plan (182-2011 Targeted General Plan Amendment-TGPA) and the Zoning Ordinance Update-ZOU (183-2011)

Dear Supervisor Knight,

The El Dorado Hills APAC established a TGPA/ZOU subcommittee in February of this year, based upon notification from County of the intent to make modifications to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. APACs subcommittee has reviewed the referenced ROIs and attempted to make some initial assessments of the impacts of the proposed changes to the residents of El Dorado Hills.

We would like to acknowledge and thank the various members of the County Planning Department and DOT who have helped define and clarify the range of changes being proposed and under consideration (both 'above the line' and 'below the line'). Based on our cursory review we have identified several proposed changes that we believe will have major or moderate impacts to EDH. The attached document identifies the proposed policy sections of both of the documents that we are currently conducting more in-depth analysis on.

We see three major issues with the proposed changes: 1) Net impacts to Traffic (ref. LOS F) and public safety (including correcting current major EDH circulator line of site visibility limitations and inadequately designed egress/ingress from and to the circulators); 2) Reductions in current open space requirements/criteria will result in elimination of the Quality of life (more destruction of the natural environment, including wildlife habitat in future residential developments) that most residents moved to EDH to enjoy and; 3) Changes in Planned Development criteria/requirements that result in further densification. The overriding concern is that the required infrastructure improvements must be implemented prior to or concurrently with development. El Dorado County has a long history of not being able to fully fund required infrastructure enhancements dictated by development impacts (i.e. EDH Blvd and Highway 50 Interchange) concurrent with the impacts invoked, and have recently reduced the EDH RIF fees, which further exacerbates the problem of the cumulative impacts of decades of underfunded road expansions/improvements.

Consequently, this letter serves to categorize the areas of greatest concern to us, with summary commentary on each (see attachment). These impacts will require thorough EIR analysis to define the full range of mitigation measures that need to be evaluated and

ultimately implemented. We will provide a more detailed assessment of our concerns before the May 15th BOS meeting, but are also exploring pursuing an EDH overlay for the General Plan that would provide specific criteria for EDH in a manner similar to the original EDH/Salmon Falls Area Plan (circa mid 1980s).

We look forward to working with County staff to find solutions/mitigation measures to resolve/reduce the concerns/issues that EDH residents face in light of the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

John Hidahl

John Hidahl,
Chairman, APAC

cc: BOS 2, BOS 3, BOS 4, BOS 5
Planning Commission
APAC Read File