

4/24/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - El Dorado County - Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivisio...



PC 4-26-18

#3

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

5 pages

El Dorado County - Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

1 message

PATRICK RODGERS <pj.rodgers@comcast.net>

Mon, Apr 23, 2018 at 9:54 PM

Reply-To: PATRICK RODGERS <pj.rodgers@comcast.net>

To: bosfour@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us, ken.kochevar@dot.gov, auduboncalifornia@audubon.org, drayres@ucdavis.edu, pinehillpreserve@gmail.com, rdarling@sbbmail.com, Efren.Sanchez@edcgov.us, srose@audubon.org, gfrost@audubon.org, aamos@audubon.org, sarthur@audubon.org



Cameron Ranch project Z17-0001 PD17-0001 TM17-1531.pdf

66K

Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

22 April, 2018

Comments on Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531 Parcel numbers 102-110-24,102-110-14 and 102-421-01

My wife was reviewing the El Dorado County Zoning Website this evening and noticed the above noted project that we, in the affected area, didn't receive any formal notification of from the County.

After reviewing the information, we have the following comments:

1. The traffic effects assessment mentions Peridot Drive and Green Valley as an intersection of interest. As a resident of Rescue, who lives near the proposed site, it is odd that Tourmaline Way was not included in the traffic evaluation because regardless of what the traffic evaluation assumes the traffic patterns will be; traffic will be using Tourmaline Way to get to Peridot Drive to continue to Cambridge Way. Tourmaline Way is nominally a two lane road but at the western end, cars are usually parked so as to reduce the road width to a single lane. We recommend that proposed cul da sac on (drive E) be extended to Green Valley as an Entrance and the road on Hastings be closed and converted to a cul de sac instead of whats presented.
2. The County has taken the time and review process to create development standards for property development. What is the developer offering to the area in return for the relaxation of the development standards? The rezoning request doesn't seem to address this.
3. The proposed builder chooses to request a waiver from current Laws that are in place to enhance design features added to protect mobility impaired person using wheel chair and or pedestrians. We request you say no to any and all request. The proposal ask to waive these known Federal laws regarding walkways Safety considerations. We feel this is wrong and need to be addressed, (Federal legislation title 23 of the United States 217.) We feel the proposal is not in compliance with the current ADA Americans with disability Act, July26,1990 42 U.S.C chapter 136 section 12101 et seq. APAAG. Visual impairments need to be addressed as there is a bus stop that does not currently comply. We request the no vote on this proposal because too many tight condos together next to a rural Green Valley road could lead to pedestrian collisions, injuries, and death in residential areas and along two-lane roadways. We feel this proposal offers no consideration to bicyclist, pedestrians and non motorized equipment such as wheel chairs and walkers.
4. We request that the city prepare a recent new environmental activity report because the old one is out dated because the tri-colored black bird was just added as threatened under the California Endangered species act.(Endangered Species FHWA FTA National policy NEPA need to be followed.) Migratory Bird Act. We disagree with your findings that the grassland area offers no value to the proposed area. Grasslands and pastures are crucial for raptors and terrestrial land birds. So I question who did the last environmental report stating that the area offers no value to the surrounding habitats.

Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

In short, we feel the development does nothing to improve the neighborhood, and does much negatively impact the surrounding area.

We are against the request for the Rezone and planned Development which would allow 41 residential units as proposed. The area near this area of land is part of the Federally protected migratory bird act and contains endangered birds that frequent the area. The amount of new proposed building would destroy habitats. The noise levels would also be of concern. As rural Green Valley Road has no sound barrier other than a concrete block wall that once was LOVELY with high bushes shrubs and pine trees until for some unknown reason the El Dorado County DOT has continued to remove the area trees and vegetation that once covered the walls behind the houses that face Green Valley Road thus making the area hear more noise from the cars that race through the area streets - both on Starbuck Road, Hastings Drive, Deer Valley and Green Valley Roads. The sound from motorcycles and cars and trucks seems amplified and echoes. We would like to know why this was done? Please replace all the trees and vegetation that you removed. It gave us some sound protection. It hid the glare from the CVS, Starbucks, Jamba juice, Good will store lights at night. Now we see the cars on Green Valley because our houses sit lower than that road way. We live in flood plane that our wet land protects us from as the rain water fills the drainage ditches up to our lawn areas during heavy rains. We are afraid this added hill slope will create more rain that could flood our surrounding subdivision. Will the developer pay for our flood insurance coverage that we will need if the proposed slop creates additional run off into our area. We refuse to have our water & sewer rates increase because you have to address these issues regarding Stormwater management control.

We are against the request for a waiver of El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual (DISM) and question even why this would be allowed! Our area of El Dorado county - Rescue and Cameron Park, and Shingle Springs, should be maintained to the standards of the other communities such as El Dorado Hills. Why does the county continue to allow inappropriate projects out in our area? Crime has gone up due to the fact that you have approved a cigarette store, and a hamburger shop to sell alcohol all near the proposed building site and Pleasantgrove Middle school! The students hang out at the CVS and Starbucks parking lot where the cigarette and hamburger shops are. There is already a Circle K gas station and Rite Aid that sell liquor as well as Vineyard liquor store across the street from the proposed site. I do not understand how you can allow the proposed cram packed subdivision to be approved. This over crowding of houses with no sidewalks or ADA approved paths should not be approved. There is no protection for non motorized transportation traffic, (23U.S.C.33b&c). Please reconsider this. If you live in our area you would see how nice our community is. We do not need more traffic. Our roads were never as congested as they are now. Animals die everyday on the roadways due to the traffic. We feel three stores that sell liquor on three out of the four corners of Green Valley Road and Cameron Park Road all surrounding your proposed site is enough problems for our once quiet area. You already approved the building of 10 ugly townhouse right on Rural Green Valley road that have impacted our community. Please do not approve this new proposal. We also don't understand why we were not notified of this proposal when our neighborhood will be impacted immensely!!!!!! We are against the request to reduce the right of way and road way width, etc. When the surrounding rural communities are already reduced to two lanes and often have cars parked on the streets making the passing very difficult so a smaller road way doesn't make since. We are against the proposal to reduce the side walk distance. As many ADA compliance needs to be accordance with the state and federal requirements.

The noise and Fugitive dust (PM10) bad air quality that the building of such homes would create isn't fair to us homeowners. The building of high soundwalls does not fit the rest of our area of wood fences. The current houses will be looking at a proposed concrete wall. This will detract from our current environment. (This is not Southern California after all!) . Your proposal says the 6 foot walls will be enough to contain the sound. I disagree with this and question how can sound be contained to a 6 foot wall? I am sure it will travel to the surrounding communities and create a sound nuisance. In my opinion 41 Condos equals at least 120 voices of people out on their patios will create a sound nuisance. More people will tax our fire department services and hospitals. Does the builder plan to build more hospitals and Fire/ Police Departments? It already takes over 25 mins to get a police response to our area because of limited resources. People die now because help doesn't arrive on time due to limited resources. Can the city guarantee that this response time wont increase? Will the builder pay to build a new School in the area? As more people move in more children will need a place to attend school. Will the city with their approval to allow less ADA or no ADA compliant side walks and or limit of parking guarantee the safety of the surrounding children at the abutting Emerald Meadows neighborhood and surrounding areas?The proposal shows no visitor parking spaces and without ample visitor parking , the surrounding neighborhoods will end up with cars parking on their one lane rural street because your proposal offers no visitor spaces. The Rural road way now is fairly quiet but your proposal will impact the surrounding wetland and Rural roadways impacting the safety of the children who play in their front yards near the road ways . Rural Road ways will be impacted. Peoples lives will impacted, so will habitats and Federally protected , bumble bees, butterflies, Golden Eagles, Ferruginous Hawk, trio colored blackbirds, Coopers Hawk, raptors, elderberry beetles & OTHER ENDANGERED animals too many to list here. The area has black birds & tri-colored black bird that nest in the wetland this bird is protected and so is it's breeding habitat.

We request you say NO the the proposal based on the fact that we homeowners will be impacted both visually, auditory by noise, by health issues from particulate dust in the air, stirred up from the building site, our local fire response teams to local ambulances will need to be enlarged. The noise on Green Valley has increased. We as tax paying home owners have had enough of this. We in good faith chose to live here to have a quiet environment to raise our families and you are choosing to ignore our request and laws . Please do not approve this house, apt/proposal. More cars would frequent our roadways or or be parked all over the surrounding neighborhoods. This distracts from the area. You mention nothing of the prices these condo/apts would be sold at or are they rentals?? We feel this project would disrupt our current ways of living if approved. Our current property values are rising and we feel this project of condos would lower property values. Please listen to the homeowners . We have to live in this town. We like our community the way it is. Please stop taking it away form us. Animals have been harmed by more traffic, habitats are threatened. The proposal mentions nothing about lighting. This area is part of the migratory belt way for birds who rely on dark sky to migrate. What about height restrictions for the houses as there is an airport down the road. The FAA has density laws regarding building near airparks. How does the city plan to get around this? I request a full FAA report be completed to prove that more houses & human life ,right in a flight pattern wont be at risk. How does the proposal plan to add lights and what kind to the areas?There is within eye sight the protected rare plant area of Pine Hill Preserve, Rescue, CA. This area will be affected by more noise, light and loss of habitats. The planning department should think about what the community needs are instead of filling a beautiful empty space with cram packed houses. Cutting corners isn't the solution. Watch how many local children in the area play at the Rite Aid/Starbucks parking across from your

Cameron Ranch project (Rezone Z17-0001/Planned Development PD17-0001/Tentative Subdivision Map TM17-1531)

proposed site. More cramped houses will mean no place for kids to play. You already have given the area a Rite Aid, a CVS and a hamburger shop that sells beer and, cigarettes shop -all across from your proposed site all right next store. If this is what the city planners have in mind for our community then then I am appalled. I recommend you drive out to this area and see for yourself what you have already created and it isn't a pretty site. We are hard working law abiding tax payers who have been here for a long time. We accepted some change but after seeing what you give us. The choices need to be better, our area deserves better. Please reconsider this proposal and vote no. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick Rodgers and Constance Rodgers
Pj.rodgers@comcast.net

cc: Efren Sanchez, Community Development Services, Planning and building Department
Michael Ranelli - Supervisor Fourth District bosfour@edcgov.us
Shiva Frentzen - Supervisor Second District bostwo@edcgov.us
John Hidahl - Supervisor First District bosone@edcgov.us
Robert Peters - El Dorado County Planning planning@edcgov.usgov.us
ken.kochevar@dot.gov
Sara Rose, Executive Director Audubon CA auduboncalifornia@audubon.org
Garrison Frost, Directory of Advocacy and communications
Debra Ayres, PHD, drayres@ucdavis.edu
Graciela Hinshaw pinehillpreserve@gmail.com
Sierra Foothills Audubon Rudy Darling rdarling@sbbmail.com

4/25/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting

PC 4-26-18

#3

4 Pages



Serena Carter <serena.carter@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting

1 message

Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>
To: Serena Carter <serena.carter@edcgov.us>
Cc: Efren Sanchez <efren.sanchez@edcgov.us>

Wed, Apr 25, 2018 at 7:52 AM

Serena,

Please prep this email and the attachment for public comment received 04-24-18 for the Cameron Ranch project being considered by the Planning Commission on April 26, 2018. Include this with any other public comment being uploaded today for this project. Thank you.

Char Tim
Clerk of the Planning Commission

County of El Dorado
Planning and Building Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5351 / FAX (530) 642-0508
charlene.tim@edcgov.us

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

From: **EDC COB** <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
Date: Wed, Apr 25, 2018 at 7:47 AM
Subject: Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting
To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>, The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>

fyi

Office of the Clerk of the Board
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5390

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

From: **K Frevert / H Levenson** <kathyhoward85@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Apr 24, 2018 at 8:32 PM
Subject: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Please see the attached letter for our comments regarding the Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

<https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=baf0d8fdbd&jsver=OeNArYUPo4g.en.&view=pt&search=inbox&th=162fd4b09107b9cb&siml=162fd4b09107b9cb>

18-0578 Public Comment
PC Rcvd 04-24-18

4/25/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comments on Cameron Ranch Project on the agenda for the April 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting

Kathy and Howard Levenson
Kathyhoward85@yahoo.com



Cameron Ranch Development ,4-24-2018.docx
20K

April 24, 2018
Roger Trout, Division Director
El Dorado County Planning
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
edc.cob@edcgov.us

Re: Cameron Ranch Project

Dear Mr. Trout,

We would like to express our opposition to the proposed Cameron Ranch Project, as proposed. This project would increase traffic on rural Starbuck Road and Hastings roads. The parcel is currently zoned Rural Lands Twenty-Acre. Further, the project appears to encroach into the rural Rescue area could induce new development or redevelopment in Rescue as the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary is amended. Leave development in Cameron Park to areas currently covered in the boundary.

While we oppose the redesignation of the project site to increase the intensity of development in the area and the encroachment of the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary into Rescue, we offer the following comments on the project as currently proposed.

1. **Sidewalks.** The language in the Conditions of Approval document dated April 26, 2018 provides ambiguous language on page 10 stating "Pedestrian/bike paths (**Recommended**): The proposed subdivision **shall** include sidewalks and bike path (Class 1) connecting the project to adjacent subdivisions..." The words "recommended" together with "shall" make this sentence unclear. The word "recommended" should be deleted for items 38, 39, and 40 so these items are clearly included, indicated by the word "shall". It is also unclear where sidewalks would be placed. They should go throughout the neighborhood so people and cars are not mixed together on the street. This is a basic safety issue. Additionally, sidewalks need to extend to other sidewalks on adjacent properties, which unfortunately are lacking. For example, the adjacent apartment complex on the corner of Hastings and Green Valley Road doesn't have sidewalks and is unattractive. That should be fixed to create a safe and pleasant neighborhood.
2. **Park or play areas.** Item 7 on the Conditions for Approval says the development should pay parkland dedication fees. *Where is the park the fees would go towards and can people in the neighborhood walk to the park? And how much are the fees?* Some area in the neighborhood should be designated as a point where people can gather as there isn't such a place on the north side of Green Valley Road. Busy roads are real dividing lines and Green Valley Road has a lot of traffic. To have piecemeal development, one after another, without parks, sidewalks, and bike paths, is not creating a very nice community. Even the low-income housing on Bass Lake Road and Green Valley Road offers a pool for its residents. If there are going to be urban-like densities, then there should be urban-like amenities such as neighborhood parks.
3. **Transportation.** It is very important that Hwy 50 traffic flows. It functions as our county's main street. All residents are negatively impacted with more traffic and there are some enormous projects being built in the region. *What other projects in the county and just across the county line also are seeking higher density and what would be the cumulative impact of these projects on roads and highways?*

In 2016, El Dorado County voters approved Measure E, which includes a number of requirements regarding traffic impacts from residential development projects. *How does the County propose to implement Measure E for this site?*

4. **Oak trees.** The project description notes the project has some oak canopy and the removal of one large oak tree. First of all, it is possible to construct a road around a tree (examples exist in Curtis Park in Sacramento). Time and time again developers fence off oak trees but the area blocked off is either too small or soil is placed on the tree roots regardless of fencing. Oak trees die when soil is placed under them or on their roots. It doesn't take place immediately, but within a few years they are dead (examples are found at the Rite Aid location and nearby golf course). *What assurances do we have that there will be adequate county oversight and enforcement of any agreement concerning protection of oaks?*

5. **Public Safety.** Regarding other County services, with the Sheriff's department currently understaffed, how will law enforcement be affected by additional high-density units in this area? Will additional patrols be established and will more deputies or other staff be needed to accommodate this level of development in the rural area of Rescue?

For the record, we would like to restate our opposition to the redesignation of the site for urban development. If the project moves forward, any proposal for development of this site should be accompanied by an EIR that fully analyzes the potential physical impacts that such a development would cause in the area and on County services and the project should have basic amenities found in urban areas, if it is going to be urban in density. It appears that the alternative of less dense housing would be what residents expected in a rural community.

Please include us on all future correspondence for this project.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Howard Levenson
1590 Velvet Horn Lane, Rescue, CA 95672
email: kathyhoward85@yahoo.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)