

**COUNTY OF EL DORADO
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: April 28, 2022

Staff: Gina Hamilton

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT/SPECIFIC PLAN
AMENDMENT/REZONE/TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION
MAP/DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

FILE NUMBERS: A14-0003/SP12-0002/Z14-0005/SP86-0002-R/Z14-0005/
PD14-0004/TM14-1516/DA14-0003/Central El Dorado Hills Specific
Plan

APPLICANT/AGENT: Serrano Associates, LLC

REQUEST: Proposed Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (CEDHSP), comprised of the development of the Serrano Westside (234 acres) and Pedregal (102 acres) planning areas (**Exhibit A**), consists of the following entitlement requests:

General Plan Amendments

- An amendment to the County General Plan Land Use Map designation of subject lands in the CEDHSP from High-Density Residential (HDR) (1–5 du/ac), Multifamily Residential (MFR) (5–24 du/ac), Open Space (OS), and Adopted Plan–El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (AP-EDHSP) to Adopted Plan–Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (AP-CEDHSP) and CEDHSP land use designations Village Residential Low (VRL) (1.0 du/ac), Village Residential High (VRH) (14–24 du/ac), Village Residential Medium High (VRM-H) (8–14 du/ac), Village Residential Medium Low (VRM-L) (5–8 du/ac), Civic–Limited Commercial (C-LC), Open Space (OS), and Community Park (CP) (**Exhibit B**);
- An amendment to the County General Plan Land Use Map designation of transferred lands of approximately 136 acres in AP-EDHSP as Open Space (OS) in the CEDHSP;

El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP) Amendments

- An amendment to the EDHSP to transfer approximately 136 acres (currently within Serrano Village D1, Lots C and D, and a portion of open space by Village

D2) affecting portions of APN 121-040-020, 121-040-029, 121-040-031, and 121-120-024 from the EDHSP area to the CEDHSP area (**Exhibit C**);

Specific Plan Adoption

Adoption and implementation of a comprehensive plan (CEDHSP) regulating the development and management of up to 1,000 dwelling units, 11 acres of civic-limited commercial use, approximately 15 acres of public community park, 1 acre of neighborhood park, and approximately 174 acres of natural open space (**Attachment 1**). **Attachment 2** consists of proposed textual edits to the Specific Plan. The CEDHSP adoption includes adoption of its Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) (**Attachment 3**).

Rezone

- Rezone existing zoning districts from Single-Unit Residential (R1), Single-Unit Residential–Planned Development (R1-PD), Multi-Unit Residential (RM), Recreational Facilities High (RFH), and Open Space (OS) to CEDHSP zoning districts Multi-family Residential–Planned Development Medium Density (8–14 du/ac) and High Density (14–24 du/ac) (RM1-PD, RM2-PD), Single-Family Residential–Planned Development (R20-PD [20,000-square-foot minimum lot] and R4-PD [4,000-square-foot minimum lot]), Civic–Limited Commercial–Planned Development (CL1-PD), Community Park (RFH1-PD), and Open Space–Planned Development (OS1-PD) (**Exhibit D**);
- Rezone existing zoning district of transferred lands in AP-EDHSP as OS1-PD.

Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map

Division of the CEDHSP plan area into five large lots for purposes of sale, lease, or financing of the development within the specific plan area (**Exhibit E**).

Planned Development Permit

Establishment of a Development Plan for the proposed CEDHSP development that includes construction of up to 1,000 dwelling units, up to 50,000 square feet of limited commercial or civic uses, and establishment of approximately 56 percent of the site for open space area and park uses.

Development Agreement

Enter and execute a Development Agreement between the County of El Dorado and Serrano Associates, LLC, for the CEDHSP.

LOCATION: The CEDHSP is in the El Dorado Hills Community Region and is adjacent to El Dorado Hills Boulevard north of US 50. The proposed Serrano Westside planning area is east of the El Dorado Hills Boulevard and

Serrano Parkway intersection. The proposed Pedregal planning area is west of El Dorado Hills Boulevard between Wilson Boulevard and Olson Lane, adjacent to the Ridgeview subdivision (**Exhibit A**). Supervisorial District 1.

APNs: 121-160-05; 120-040-20, 29, 31; 121-050-01, 05; 121-120-24 (portion) (**Exhibit F**)

ACREAGE: 336 acres

GENERAL PLAN: OS-Open Space, HDR-High-Density Residential, MFR- Multifamily Residential, AP-Adopted Plan (**Exhibit J**)

ZONING: Single-Unit Residential (R1), Single-Unit Residential–Planned Development (R1-PD), Multi-Unit Residential (RM), Recreational Facilities High (RFH), and Open Space (OS) (**Exhibit K**)

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Revised Final Environmental Impact Report (RFEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2013022044) (**Attachment 5**)

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the staff report, receive public comment, recommend certification of the CEDHSP Revised Final EIR, and direct staff on recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the CEDHSP.

POTENTIAL ACTIONS: The Planning Commission may consider the following actions:

1. Recommend adoption of the CEDHSP and associated actions to the Board of Supervisors in a future resolution that includes:
 - Make Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for CEDHSP environmental impacts
 - Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
 - Approval of the amendments to the County General Plan Land Use Map
 - Approval of the amendments to the EDHSP
 - Approve the rezoning
 - Approve the Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map
 - Approve the Planned Development Permit
 - Approval of the Development Agreement

Or

2. Recommend denial of the CEDHSP and associated actions in a future resolution to the Board of Supervisors.

Or

3. Recommend adoption of the CEDHSP and associated actions with modifications to the project as identified in a future resolution to the Board of Supervisors.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION PROCESSING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS TO DATE

The application for the CEDHSP was submitted to the County in 2012. Between 2013 and 2020, several meetings of the public and interest groups regarding the project were held by the County, the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD), the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC), and the applicant. The Planning Commission held three public hearings on the project between November 2019 and January 2020 (November 19, 2019; December 3, 2019; and January 13, 2020) with no action taken on the project. The project was continued off-calendar by the Planning Commission to allow for preparation of the Second RDEIR that addressed changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines related to the evaluation of transportation impacts and an expanded discussion of alternatives to the project.

Because of the length of time since the last Planning Commission hearing, receipt of public comment on the project during and after the public hearings, refinements to the project, and updates to regulations and setting conditions, County staff have updated the original November 19, 2019, staff report to reflect these circumstances.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CEDHSP is a comprehensive plan for the amendment of the County General Plan Land Use Map to create a new mixed development within a developed portion of the El Dorado Hills Community Region. This development would serve as infill development within the El Dorado Hills community. Since release of the original Draft EIR, the project design has been refined regarding acreage among the proposed land uses (see **Table 3**). Development of the CEDHSP area would use the existing road and utility infrastructure network, preserve open space areas, and provide additional recreational opportunities.

A key item addressed in this staff report is whether the CEDHSP can be determined consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan.

General plans are the constitution of a community. They express the community's development goals and embody public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. General plans establish a community's land use, circulation, environmental, economic, and social goals, and policies as they relate to future growth and development. They are the basis for local government decision-making, including decisions on development approvals and exactions. The El Dorado County General Plan's goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures are based on a central policy direction that is established in the Statement of Vision, Plan Strategies, Plan Concepts, and Plan Objectives that are identified in the Introduction chapter of the General Plan. These are described in detail under "Staff Evaluation of Project" below.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 1988, the County of El Dorado approved the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan for a total of 6,162 dwelling units, and the EDHSP has governed the development of the Serrano Master Planned Development community for more than 20 years. Development of the EDHSP has not reached its maximum buildout. Currently, approximately 4,614 lots exist in the Serrano community. The total anticipated buildout is estimated at 4,800 dwelling units, approximately 1,350 units fewer than approved.

The proposed CEDHSP is entirely located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region, consists of 336 acres, and is divided into two planning areas: the Serrano Westside planning area and the Pedregal planning area (**Exhibit A**).

The Serrano Westside planning area includes portions of the approved 1988 EDHSP and is currently planned for 135 dwelling units as part of Serrano Village D1, Lots C and D (**Exhibit C**). This planning area also includes the former El Dorado Hills Executive Golf Course, a par-62, 100-acre recreational amenity constructed in the early 1960s. The property was acquired by Serrano Associates (formerly El Dorado Hills Investors, LLC) in the early 1990s. The golf course was not part of or a mitigation for the 1988 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan,¹ nor was it constructed as a mitigation requirement for the El Dorado Hills–Salmon Falls Area Plan.

The El Dorado Hills CSD commissioned a study from NGF Consulting to evaluate the capital investment needed to reopen the El Dorado Hills Executive Golf Course in a way that would make it competitive in the local golf market. This study also projected the net cash flows that the El Dorado Hills CSD could expect should it spend this money and operate the golf course as a municipal golf facility. The *Operational Feasibility Analysis for El Dorado Hills Golf Course* (May 2007) concluded that several municipal golf course operators in the region have struggled to operate as a result in a drop-off in rounds played. The report identified that Sacramento County's Ancil Hoffman and Mather golf courses are down to approximately 70,000 rounds played from respective peaks of 110,000 and 90,000. The City of Rancho Cordova's 18-hole executive-length Cordova Golf Course, which may have benefited from the closure of the El Dorado Hills Executive Golf Course, reported that it is down nearly 50 percent from peak activity levels of about 120,000 in the 1990s. The NGF Consulting report notes that this drop-off in per-course activity levels in the Sacramento market is consistent with a nationwide trend caused primarily by an oversupply of public golf courses fighting for shares of stagnant markets.

The *Operational Feasibility Analysis for El Dorado Hills Golf Course* evaluation indicates that the immediate permanent resident population around the subject El Dorado Hills Executive Golf Course appears sufficient to provide a high level of activity to the golf course, but it is unlikely that this level of activity will render enough income to cover all facility expenses, reduce any capital

¹ The El Dorado Hills Specific Plan contemplated the construction of two golf courses, one private and one public. The private course, currently known as the Serrano Country Club, was built, while the public course was not constructed. The decision to abandon the land for the public course was made in 2000 with the approval of the Serrano Village C1 residential tentative subdivision map/planned development (under application PD99-04/TM99-1361) by the County Planning Commission. The land for the public golf course is now part of the approximately 1,211 acres of open space within the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan.

investment made to improve the course (plus interest), and provide a lease (or other) payment to the property owner. This was found to be the case even in a scenario with a new clubhouse and significantly enhanced banquet revenues.

The Pedregal planning area is a remainder of the Ridgeview East subdivision (**Exhibit A**). Previous attempts by prior property owners to develop the property with residential uses in the late 1990s and 2000 failed due to complications with a water moratorium, environmental review, the 1999 General Plan Writ of Mandate, and expiration of an underlying Development Agreement. Since then, the property has remained vacant and undeveloped.

EXISTING CONDITIONS OF THE PROJECT

Serrano Westside Planning Area

The Serrano Westside planning area consists of approximately 234 acres of the former El Dorado Hills Executive Golf Course and undeveloped oak woodland and annual grassland ridgeline associated with Serrano Village D1, Lots C and D. The elevation ranges from approximately 600 to 1,020 feet above mean sea level. Although most of the Serrano Westside planning area primarily consists of the previous executive golf course, this area has not been maintained since approximately 2007 and most of the fairways have reverted to annual grassland. Along with the annual grassland covering much of the site, oak woodland dominated by blue oak is in the northeast portion of Serrano Westside, and riparian woodland occurs along the creek, in intermittent drainages, and around a few of the ponds. Adjacent land uses consist of a shopping center, residences, El Dorado Hills Fire Station 85, El Dorado Hills CSD's archery range, and undeveloped land.

Pedregal Planning Area

The Pedregal planning area consists of approximately 102 acres on steep terrain, ranging in elevation from approximately 740 to 1,060 feet above mean sea level. Vegetation communities on the Pedregal parcel consist of oak woodland, riparian woodland, and annual grassland. The area is currently undeveloped but is surrounded to the north, south, and west by single-family detached and multifamily residential development. The site borders Wilson Boulevard on the southern perimeter, Gillette Drive on the northern end, and El Dorado Hills Boulevard on the eastern perimeter.

Current Land Use and Zoning Designations and Development Potential

The current General Plan land use designations and zoning for both planning areas as provided in **Table 1**. Also indicated is the potential number of housing units based on current zoning for the two planning areas. As shown, the 336 acres currently have a maximum buildout of 759 residential units.

Table 1. Existing General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts

Assessor's Parcel No.	Land Use	Zoning	Max No. Units
Serrano Westside Planning Area			
121-160-005	OS	RFH	0
121-040-020	AP	R1-PD	65
121-040-029	AP	R1-PD	70
121-040-031	AP	OS	0
121-120-024 (portion)	AP	OS	0
Subtotal			135
Pedregal Planning Area			
120-050-001	HDR	R1	345
	MFR	RM	144
120-050-005	HDR	R1	135
Subtotal			624
Total			759
General Plan Land Use		Zoning	
OS = Open Space		RFH = Recreational Facilities High	
AP = Adopted Plan		R1-PD = Single Unit Residential-Planned Development	
HDR = High-Density Residential		OS = Open Space	
MFR = Multifamily Residential		R1 = Single-Family Residential	
		RM = Residential Multi-Unit	
		-PD = Planned Development Overlay Zone	

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CENTRAL EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN

The CEDHSP includes the development of up to 1,000 dwelling units, approximately 11 acres of civic-limited commercial uses, approximately 15 acres of public community park, 1 acre of neighborhood park, and approximately 174 total acres of open space within the 336-acre CEDHSP area (**Exhibit B**). The CEDHSP area would be served by open space and active recreational opportunities, including a bike trail network that would connect to and enhance existing trails in the immediate area. The project's circulation system would connect to Wilson Boulevard and Serrano Parkway and would accommodate a planned new connection between El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway (Country Club Drive Extension - Capital Improvement Program Project No. 36105007) would provide a direct connection from El Dorado Hills Boulevard (or Serrano Parkway under the Country Club Drive Extension Circulation Option) through the Serrano Westside planning area, as well as a new connection to Silva Valley Parkway. The development would have daily retail and public services within walking distance to the site, including the Raley's shopping center, La Borgata, The Shops, Town Center, El Dorado Hills Fire Station 85, and El Dorado Hills Senior Center. The CEDHSP document is provided in **Attachment 1**.

Project Characteristics

Proposed Land Uses: Section 3 (Land Use) of the CEDHSP details the specific policies and standards regulating the development of the plan. **Exhibits B** and **D** show the proposed land uses

and zoning for the CEDHSP. **Table 2** provides a summary of the original application addressed in the original Draft EIR and **Table 3** identifies recent modifications to the project. The 2019 Staff Report identified modifications to the CEDHSP land uses that identified an “attainable” residential development potential of 737 dwelling units and up to 1,000 residential units if age-restricted units were provided. This land use concept has now been replaced with the land uses identified in **Table 3**.

As identified in **Table 3**, the land use plan for the Serrano Westside planning area anticipates 763 residential dwelling units, approximately 15 acres of public community park, 11 acres of limited commercial, civic, or recreational use, a 1-acre neighborhood park, and 133 acres of open space. The land use plan for the Pedregal planning area anticipates 237 residential dwelling units and 42 acres of open space.

The proposed land use designations, zoning districts, acreages, and proposed dwelling units and commercial square footage for the CEDHSP are shown in **Table 3**. As part of the project, rezoning would be required for the two new planning areas. In addition, existing Lots C and D of Serrano Village D1 of the EDHSP would be rezoned to open space use. **Exhibit D** shows the location of the proposed zoning districts for the Serrano Westside and Pedregal planning areas.

Exhibit G identifies the proposed CEDHSP roadway system. The CEDHSP also offers alternative transportation choices by incorporating a network of bikeways and pedestrian paths. The plan area’s adjacency to the significant north–south arterial of El Dorado Hills Boulevard allows for access to future public transit routes, and the compact nature of the land uses minimizes intrusion onto neighboring properties, simultaneously preserving the ridgeline character of El Dorado Hills.

The Serrano Westside planning area land plan incorporates an open space area buffering the existing residential units of Serrano Village D1 from the proposed Village Residential Medium High and Village Residential High areas.

The Pedregal planning area land plan consists of Village Residential Low that is intended to complement the existing density and lot sizes of the subdivisions associated with the Ridgeview East area, given the density range of the land use designation and lot sizing standards set forth in CEDHSP Appendix B, Table B.6. The Village Residential High land use designation would match densities of the existing El Dorado Village Apartments to the north and the Copper Hill Apartments to the south.

Table 2. CEDHSP Land Uses Evaluated in the Original Draft EIR

Proposed Land Use			Acres	Dwelling Units/ Commercial Square Footage	Average Density
Planning Area	Land Use Designation	Zoning District			
Residential					
Pedregal	VRL	R20-PD	45	37	<1.0
Serrano Westside	VRM-L	R4-PD	23	123	5.3
Serrano Westside	VRM-H	RM1-PD	37	310	8.3
Serrano Westside	VRH	RM2-PD	16	330	18.3
Pedregal			13	200	

Proposed Land Use			Acres	Dwelling Units/ Commercial Square Footage	Average Density
Planning Area	Land Use Designation	Zoning District			
Subtotal			134	1,000	—
Civic–Limited Commercial					
Serrano Westside	C-LC	CL1-PD	11	50,000 sq. ft.	—
Public Facilities (Village Park)					
Serrano Westside	OS	RFH1-PD	15	—	—
Open Space (including Neighborhood Park) ¹					
Serrano Westside	OS	OS1-PD	130	—	—
Pedregal	OS	OS1-PD	39	—	—
Subtotal			169	—	—
Road Right-of-Way and Landscape Lots					
Serrano Westside			7	—	
Pedregal			5		
Subtotal			12		
Total			341	1,000 dwelling units 50,000 sq. ft. commercial	

¹ This open space includes the 1-acre neighborhood park.

Table 3. CEDHSP Modified Land Uses (2022)

Proposed Land Use			Acres	Dwelling Units/ Commercial Square Footage	Average Density
Planning Area	Land Use Designation	Zoning District			
Residential					
Pedregal	VRL	R20-PD	45	37	<1.0
Serrano Westside	VRM-L	R4-PD	20	123	6.2
Serrano Westside	VRM-H	RM1-PD	33	310	9.4
Serrano Westside	VRH	RM2-PD	16	330	20.6
Pedregal			10	200	20.0
Subtotal			124	1,000	—
Civic–Limited Commercial					
Serrano Westside	C-LC	CL1-PD	11	50,000 sq. ft.	—
Public Facilities (Community Park)					
Serrano Westside	OS	RFH1-PD	15	—	—
Open Space (including Neighborhood Park) ¹					
Serrano Westside	OS	OS1-PD	133	—	—
Pedregal	OS	OS1-PD	42	—	—
Subtotal			175	—	—
Road Right-of-Way and Landscape Lots					
Serrano Westside			6	—	
Pedregal			5		
Subtotal			11		
Total			336²	1,000 dwelling units 50,000 sq. ft. commercial	

¹ This open space includes the 1-acre neighborhood park.

² Mapping adjustments were made by the applicant that reduced project acreage.

Circulation: **Exhibit G** shows the proposed road circulation system serving the two planning areas in the CEDHSP. The Serrano Westside planning area would obtain access from El Dorado Hills Boulevard, Wilson Boulevard, Park Drive, and Serrano Parkway, while the Pedregal planning area would obtain access from Wilson Boulevard for the VRL units and from El Dorado Hills Boulevard for the VRH units.

Section 4 (Transportation and Circulation) of the CEDHSP establishes the design and cross sections of the project's internal local roadway system. The roadway system design includes the following:

- Local streets (44- to 33-foot-wide right-of-way with varying allowances for on-street parking)
- Secondary local streets (29- to 27-foot-wide right-of-way)
- Private gate design
- Traffic-calming features (roundabouts, traffic circles, neckdowns, and bulbouts)

These roadways may be public or private. All private and gated roadways would be owned and maintained by a homeowners association. The CEDHSP does not include internal roadway connections with existing residential areas.

Park Drive/Country Club Drive would be reconfigured within the Raley's and La Borgata shopping centers (**Exhibit H**) and would provide public access from El Dorado Hills Boulevard to the community park site and eventually extended to Silva Valley Parkway. Country Club Drive would consist of a 45-foot right-of-way that includes two 12-foot travel lanes, 6-foot shoulders, and an 8-foot Class I bike path.

The Country Club Drive roadway extension is identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP Project No. 36105007) to be completed by the year 2041. Since circulation of the Second RDEIR and in response to public comments, a circulation option that would avoid the extension of Park Drive through the Raley's shopping center area has been analyzed. Under the Country Club Drive Extension Circulation Option, Park Drive would not be extended and instead the north-south roadway from Serrano Parkway would curve to the east and extend to Silva Valley Parkway. The alignment through the Serrano Westside planning area would be similar, as would the width of the roadway, and there would be no roundabout or intersection (**Exhibit H-1**). The Country Club Drive Extension Option would include an emergency vehicle access connection to Park Drive at the Raley's and La Borgata shopping centers. This emergency vehicle access would also accommodate pedestrian and bicycle use. The Revised Final EIR analysis determined that no new worsened impacts as compared to the proposed project would result from implementation of this option.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Network: The CEDHSP, specifically the Serrano Westside planning area, would provide a bicycle and pedestrian network that would connect to, enhance, and extend existing trails located along El Dorado Hills Boulevard (approximately 7,800 feet of proposed public walking and bicycling trails) and would reserve right-of-way on the north side of US 50 for a new location for a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing connection, replacing the existing planned location,

to areas south of US 50 (**Exhibit I**). The preliminary trail circulation plan identifies the proposed open space and recreational opportunities and their integration with trail facilities.

Utilities: Section 7 (Utilities) of the CEDHSP details the specific policies and standards regulating the proposed utilities serving the project area.

Potable Water System: Potable water service will be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). An overall potable water system is already in place because of existing development in El Dorado Hills. However, the project would require the construction and extension of distribution mains and laterals. Additional water lines for the project area are proposed to be extended adjacent to El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The proposed water pipelines would be constructed in the Serrano Westside planning area to run along El Dorado Hills Boulevard, east of existing water lines, and make a loop in the southern section. The proposed on-site lines in the Pedregal planning area would extend west of El Dorado Hills Boulevard in the central portion of the project area. To serve the Pedregal planning area, two off-site water line extensions are needed to extend utilities from the Ridgeview subdivision (north water line) and the Sterling Ranch Apartments (south water line). The final design and alignment of water infrastructure improvements would be determined in the engineering Facility Plan Report, to be reviewed and approved by EID.

As identified in the CEDHSP Water Supply Assessment (WSA) approved by EID in 2013, there is adequate water supply available as well as planned future water supply sources to meet the project's water demands under normal year, single-year drought, and multiple-year drought conditions for current and year 2035 conditions (see **Attachment 5**, RFEIR Appendix K-1). Residential development of the CEDHSP is subject to all applicable drought-related water conservation measures as enforced by EID.

In 2021, the authors of the WSA (Tully & Young) prepared a technical memorandum titled *Revalidation of Previously Adopted Water Supply Assessments for the Village of Marble Valley, Lime Rock Valley, and Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plans* to re-evaluate the water supply conclusions of these assessments (see **Attachment 5**, RFEIR Appendix K-2). The memorandum concluded that it is expected that water demand for the proposed project would be lower than calculated in the WSA approved by EID in 2013. This decrease would be due to current assumptions about residential and nonresidential water use that has been driven by continued statutory, regulatory, and common-practice considerations. For instance, since 2013, both the statewide mandatory Green Building Standards Code and the statewide Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) have been modified to require more efficient appliances and fixtures and placed further restrictions on residential and nonresidential irrigated landscapes. These factors, as well as a continued conservation ethic among water-using customers, have resulted in a lowering of EID's per-capita water demand factors compared to those used for the 2013 WSA. The land uses for the proposed project represented in the 2013 WSA are consistent with the current land uses, and the water demand forecasts represented in the 2013 WSA are likely conservatively high. The 2013 WSA found water availability and sufficiency for the proposed project through 2035. The proposed project is recognized in EID's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) as part of planned future customer demands. EID's 2020 UWMP concludes that EID has sufficient water supplies for all current and planned future customers through 2045 during normal years, single-dry years, and

droughts lasting 5 years. Therefore, EID's conclusions of water availability and sufficiency to meet the proposed project's estimated water demands as articulated in the 2013 WSA are still valid, and the 2020 UWMP provides necessary concurrence of these prior conclusions.

Recycled Water System: EID operates a recycled water delivery system in the project area with pipelines in Serrano Parkway and east of the Raley's and La Borgata shopping areas. Development of the Serrano Westside planning area may require the construction of a reclaimed water line on-site, which would run north-south through the Serrano Westside planning area and connect to the existing system. The recycled water pipeline, if deemed economically feasible by EID, would be used to route recycled water to parks, landscape corridors, residential yards, and other areas. Development of the Serrano Westside planning area would also require the expansion of a recycled water line off-site from the southeastern corner of the planning area to Silva Valley Parkway. The expanded line would extend approximately 1,700 feet. Recycled water lines would not be extended to the Pedregal planning area. The final design and alignment of recycled water infrastructure improvements will be determined in the Facility Plan Report at the small lot map stage, to be reviewed and approved by EID.

Wastewater System: Wastewater service will be provided by EID, which currently operates the El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant. The plant's existing capacity for average dry weather flow is 4.0 million gallons per day (mgd). To accommodate future growth, EID plans to expand the plant's treatment capacity to 5.45 mgd when needed to accommodate future growth (including the project's contribution to flows). Adequate wastewater plant capacity would be available to the project under current and cumulative conditions.

Wastewater from the CEDHSP will flow in a southerly direction to the El Dorado Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant through a system of pipelines installed within road rights-of-way or public utilities easements. The new wastewater collection system lines are proposed to be parallel to El Dorado Hills Boulevard in the Serrano Westside and Pedregal planning areas. The Serrano Westside planning area lines would connect to a trunk sewer in El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The Pedregal planning area lines would connect to sewer lines along Wilson Boulevard and Gillette Drive that connect to the line in El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The final design and alignment of recycled water infrastructure improvements will be determined in the Facility Plan Report, to be reviewed and approved by EID.

Drainage System: The CEDHSP includes detention or retention facilities on-site to attenuate peak stormwater runoff to a level that does not impact downstream facilities. A hydrology analysis by Watermark Engineering, Inc. (2014) shows that existing culverts at Serrano Parkway and US 50 attenuate 100-year storm flows from the Serrano Westside planning area, but a detention basin is needed in the Pedregal planning area to attenuate post-development flows.

Open Space and Resource Preservation: CEDHSP Section 5 (Conservation, Open Space, and Resource Management) details the specific policies and standards regulating the conservation and resource management efforts in the plan. The Serrano Westside and Pedregal planning areas incorporate approximately 174 acres of combined natural open space (approximately 132 acres for Serrano Westside and 42 acres for Pedregal) for the protection of valuable natural resources including oak woodlands, intermittent tributaries, wetlands, steep hillsides, known cultural resource sites, and scenic vistas. This amount of open space encompasses 50 percent of the project site, which exceeds the minimum 30 percent required of residential Planned Development.

The CEDHSP encompasses a prominent ridgeline of oak woodland canopy planned for the development of Serrano Village D1, Lots C and D, which would be preserved under the plan. The CEDHSP has an open space zoning category (OS1-PD), which provides for passive recreation uses such as trails and bikeways for walking, hiking, and cycling.

The open space designated areas would retain approximately 124 acres of the CEDHSP's approximately 153 acres of oak woodland canopy. The County adopted the Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP) as provided under General Plan Implementation Measure Policy 7.4.4.4 and codified under Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resources Conservation). The ORMP consists of oak woodland mitigation ratios based on the loss of on-site oak woodlands and mitigation for loss of certain-sized individual native oak trees ("heritage trees"). Consistent with the ORMP, oak woodland impacts outside of the 81 percent retention would be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through a combination of on-site replanting (50 percent of mitigation) and payment of the in-lieu fee to the County (50 percent of mitigation).

Should the ORMP be rescinded through litigation, the CEDHSP would implement all mitigation through on-site replanting consistent with the project's Important Habitat Mitigation Plan, which would involve on-site mitigation via replanting consistent with the previous version of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4.

Parks: Section 6 (Public Facilities and Services) of the CEDHSP details the specific policies and standards regulating the proposed facilities and services in the plan area.

The CEDHSP includes a public community park site of approximately 15 acres located in the southernmost portion of the Serrano Westside planning area adjacent to US 50; the park site is proposed to be dedicated to the El Dorado Hills CSD. The site is relatively flat. Park amenities may include a passive recreation area with walking paths and water features, sports fields for baseball, softball, and soccer (adult- or youth-sized, artificial or natural turf, lighted or unlighted), playground equipment, on-site parking, permanent restrooms, site furnishings, picnic shelters, a community garden, an off-leash dog park, and site identification (in addition to other uses allowed in the CEDHSP). However, final design of this park would be determined by the El Dorado Hills CSD.

Additionally, the CEDHSP provides for a 1-acre privately maintained but publicly accessible neighborhood park at the northeastern corner of Serrano Parkway and El Dorado Hills Boulevard. The precise acreage would be determined in the specific development plans or small lot tentative subdivision map for that phase of development in the Serrano Westside planning area.

El Dorado County General Plan Policy 9.1.1.1 sets the guidelines for the acquisition and development of parkland at 5 acres per 1,000 population within the boundaries of the El Dorado Hills CSD. Section 120.12.090 of the El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance establishes the population density for the purposes of parkland dedications for the El Dorado Hills CSD. The parkland dedication formula indicates that the CEDHSP at a maximum development potential of 1,000 residential dwelling units must include approximately 13 acres of land for public park use. The CEDHSP provides approximately 16 acres of community and neighborhood parks. If the El Dorado Hills CSD uses the planned Civic–Limited Commercial site for recreation uses, total park acreage could be as much as 27 acres.

Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map: The project includes an application for a large lot tentative subdivision map that would divide the 336-acre project site into six separate large lots (**Exhibit E**). The purpose of the large lot map is to facilitate the sale, lease, and financing of the project area. The County will not issue any building permit for any large lot until the corresponding small lot final subdivision map has been approved and recorded.

Proposed Specific Plan Document

Specific plans are a land use planning tool for the further implementation of the General Plan for individual development proposals in a defined geographic area. They give local land use agencies the ability to establish land use and design regulations to create development that is consistent with site-specific physical constraints and opportunities as well as available infrastructure. All subsequent development within the boundaries of the specific plan area is subject to the requirements of the specific plan.

Sections 65450 through 65457 of the California Government Code grant authority to the County for the development and adoption of specific plans. Chapter 130.56 (Specific Plans) of the El Dorado County Ordinance Code specifies that the Board of Supervisors shall have review authority of original jurisdiction for specific plan applications, after review and recommendation by the Planning Commission.

Previously adopted specific plans in the El Dorado Hills area include the Northwest El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, Bass Lake Hills Specific Plan, Promontory Specific Plan, Carson Creek Specific Plan, and Valley View Specific Plan. Development within these plans is nearing or at complete buildout.

Proposed Specific Plan Boundary Adjustments: Adoption of the CEDHSP would amend the existing EDHSP as follows (**Exhibit C**):

- Approximately 136 acres of lands in the existing EDHSP transfer to the CEDHSP

All portions of the 1988 EDHSP area outside of the 336 acres included in this specific plan would remain subject to the current EDHSP standards.

Specific Plan Content and Consistency with County Standards: The Board of Supervisors may adopt a proposed specific plan under El Dorado County Code Section 130.56.030 only if it finds that the plan:

- Is consistent with and implements the General Plan;
- Is consistent with any applicable airport land use plan, in compliance with Public Utilities Code Section 21676; and
- Will not have a significant effect on the environment or a statement of overriding considerations has been made for the proposed specific plan in compliance with the provisions of California Code of Regulations Section 15093 (CEQA Guidelines).

The staff analysis below and in **Attachment 6** analyzes the project's consistency with applicable General Plan policies and zoning provisions (see further discussion below regarding General Plan consistency). The CEDHSP is not located within any airport land use plan.

As noted below, an EIR has been prepared consistent with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines that evaluates and discloses the environmental impacts of the CEDHSP. CEQA findings and a statement of overriding considerations have been included in **Attachment 8** should the Board of Supervisors adopt the project.

Zoning Ordinance Section 130.56.040 requires that specific plans provide the following information:

- A statement of the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan.
- A site plan showing the distribution, location, and extent of uses proposed within the area covered by the specific plan.
- Identification of the proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of public and private infrastructure and facilities for transportation, sewage, stormwater drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, education, fire protection, or other essential modes proposed to be located in the specific plan area to support the uses described within.
- Standards and criteria by which development will proceed within the specific plan area and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable.
- Implementation measures including regulations, programs, public works projects, and financing measures necessary to carry out the specific plan.

With the adoption of a specific plan, no local public works project, development plan permit, tentative map, or parcel map may be approved, and no ordinance may be adopted or amended within the specific plan area unless it is consistent with the adopted specific plan (El Dorado County Code Section 130.56.050).

The CEDHSP consists of the following sections that are consistent with Zoning Ordinance Section 130.56.040 and with state law. **Attachment 2** includes edits to the CEDHSP that address County staff input, other public agency input, and minor updates to the draft specific plan document. The document will be finalized to include any comments from the Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors if the CEDHSP is approved.

- *Introduction (1.0)* – includes the project’s vision and planning principles
- *Setting (2.0)* – existing setting conditions of the CEDHSP area
- *Land Use (3.0)* – CEDHSP land use designations and policy provisions
- *Transportation and Circulation (4.0)* – CEDHSP circulation plan, including bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities
- *Conservation, Open Space and Resource Management (5.0)* – policy provisions on the protection and management of open space areas and natural and cultural resources
- *Public Facilities and Services (6.0)* – policy provisions regarding fire protection, law enforcement, parks and recreation, public schools, and other public service provisions
- *Utilities (7.0)* – conceptual utility improvement plans and policy provisions for the provision of utility services to the project, including potable water, recycled water, and wastewater service
- *Sustainability (8.0)* – policy provisions that address energy efficiency, waste reduction, mobility, low-impact development methods, water conservation, and other related sustainability areas
- *Implementation and Administration (9.0)* – details on how the specific plan and its requirements will be administered for subsequent development activities and improvements
- *Appendix A (Zoning and Development Standards)* – CEDHSP area-specific zoning and development standards that would supersede the County Zoning Ordinance
- *Appendix B (Site Design Standards)* – CEDHSP area-specific development standards for grading, lot design, and other development-related requirements
- *Appendix C (Summary of Specific Plan Policies)*

Project Financing and Fiscal Considerations

Public Facilities Finance Plan: The CEDHSP includes a draft Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) (see **Attachment 3**). The Specific Plan would result in the construction of a network of backbone infrastructure necessary to support the project at buildout, including roads, potable water and recycled water, wastewater systems, stormwater conveyance, dry utilities, and other improvements. This includes off-site roadway improvements to the intersection of Silva Valley Parkway and Appian Way

and to Latrobe Road between US 50 and Town Center Boulevard to comply with applicable General Plan Circulation Element policies that were amended in 2016 by Measure E (Initiative to Reinstate Measure Y's Original Intent – No More Paper Roads). The PFFP estimates project backbone infrastructure costs at approximately \$5,600,000.

The PFFP also addresses public facilities necessary to support the project that include parks, trails, wetland improvements, and fire protection services. The PFFP estimates project public facilities costs at approximately \$12,100,000.

The PFFP identifies that operation and maintenance for CEDHSP would be funded from the following sources:

- County General Fund and Road Fund
- Community Facilities District and/or Statewide Infrastructure Program District
- Special District Funds (County Service Areas #7 [Emergency Medical Services] and #10 [Solid, Liquid, and Hazardous Waste], EID [water and wastewater services], El Dorado Hills Fire Department [fire protection services], El Dorado Hills CSD [park and recreation services], and others [e.g., Lighting and Landscaping Districts #19 and #29 or a new lighting and landscaping district (LLAD)])
- School District Funds
- Library Tax Funds
- Homeowners Association

Fiscal Impact Analysis: General Plan Objective 10.2.5 and Policies 10.2.5.1 and 10.2.5.2 require the County to evaluate the fiscal impacts of new development on municipal services and to avoid using County General Fund revenues to fund services. A draft Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) was prepared for the CEDHSP by the project applicant and was independently reviewed by Goodwin Consulting Group on behalf of the County (see **Attachment 7**). The FIA identifies that the CEDHSP at maximum buildout (1,000 residential units) would result in a net fiscal deficit of approximately \$438,000 to the County's General Fund and a net fiscal deficit of approximately \$56,000 to the County's Road Fund.

As further described under "Development Agreement" below, the proposed Development Agreement is anticipated to include a commitment to provide a financing mechanism (e.g., formation of a community facilities district) to generate the annual revenues to protect against fiscal deficits to the General Fund and Road Fund from the project.

Development Agreement

Development agreements are authorized by Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5 and County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.58. A development agreement is adopted by ordinance. The

purpose of a development agreement “is to provide assurance to an applicant for a development project that upon approval of the project the applicant may proceed in accordance with existing policies, rules and regulations, and subject to conditions of approval, will strengthen the public planning process, encourage private participation in comprehensive planning and reduce the economic costs of development” (County Zoning Ordinance Section 130.58.010).

The proposed draft CEDHSP Development Agreement (DA) was initially prepared in 2019 and is being updated. The new proposed DA will be provided to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation. The DA preparation is based on negotiations between the applicant and County staff, County Counsel, and the Chief Administrative Officer’s office. The final terms are subject to Board of Supervisors approval. The proposed DA would vest rights to the developer to develop the project as approved by the County, in conformance with the County rules, regulations, policies, standards, specifications, and ordinances in effect on the date of adoption of the ordinance for the DA.

STAFF EVALUATION OF PROJECT

General Plan Consistency

Overview of the Function of a General Plan: General plans are the constitution of a community. They express the community’s development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. The California Supreme Court has called the general plan the “constitution for future development.” General plans establish a community’s land use, circulation, environmental, economic, and social goals, and policies as they relate to future growth and development. General plans are the basis for local government decision-making, including decisions on development approvals and exactions.

However, *planning is a continuous process*. General plans should be reviewed regularly, regardless of their planning horizon, and revised as new information becomes available and as community needs and values change. State law requires annual reviews of general plans and the opportunity to amend general plans four times a year to address changed conditions.

Guiding Provisions of the El Dorado County General Plan: The Introduction chapter of the General Plan identifies the long-range direction and policy for the use of land in the County through the Statement of Vision, Plan Strategies, Plan Concepts, and Plan Objectives. These are listed below and are the basis of the General Plan’s goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures contained in each of the plan’s nine elements. These provisions constitute the central policy direction of the General Plan.

Statement of Vision

The vision for future growth in the County includes the following:

1. Maintain and protect the County’s natural beauty and environmental quality, vegetation, air and water quality, natural landscape features, cultural resource values, and maintain

the rural character and lifestyle while ensuring the economic viability critical to promoting and sustaining community identity.

2. Where appropriate, encourage clustered development as an option to maintain the integrity and distinct character of individual communities, while protecting open space and promoting natural resource uses.
3. Make land use decisions in conjunction with comprehensive transportation planning and pursuing economically viable alternative transportation modes, including light rail. Adopt a Circulation Element providing for rural and urban flows that recognize limitations of topography and natural beauty with flexibility of road standards.
4. Promote a better balance between local jobs and housing by encouraging high technology activities and value added activities tied directly to available resource based industries such as the timber industry, tourism, agriculture, mining, and recreation.
5. Increase the amount of affordable housing by providing a variety of housing types and encouraging residential projects to reflect affordability in light of the existing local job base and/or infrastructure.
6. Encourage efforts to locate a four-year college and support the ability of elementary, middle, and high schools to keep pace with population growth.
7. Improve and expand local park and recreational facilities throughout the County.
8. Recognize that the General Plan is a living document which must be updated periodically, consistent with the desires of the public, and provide for public involvement in the planning process.

Plan Strategies

The following is a list of strategies to provide for methods of achieving the visions and goals and to carry forward the Plan's principle purposes:

1. Recognize urban growth in Community Regions while allowing reasonable growth throughout the rural areas of the County.
2. Promote growth in a manner that retains natural resources and reduces infrastructure costs.
3. Encourage growth to reflect the character and scale of the community in which it occurs and recognize that planned developments are an effective planning tool to maximize community identity and minimize impact on the surrounding area.
4. Require new growth to fully fund its on-site services and apportioned share of off-site services.

5. Provide that Plan goals, objectives, and policies reflect the significant differences in characteristics between the principal land use planning areas of Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions.
6. Provide sufficient land densities and land use designations throughout the County to accommodate the projected growth for all categories of development.
7. Support the ability of the private sector to create and provide housing for all residents regardless of income, race, sex, age, religion, or any other arbitrary factor to accommodate the County's projected share of the regional housing needs.
8. Recognize economic development as an integral part of the development of existing communities and new communities by allowing for a diverse mix of land use types which would facilitate economic growth and viability.

Plan Concepts

The development of these visions and strategies serves to provide for the underlying approach of the General Plan. This approach is the identification of distinct planning concept areas where growth will be directed as a means of providing for a more manageable land use pattern. The concepts of the Plan also recognize that differing levels of service will occur within community and rural areas.

Flexible boundaries shall be provided identifying Community Regions, Rural Centers, and Rural Regions on the General Plan Land Use Map for clear distinction between:

- A. Community Regions where growth will be directed and facilitated;
- B. Rural Centers where growth and commercial activities will be directed to serve the larger Rural Regions; and
- C. Rural Regions where resource based activities are located will be enhanced while accommodating reasonable growth.

Higher levels of infrastructure and public services of all types shall be provided within Community Regions to minimize the demands on services in Rural Regions. The Capital Improvement Plan for the County and all special districts will prioritize improvements.

It is the explicit intent of the Plan, through the appropriate application of these planning concept areas, to: (1) foster a rural quality of life; (2) sustain a quality environment; (3) develop a strong diversified, sustainable local economy; (4) plan land use patterns which will determine the level of public services appropriate to the character, economy, and environment of each region; and (5) accommodate the County's fair share of the regional growth projections while encouraging those activities that comprise the basis for the County's customs, culture, and economic stability.

Plan Objectives

Through the appropriate application of the above statements, the objectives of the General Plan are:

1. To develop a strong diversified and sustainable local economy;
2. To foster a rural quality of life;
3. To sustain a quality environment;
4. To accommodate the County's fair share of regional growth projections and affordable housing while encouraging those activities that comprise the basis for the County's customs, culture, and economic stability;
5. To oversupply residential and non-residential land use designations to provide market and landowner flexibility to more feasibly accommodate the market;
6. To concentrate and direct urban growth where infrastructure is present and/or can be more feasibly provided;
7. To recognize that funding limitations for infrastructure and services will result in lower levels of service while the County improves employment and housing opportunities;
8. To conserve, protect, and manage the County's abundant natural resources for economic benefits now and for the future;
9. To encourage infill development that more efficiently utilizes existing infrastructure and minimizes land use conflicts while avoiding the premature development of non-contiguous lands where direct and life cycle costs are greater;
10. To accomplish the retention of permanent open space/natural areas on a project-by-project bases through clustering;
11. To minimize down planning and/or down zoning where feasible;
12. To improve the jobs-to-housing ratio by giving preference to the development of high technology and value added employment centers and regional retail and tourism uses.

CEDHSP Consistency Analysis with Guiding Provisions of the General Plan: As noted above, the CEDHSP would amend the General Plan Land Use Map in a manner that would provide a new mix of higher-density housing within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. As identified in **Tables 1 and 3** above, the most substantial change in designated land uses would occur in the Serrano Westside planning area with the establishment of low (5–8 du/ac), medium (8–14 du/ac), and high (14–24 du/ac) density residential land uses in an area currently zoned for open space, recreation facilities, and single-family residential uses.

Proposed land use designation changes for the Pedregal planning area would be consistent with the current General Plan land use designations but would refine the development pattern to be

consistent with policy provisions of the General Plan intended to protect natural resources (e.g., oak woodland preservation provisions under Policy 7.4.4.4).

The intent of the CEDHSP is to provide a higher-density housing mix type with new active park facilities that are currently in limited supply as infill near retail and job centers in El Dorado Hills such as the El Dorado Hills Business Park and the El Dorado Hills Town Center. The US Census Bureau American Community Survey estimated that the 2019 median household income in El Dorado County is \$87,059. Housing prices in El Dorado Hills vary depending on the neighborhood, but the median sales price was \$819,500 on February 10, 2022, based on review of data on Redfin.com. Median-income households rely on higher-density and multifamily housing products that are available in the County. Currently there are no available high-density residential undeveloped parcels near US 50, commercial centers (El Dorado Hills Town Center), and office uses in the El Dorado Hills community.

The CEDHSP's amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map would be consistent with the central policy direction set forth in the Introduction chapter of the General Plan by:

- Clustering development that would maintain the urban character of the El Dorado Hills Community Region while protecting open space areas and promoting natural resource uses (on-site oak woodlands).
- Increasing the amount of housing options by providing a variety of housing opportunities at a range of densities near an existing local job base and/or infrastructure in the project area.
- Improving and expanding local park and recreational facilities in El Dorado Hills through the provision of a 15-acre park site.
- Recognizing that urban growth should be focused in the General Plan designated Community Regions such as El Dorado Hills.
- Promoting infill development in an area where public infrastructure and roadways already exist that can serve urban development and reduce infrastructure costs.
- Implementing a PFFP to fully fund its on-site services and apportioned share of off-site services.
- Providing a range of residential density and product types that support the ability of the private sector to create and provide housing opportunities for all residents regardless of income, race, sex, age, religion, or any other arbitrary factor.

CEDHSP General Plan Goal, Objective, and Policy Consistency: General Plan Policy 2.2.5.2 requires all discretionary projects to be reviewed for consistency with applicable General Plan policies in addition to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 130.56.030. California Government Code Section 64554 requires that specific plans be consistent with the agency's general plan. State law does not require perfect conformity between a proposed project and the applicable general plan because "it is nearly, if not absolutely, impossible for a project to be in

perfect conformity with each and every policy set forth in the applicable plan” (*Pfeiffer v. City of Sunnyvale City Council* [2011] 200 Cal.App.4th 1552, 1563). “‘Once a general plan is in place, it is the province of elected city officials to examine the specifics of a proposed project to determine whether it would be “in harmony” with the policies stated in the plan’” (*Spring Valley Lake Association v. City of Victorville* [2016] 248 Cal.App.4th 91, 99; see also *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland* [1993] 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 717 [requirement in Government Code Section 66473.5 of the Subdivision Map Act that a map approval must be consistent with the general plan has been interpreted to require that the map be “in agreement or harmony with” the general plan]). “A project is inconsistent with a general plan only ‘if it conflicts with a general plan policy that is fundamental, mandatory, and clear’” (*Spring Valley Lake Association, supra*, 248 Cal.App.4th at p. 100 [quoting *Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 782, 32 Cal.Rptr.3d 177]).

“‘Because policies in a general plan reflect a range of competing interests, the governmental agency must be allowed to weigh and balance the plan’s policies when applying them, and it has broad discretion to construe its policies in light of the plan’s purposes’” (*Naraghi Lakes Neighborhood Preservation Assn. v. City of Modesto* [2016] 1 Cal.App.5th 9, 18–19 [quoting *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City & County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656, 677–678]).

Recognizing that perfect conformity is not possible, the Introduction chapter of the General Plan provides:

In implementing the General Plan, it must be applied comprehensively. No single component (map, goal, objective, policy, or map) can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. Conversely, the absence of a specific policy enabling a particular aspect of a project (exclusive of basic density consistency) is not to be grounds for a finding of General Plan inconsistency. Projects inherently raise policy issues. It is the task of the decision makers, consistent with State law, to weigh project benefits and consequences up against the General Plan as a whole. The merits of a project should ultimately be determined by its consistency with goals, objectives, and policies of all the elements and the land use map. Development standards as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and other County policies must be consistent with the standards in this Plan. The Plan standards represent a careful balancing of competing economic, social, and environmental interests.

The discussion below is an overview of the CEDHSP’s consistency with key General Plan policy provisions. A policy-by-policy analysis is further detailed in **Attachment 6** that is based on technical information provided in the proposed specific plan document, EIR, Water Supply Assessment, Public Facilities Financing Plan, and commitments proposed in the DA. It is important to note that the Planning Commission would provide a recommendation of the project’s consistency with the General Plan to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors would ultimately determine whether the project is consistent with the General Plan.

The consistency analysis is focused on consistency with policies because policies are specific statements that guide decision-making. They are a commitment of the local legislative body to a

particular course of action. By contrast, goals are a general expression of community values and therefore may be abstract. Objectives are specified ends, conditions, or states that are intermediate steps toward attaining a goal.²

Land Use and Form

The CEDHSP proposed land use designations would be inconsistent with existing General Plan Open Space land use designations in the Serrano Westside planning area. Adoption of the CEDHSP would amend the General Plan land use designations to match the proposed land use plan. The County is allowed to amend General Plan land use designations provided that the project is consistent overall with the General Plan.

The CEDHSP responds to the El Dorado County General Plan, Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), and contemporary planning principles by offering a range of housing choices for multiple market segments in proximity to existing retail and public services. The CEDHSP area is located in the El Dorado Hills Community Region and is subject to the policy provisions under Goal 2.1 that include Policies 2.1.1.1 (definition of community regions), 2.1.1.2 (community regions are areas that are appropriate for urban-type or suburban-type development), 2.1.1.3 (encouragement of mixed-use development), and 2.1.1.7 (development within community regions may proceed in accordance with General Plan policies and will be limited until adequate roads, utilities, public services, and wildfire are addressed). The CEDHSP's adjacency to the significant north-south arterial of El Dorado Hills Boulevard and to US 50 makes it an appropriate location to capitalize on future public transit routes, and the compact nature of the land uses minimizes intrusion onto neighboring properties while preserving ridgelines and oak woodlands consistent with General Plan policy provisions.

The Serrano Westside planning area land plan incorporates a large open space area buffering the existing residential units of Serrano Village D1 and the proposed Village Residential Medium High and Village Residential High areas. The Pedregal planning area land plan consists of Village Residential Low that is intended to complement the existing density and lot sizes of the subdivisions associated with the Ridgeview East area, given the density range of the land use designation and lot sizing standards set forth in CEDHSP Appendix B, Table B.6. The Village Residential High land use designation would match densities of the existing El Dorado Village Apartments to the north and the Copper Hill Apartments to the south.

The CEDHSP also provides improved protection of existing on-site oak woodland conditions as compared to the existing General Plan land use designations and approved development in Serrano Village D1, Lots C and D. The CEDHSP would be subject to mitigation (on-site planting and fees) consistent with the County's Oak Resources Management Plan that implements General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, which would include the conversion of Lots C and D from planned residential to open

² See the definition of goals, objectives, and policies in Appendix E of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines (2017 Update).

space. Remaining oak woodland impacts would be mitigated on-site through implementation of the project's Important Habitat Mitigation Plan.

Housing

The CEDHSP's range of housing choices and densities would also assist in meeting the County's 2029 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 4,994 housing units that consists of 2,163 very low and low income units, 840 moderate income units, and 1,991 above moderate income units. It would also assist in implementing Housing Element Policies HO 1.1 (ensure that the goals, policies, and implementation programs are developed with the consideration of achieving and maintaining the County's regional housing allocation in specific plans), HO 1.5 (direct higher density residential development to Community Regions), and HO 4.1 (encourage the development of affordable housing for seniors).

Transportation and Measure E Consistency

Measure E (Initiative to Reinstate Measure Y's Original Intent – No More Paper Roads), which became effective on July 29, 2016, modified General Plan Policies TC-Xa, TC-Xf, and TC-Xg related to maintaining level of service (LOS) standards for County roads and highways. Specifically, these policies require that roadway improvements be constructed by development projects when LOS is expected to be below LOS standards under project, 10-year growth conditions (referred to as "near-term"), and cumulative conditions of the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Measure E went into effect after completion of the CEDHSP traffic impact analysis and public release of the CEDHSP original Draft EIR.

A 2017 updated traffic analysis was prepared to evaluate CEDHSP impacts under existing, near-term, and cumulative conditions to address Measure E compliance, the County's Capital Improvement Program, and the following completed transportation improvements:

- US 50/El Dorado Hills Boulevard interchange improvements
- US 50/Silva Valley Parkway interchange opening

The updated traffic analysis identified that the CEDHSP would be responsible to ensure these improvements are made prior to development of the project as identified in RFEIR Transportation Improvements TRA-1a, TRA-b, TRA-1c, and CUM-A identified below.

Latrobe Road/Town Center Boulevard intersection

- Modify the northbound approach to provide two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.
- Modify the westbound approach to provide a shared through/left-turn lane, and two right-turn lanes.
- Provide right-turn overlap phasing for westbound approach.
- Provide split phasing east and westbound.
- Optimize signal timings to accommodate the revised intersection lane configurations.

Silva Valley Parkway/Appian Road Intersection

- Install a traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing northbound and southbound and split phasing eastbound and westbound.
- Provide one left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound and southbound approaches.

El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Park Drive/Saratoga Way Intersection

- Provide one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane on the southbound approach.

Silva Valley Parkway/Appian Way intersection (future conditions)

- Provide a shared through/left-turn lane and a separate right-turn lane on the westbound approach.

Fiscal Matters

As previously discussed above, General Plan Objective 10.2.5 and Policies 10.2.5.1 and 10.2.5.2 require the County to evaluate the fiscal impacts of new development to municipal services and to avoid using County General Fund revenues to fund services. The CEDHSP Fiscal Impact Analysis identifies that at maximum buildout (1,000 residential units), the project would result in a net fiscal deficit of approximately \$438,000 to the County's General Fund and a net fiscal deficit of approximately \$56,000 to the County's Road Fund. In response to this issue, the applicant has agreed to mutually acceptable financing mechanism to generate the annual revenues to eliminate the fiscal deficits to the General Fund and Road Fund as part of the proposed DA.

Consistency with the Sacramento Area Council of Government MTP/SCS

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Sacramento region links land use, air quality, and transportation needs. The MTP/SCS implements smart growth principles, including housing choice, compact development, mixed-use development, natural resource conservation, use of existing assets, quality design, and transportation choice. It also provides increased transportation options while reducing congestion, shortening commute times, and improving air quality. The MTP/SCS is routinely updated. The current document is known as the 2020 MTP/SCS.

The project is consistent with the current 2020 MTP/SCS because it is located in a designated Established Community for the unincorporated area of El Dorado County in the MTP/SCS and would be within the 3,300 new residential units projected in Appendix D of the 2020 MTP/SCS (SACOG 2019:Appendix D, page 31).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have significant effects on the environment that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. County staff determined that the scope and magnitude of the CEDHSP was such that significant environmental

impacts might occur and directed that an EIR be prepared. Under the County’s direction, ICF International prepared the CEDHSP Draft Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2013022044) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with implementing the proposed project, including implementing the CEDHSP , amending El Dorado County’s General Plan and related specific plans, and zoning changes. Subsequent to the publication of the original Draft EIR, County staff determined that additional information was required to reflect recent direction from the California Supreme Court regarding methods of evaluating greenhouse gas emissions. The RDEIR includes revisions to Section 3.6 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), Chapter 4 (Alternatives Analysis), and Chapter 5 (Other CEQA Considerations), which included information pertaining to greenhouse gas emissions. The original Final EIR was released in October 2019 prior to the Planning Commission hearing on November 19, 2019.

In response to public comments on the Final EIR and during Planning Commission hearings, the County prepared and released for review and comment a Second RDEIR, addressing changes to the State CEQA Guidelines related to the evaluation of transportation impacts and an expanded discussion of alternatives to the project. The Second RDEIR also discussed two additional alternatives proposing other uses for the former executive golf course parcel. Pursuant to Senate Bill 743, Public Resources Code Section 21099, and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has replaced congestion as the metric for determining transportation impacts under CEQA. A project’s effect on automobile delay is no longer a consideration when identifying a significant environmental impact. Transportation Improvements TRA-1a, TRA-b, TRA-1c, and CUM-A identified in the RFEIR would still apply as requirements on the project in order to comply with General Plan Policies TC-Xa, TC-Xf, and TC-Xg related to maintaining level of service standards for County roads and highways.

The CEDHSP RFEIR incorporated revisions to the original Draft EIR, the RDEIR, and the Second RDEIR made in response to the comments received during the reviews of those documents, written responses to comments, and copies of the comments themselves. The RFEIR is provided in **Attachment 5**. The RFEIR also identifies refinements to identified mitigation measures and additional mitigation measures in response to comments that have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (**Attachment 9**). Should the project be approved, the MMRP would be adopted and the mitigation measures would be legally binding requirements on the project.

The following table summarizes the timeline for preparation of key milestones in the preparation of the EIR.

Table 4. Summary of the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan EIR Process

Milestone	Date(s)
Notice of Preparation (NOP)	February 19, 2013
NOP Comment Period	February 19, 2013, to March 19, 2013
Public Comment Period for Original Draft EIR	November 20, 2015, to January 19, 2016
Public Comment Period for the Partial Recirculated Draft EIR	March 22, 2016, to June 6, 2016
Final EIR Issued	October 2019
Public Comment Period for the Second Recirculated Draft EIR	April 30, 2021, to June 14, 2021

Revised Final EIR Issued	March 2022
--------------------------	------------

Significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR included the following:

Air Quality

- Impact AQ-1 and AQ-1 CUM: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- Impact AQ-2b and AQ-2b CUM: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during operation.
- Impact AQ-3 and AQ-3 CUM: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

Cultural Resources

- Impact CUL-1 CUM: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource that is a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.

Greenhouse Gases

- Impact GHG-1b and GHG-1b CUM: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment during operation.
- Impact GHG-2 and GHG-2 CUM: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Noise and Vibration

- Impact NOI-1a: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan as a result of construction activities.
- Impact NOI-4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project during construction.
- Impact NOI-5: Be located within an airport land use plan area, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

PUBLIC INPUT, COMMENTS, AND CONCERNS

Public Outreach by the Applicant

The applicant has conducted public outreach to solicit input on the project that has included the following:

- 86 project briefing meetings with interest groups
- 73 project site tours
- 19 project briefing meetings with the public

County Public Meetings and Hearings

The County has held the following meetings and hearing on the project:

- Notice of Preparation Scoping Meeting – March 14, 2013 (Oak Meadow Elementary School in El Dorado Hills)
- Planning Commission Public Hearing – November 19, 2019 (Building C Hearing Room)
- Planning Commission Public Hearing – December 3, 2019 (Building C Hearing Room)
- Planning Commission Special Public Hearing – January 13, 2020 (District Church in El Dorado Hills)

Public Input Received During and After Public Hearings

The County received a substantial amount of public and Planning Commission input in the form of verbal comments at public hearings, comment letters, and emails commenting on the CEDHSP during the public hearings as well as outside of these hearings. These comments are available for public review at the El Dorado legistar site for the Planning Commission meetings on the CEDHSP in 2019 and 2020: <https://eldorado.legistar.com>.

The following list summarizes the key issues identified in these comments.

1. CEDHSP Consistency with the General Plan
2. Hazards Associated with Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) and the Adequacy of the Studies Prepared to Date
3. Impacts on Public Schools Related to School Capacity
4. Impacts on Cultural and Historic Resources
5. El Dorado Hills Community Services District Request to Retain the 100-Acre Former Golf Course Site as Open Space and a 45-Acre Park Site Alternative
6. Definition of “Infill”
7. Use of Outdated Reports in the EIR
8. Traffic
9. Open Space Loss and Aesthetic Impacts
10. Wildland Fire Hazards
11. Concerns Regarding the Development Agreement (DA)
12. Park Location and Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) from US 50
13. Water Supply
14. Responses in the Final EIR

15. Processing of One Versus Two Projects
16. Pedregal Planning Area Seeps and Wetlands
17. Affordable Housing and Regional Housing Needs Allocation for El Dorado County
18. Compliance with the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E Results

These topic areas are addressed below.

Topic Area 1 – CEDHSP Consistency with the General Plan

As further discussed under “Staff Evaluation of Project,” General Plan Policy 2.2.5.2, Zoning Ordinance Section 130.56.030, and California Government Code Section 64554 all require that the project be consistent with the General Plan. State law and published case law identify that perfect conformity between a proposed project and the applicable general plan is not required because “it is nearly, if not absolutely, impossible for a project to be in perfect conformity with each and every policy set forth in the applicable plan” (*Pfeiffer v. City of Sunnyvale City Council* [2011] 200 Cal.App.4th).

This recognition that perfect conformity is not possible is addressed in the Introduction chapter of the County’s General Plan. The consistency analysis in **Attachment 6** is focused on consistency with policies because policies are specific statements that guide decision-making. They are a commitment of the local legislative body to a particular course of action. By contrast, goals are a general expression of community values and therefore may be abstract. Objectives are specified ends, conditions, or states that are intermediate steps toward attaining a goal.

Several comment letters state that the CEDHSP is inconsistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan. A response is provided after each General Plan provision identified in the comment (provided in italic text):

Goal 2.1: Land Use. Protection and conservation of existing communities and rural centers; creation of new sustainable communities; curtailment of urban/suburban sprawl; location and intensity of future development consistent with the availability of adequate infrastructure; and mixed and balanced uses that promote use of alternate transportation systems.

Comments state that a consistency analysis was not conducted for this goal and specifically for the phrase “Protection and conservation of existing communities...” The comments state that the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E voting results demonstrate community opposition to the project and the belief that the project does not protect and conserve existing communities.

As noted above, policies applicable to the project that implement this goal were evaluated for consistency. The CEDHSP area is located in the El Dorado Hills Community Region and is subject to Policies 2.1.1.1 (definition of community regions), 2.1.1.2 (community regions are areas that are appropriate for urban-type or suburban-type development), 2.1.1.3 (encouragement of mixed use developments), and 2.1.1.7 (development within community regions may proceed in accordance with General Plan policies and will be limited until

adequate roads, utilities, public services, and wildfire are addressed). Protection and conservation of existing communities are addressed through Policy 2.1.1.7. **Attachment 6** states that the CEDHSP would be consistent with this policy through provision of infrastructure (roadway improvements and infrastructure extensions). The General Plan does not provide that preventing future development is the mandatory or primary means to preserve “existing communities.” To the contrary, Goal 2.1 refers to “creating new sustainable communities,” and Objective 2.1.1, quoted below, seeks to “[p]rovide opportunities that allow for continued population growth and economic expansion,” especially in Community Regions. Although public opinion is an important factor in the Board of Supervisors making policy decisions, no policies under Goal 2.1 identify resident opposition to a development as a component of “protection and conservation of existing communities.”

Objective 2.1.1: Community Regions – Purpose: The urban limit line establishes a line on the General Plan land use maps demarcating where the urban and suburban land uses will be developed. The Community Region boundaries as depicted on the General Plan land use map shall be the established urban limit line.

Provide opportunities that allow for continued population growth and economic expansion while preserving the character and extent of existing rural centers and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life and economic health of the County.

Comments state that a consistency analysis was not conducted for this objective and that the project does not preserve the character of existing urban centers and does not contribute to the quality of life for County residents. The comments state that the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E voting results demonstrate community opposition to the project and the belief that the project is inconsistent with the values of the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

As noted above, policies applicable to the project that implement this objective were evaluated for consistency. The CEDHSP area is located within the El Dorado Hills Community Region. Development in this location would provide opportunities for continued population growth and residential uses that are similar in character to other residential uses in El Dorado Hills, consistent with this objective (see Volume I of the RFEIR visual simulations in Figures 3.1-3 and 3.1-4 in **Attachment 5**). The CEDHSP would retain the existing open space character of the visually prominent ridgeline east of El Dorado Hills Boulevard (see Volume I of the RFEIR visual simulations in Figure 3.1-4 in **Attachment 5**). It is acknowledged that preservation of this ridgeline would involve the redesignation and development of the 100-acre former golf course site for residential and park development. No policies under Objective 2.1.1 preclude a project because of resident opposition, and there is no general policy providing that opposition to a development is a mandatory evaluation criterion.

Policy 2.2.5.3: The County shall evaluate future rezoning: (1) To be based on the General Plan’s general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density; and

(2) To assess whether changes in conditions that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The specific criteria to be considered include, but are not limited to, the following:

4. Distance to and capacity of the serving elementary and high school;

Comments state that Oak Ridge High School is over its capacity and ask whether CEDHSP students would be sent to a distant high school in violation of this policy provision.

As further discussed in greater detail in response to Topic Area 3, Impacts on Public Schools Related to School Capacity, Oak Ridge High School is under its capacity and is projected not to exceed its capacity through 2026/2027 (El Dorado Union High School District 2020/2021 Demographics and Enrollment Projections). The El Dorado Union High School District would receive funding for new or improved school facilities through payment of fees and participation in Community Facilities District No. 1 or a new CFD for the funding of schools.

15. Existing land use pattern;

Comments state that the consistency analysis incorrectly evaluates the proposed CEDHSP land use plan using adjacent land use conditions. The comments recommend that the analysis be based on the existing land use of the project site (currently in open space).

Policy 2.2.5.3 speaks to the manner in which the County evaluates future rezoning, indicating that it is “(1) To be based on the General Plan’s general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density; and (2) To assess whether changes in conditions that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The specific criteria to be considered include, but are not limited to, the following” and goes on to list 19 criteria for consideration. The existing land use pattern is one of the criteria. Proposed land uses were considered against the existing land use pattern and are similar to surrounding developed land uses, including residential, commercial, and open space. Open space areas are proposed as a part of the Serrano Westside planning area to the east between the project residential uses and the existing land uses east of the project site.

As identified in **Attachment 6**, the CEDHSP is consistent with or advances the applicable factors identified in Policy 2.2.5.3.

Goal 2.3: Natural Landscape Features. Maintain the characteristic natural landscape features unique to each area of the County.

Comments state that the consistency analysis ignores Goal 2.3 and focuses only on Objective 2.3.2 and the associated Policy 2.3.2.1 when it should address all policy provisions under Goal 2.3.

In addition to Objective 2.3.2 and Policy 2.3.2.1, the General Plan includes Objective 2.3.1 (topography and native vegetation) and Policies 2.3.1.1 (continued County enforcement of

County tree protection standards and use of hillside road standards) and 2.3.1.2 (Zoning Ordinance to include parking lot shading standards). These policies direct the County to take actions to implement existing tree protection standards in the Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Ordinance, as well as establish shade tree requirements in the County Zoning Ordinance. These policies are not directed at new development. However, construction activities would be required to comply with the Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Ordinance (see Volume I of the RFEIR Section 3.5 in **Attachment 5**). The CEDHSP land use plan designates ridgelines in the Serrano Westside planning area that contain oak woodlands as open space. County Landscape and Irrigation Standards include shade tree requirements. CEDHSP Policy 8.8 requires the provision of shade trees for parking lots.

Goal 2.4: Maintain and enhance the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life, economic health, and community pride of County residents.

Comments state that the consistency analysis ignores Goal 2.4 and its policies (policies are listed below with responses). The comments state that the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E voting results demonstrate community opposition to the project and the belief that the project is inconsistent with this goal associated with community character and quality of life of the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

As noted above, the consistency analysis is focused on consistency with policies because policies are specific statements that guide decision-making. They are a commitment of the local legislative body to a particular course of action. By contrast, goals are a general expression of community values and therefore may be abstract. None of the policies under Goal 2.4 are applicable to the project as identified below. Although it is acknowledged that there is community opposition to the loss of the 100-acre former golf course site as open space, proposed CEDHSP land uses are similar in character to surrounding developed land uses, as well as those in the entire El Dorado Hills Community Region. Open space areas are proposed as a part of the Serrano Westside planning area to the east between the project residential uses and the existing land uses east of the project site.

Policy 2.4.1.1: Design control combining zone districts shall be expanded for commercial and multiple family zoning districts to include identified Communities, Rural Centers, historic districts, and scenic corridors.

This policy directs the County to establish additional combining zone districts. This policy has been implemented. The CEDHSP is not located in these design control combining districts.

Policy 2.4.1.2: The County shall develop community design guidelines in concert with members of each community which will detail specific qualities and features unique to the community as Planning staff and funds are available. Each plan shall contain design guidelines to be used in project site review of all discretionary project permits. Such plans may be developed for Rural Centers to the extent possible. The guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, the following criteria:

- A. *Historic preservation*
- B. *Streetscape elements and improvements*
- C. *Signage*
- D. *Maintenance of existing scenic road and riparian corridors*
- E. *Compatible architectural design*
- F. *Designs for landmark land uses*
- G. *Outdoor art*

This policy directs the County to establish community design guidelines. The County is implementing this policy with the Commercial and Multi-Family Residential Design Standards. The CEDHSP includes development and design standards in CEDHSP Appendices A and B.

Policy 2.4.1.3: All properties located within the historic townsite known as Clarksville, El Dorado and Diamond Springs shall be designated on the zoning maps as Design Historic (-DH) combining zone district. Other historical townsites may apply for a historical overlay per guidelines in the Zoning Ordinance.

This policy is not applicable because the CEDHSP is not located in any of these historic townsites.

Policy 2.4.1.4: Strip commercial development shall be precluded in favor of clustered contiguous facilities. Existing strip commercial areas shall be developed with common and continuous landscaping along the street frontage, shall utilize common driveways, and accommodate parcel-to-parcel internal automobile and non-automobile circulation where possible.

This policy is not applicable because the CEDHSP does not propose a strip commercial development.

Policy 2.4.1.5: The County shall implement a program to promote infill development in existing communities.

- *Projects site must be consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.*
- *Project sites may not be more than five acres in size and must demonstrate substantially development has occurred on 2 or more sides of the site.*
- *Project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.*
- *Approval of a project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.*
- *The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.*

This policy directs the County to establish a program to promote infill development. It has

not yet been implemented by the County. The CEDHSP would not be able to participate in this future program because the CEDHSP area exceeds 5 acres in size.

Goal 2.5: Carefully planned communities incorporating visual elements which enhance and maintain the rural character and promote a sense of community.

Comments state that the consistency analysis ignores Goal 2.5 and its policies (policies are listed below with responses). The comments state that the development of the existing designated open space in the CEDHSP area would negatively affect the rural character and sense of community in the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

As noted above, the consistency analysis is focused primarily on consistency with policies because policies are specific statements that guide decision-making. They are commitments of the local legislative body to a particular course of action. By contrast, goals are general expressions of community values and therefore may be abstract. An analysis of the consistency of the policies under Goal 2.5 is provided below. Although it is acknowledged that there is community opposition to the loss of the 100-acre former golf course site as open space, proposed CEDHSP land uses are similar in character to surrounding developed land uses, including residential, commercial, and open space, as well as those in the entire El Dorado Hills Community Region. Open space areas are proposed as a part of the Serrano Westside planning area to the east between the project residential uses and the existing land uses east of the project site.

Policy 2.5.1.1: Low intensity land uses shall be incorporated into new development projects to provide for the physical and visual separation of communities. Low intensity land uses may include any one or a combination of the following: parks and natural open space areas, special setbacks, parkways, landscaped roadway buffers, natural landscape features, and transitional development densities.

The CEDHSP is consistent with this policy through the provision of open space buffers between the project residential uses and the existing land uses to the east of the project site for the Serrano Westside planning area. This policy would not apply to the Pedregal planning area because it is located within an existing community. This policy and the CEDHSP consistency analysis was been added to **Attachment 6**.

Policy 2.5.1.2: Greenbelts or other means of community separation shall be included within a specific plan and may include any of the following: preserved open space, parks, agricultural districts, wildlife habitat, rare plant preserves, riparian corridors, and designated Natural Resource areas.

The CEDHSP is consistent with this policy through the provision of open space buffers between the project residential uses and the existing land uses to the east of the project site for the Serrano Westside planning area. Although the Pedregal planning area is located within an existing community, the land use plan includes open space buffering along Wilson Boulevard and Gillette Drive. This policy and the CEDHSP consistency analysis was been added to **Attachment 6**.

Policy 2.5.1.3: The County shall develop a program that allows the maintenance of distinct separators between developed areas (Community Regions and Rural Centers). This program shall include the following elements:

Parcel Analysis: Areas between developed areas (Community Regions and Rural Centers) shall be analyzed to determine if they create inefficiencies for ongoing rural land uses. For instance, parcels that may be too small to support long-term agricultural production shall be identified for potential consolidation. Areas within Community Regions and Rural Centers shall also be analyzed to identify opportunity sites where clustering of development may be appropriate, including increases in the allowable floor-to-area building ratio (FAR) in Community Regions.

Parcel Consolidation/Transfer of Development Rights (TDR): A program to allow consolidation of parcels where appropriate shall be established. This shall include a TDR program that encourages transfer of development rights from the parcels to be consolidated to opportunity sites in Community Regions and Rural Centers. The TDR program shall also allow for consideration of increasing the FARs at specific sites in Community Regions, as deemed appropriate.

The CEDHSP is consistent with this policy through the provision of open space buffers between the project residential uses and the existing land uses to the east of the project site for the Serrano Westside planning area. This policy and the CEDHSP consistency analysis was been added to **Attachment 6**.

Goal 2.6: Protection and improvement of scenic values along designated scenic road corridors.

Commenters state that they cannot find a definitive list of scenic road corridors and that the consistency analysis does not address Goal 2.6 and its policies (policies are listed below with responses).

As noted above, the consistency analysis is focused on consistency with policies because policies are specific statements that guide decision-making. They are commitments of the local legislative body to a particular course of action. By contrast, goals are general expressions of community values and therefore may be abstract. An analysis of the consistency of the policies under Goal 2.6 is provided below.

Policy 2.6.1.1: A Scenic Corridor Ordinance shall be prepared and adopted for the purpose of establishing standards for the protection of identified scenic local roads and State highways. The ordinance shall incorporate standards that address at a minimum the following:

- A. Mapped inventory of sensitive views and viewsheds within the entire County;*
- B. Criteria for designation of scenic corridors;*
- C. State Scenic Highway criteria;*

- D. Limitations on incompatible land uses;*
- E. Design guidelines for project site review, with the exception of single family residential and agricultural uses;*
- F. Identification of foreground and background;*
- G. Long distance viewsheds within the built environment;*
- H. Placement of public utility distribution and transmission facilities and wireless communication structures;*
- I. A program for visual resource management for various landscape types, including guidelines for and restrictions on ridgeline development;*
- J. Residential setbacks established at the 60 CNEL noise contour line along State highways, the local County scenic roads, and along the roads within the Gold Rush Parkway and Action Program;*
- K. Restrict sound walls within the foreground area of a scenic corridor; and*
- L. Grading and earthmoving standards for the foreground area*

This policy directs the County to establish a scenic corridor ordinance. Development of a scenic corridor ordinance is anticipated to commence this year.

Policy 2.6.1.2: Until such time as the Scenic Corridor Ordinance is adopted, the County shall review all projects within designated State Scenic Highway corridors for compliance with State criteria.

This policy is not applicable because the CEDHSP is not located along a designed State Scenic Highway corridor.

Policy 2.6.1.3: Discretionary projects reviewed prior to the adoption of the Scenic Corridor Ordinance, that would be visible from any of the important public scenic viewpoints identified in Table 5.3-1 and Exhibit 5.3-1 of the El Dorado County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, shall be subject to design review, and Policies 2.6.1.4, 2.6.1.5, and 2.6.1.6 shall be applicable to such projects until scenic corridors have been established.

This policy is not applicable because the CEDHSP is not located along the important public scenic viewpoints identified in Table 5.3-1 and Exhibit 5.3-1 of the El Dorado County General Plan Draft EIR (2003).

Policy 2.6.1.4: Commercial designations on U.S. Highway 50 interchanges will be considered for commercial development as part of the General Plan review pursuant to Policy 2.9.1.2.

This policy is not applicable because the CEDHSP would not locate commercial uses near US 50.

Policy 2.6.1.5: All development on ridgelines shall be reviewed by the County for potential impacts on visual resources. Visual impacts will be assessed and may require methods such as setbacks, screening, low-glare or directed lighting, automatic light shutoffs, and external

color schemes that blend with the surroundings in order to avoid visual breaks to the skyline.

This policy is not applicable to the CEDHSP because no development would occur on ridgelines. Volume I of the RFEIR evaluates the visual impacts of the project and includes mitigation measures (AES-2 and AES-4) to blend development features into the natural conditions of the site (**Attachment 5**).

Policy 2.6.1.6: A Scenic Corridor (-SC) Combining Zone District shall be applied to all lands within an identified scenic corridor. Community participation shall be encouraged in identifying those corridors and developing the regulations.

This policy is not applicable because the CEDHSP area does not have a Scenic Corridor Combining Zone.

Policy 2.6.1.7: intentionally blank

Policy 2.6.1.8: In addition to the items referenced in Policy 2.6.1.1, the Scenic Corridor Ordinance shall consider those portions of Highway 49 through El Dorado County that are appropriate for scenic highway designation and pursue nomination for designation as such by Caltrans.

This policy directs the County to establish a scenic corridor ordinance. Development of a scenic corridor ordinance is in process. In addition, the CEDHSP is not located along Highway 49.

Policy HO-1.9: The County shall work with local community, neighborhood, and special interest groups in order to integrate affordable workforce housing into a community and to minimize opposition to increasing housing densities.

Comments state that the consistency analysis does not address this policy. The comments state that the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E voting results demonstrate community opposition to the project and the belief that the County has failed to meet its obligation under this policy.

The Housing Element and its policies are intended to adequately plan for the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the County. A key aspect of housing elements is the identification of adequate housing sites to meet the County's share of the RHNA identified by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments. As addressed below for Topic Area 17, Affordable Housing and Regional Housing Needs Allocation for El Dorado County, the 2021–2029 RHNA for El Dorado County is anticipated to be 4,994 dwelling units. County staff believe that the County has land use capacity sufficient to meet the RHNA. Although the CEDHSP proposes multifamily-designated land areas, the project does not currently commit to the development of affordable housing, and these proposed multifamily-designated land areas are not assumed in the existing or anticipated RHNA for the County.

The County has conducted several public meetings regarding the CEDHSP. Although it is acknowledged that there is community opposition to the CEDHSP, this policy does not mandate the County to obtain community support of the project to determine consistency with the General Plan.

Policy HO-1.25: The County shall encourage programs that will result in improved levels of service on existing roadways and allow for focused reductions in the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee. Such programs may include, but not be limited to, analyzing the traffic benefits of mixed-use development.

Comments note that the consistency analysis does not address this policy. The comments state that the project does not encourage improved levels of service on existing roadways.

This policy references “programs” and not housing projects. This policy is tied to Housing Element Measure HO-2013-35, which would update the TIM Fee Program analysis to analyze anticipated lower trip generation and traffic benefits of a variety of housing types, including mixed-use, second units, transitional and supportive housing, employee housing including agricultural worker housing, and housing for disabled or elderly persons, to determine whether a reduction of TIM fees can be accomplished. This policy is not applicable to the project. Consistency with General Plan level of service policies is addressed in **Attachment 6**.

Policy HO-4.1: The development of affordable housing for seniors, including congregate care facilities, shall be encouraged.

Comments state that the project is inconsistent with this policy because the CEDHSP would convert open space to allow this development potential and senior housing is identified only as an optional use.

The policy encourages and does not require the provision of affordable housing for seniors. The CEDHSP would provide the land use designations and standards that would allow potential senior housing development.

Goal 7.6: Conserve open space land for the continuation of the County’s rural character, commercial agriculture, forestry and other productive uses, the enjoyment of scenic beauty and recreation, the protection of natural resources, for protection from natural hazards, and for wildlife habitat.

Policy 7.6.1.1: The General Plan land use map shall include an Open Space land use designation. The purpose of this designation is to implement the goals and objectives of the Land Use and the Conservation and Open Space Elements by serving one or more of the purposes stated below. In addition, the designations on the land use map for Rural Residential and Natural Resource areas are also intended to implement said goals and objectives. Primary purposes of open space include:

- A. *Conserving natural resource areas required for the conservation of plant and animal life including habitat for fish and wildlife species; areas required for ecologic and other scientific study purposes; rivers, streams, banks of rivers and streams and watershed lands;*
- B. *Conserving natural resource lands for the managed production of resources including forest products, rangeland, agricultural lands important to the production of food and fiber; and areas containing important mineral deposits;*
- C. *Maintaining areas of importance for outdoor recreation including areas of outstanding scenic, historic and cultural value; areas particularly suited for park and recreation purposes including those providing access to lake shores, beaches and rivers and streams; and areas which serve as links between major recreation and open space reservations including utility easements, banks of rivers and streams, trails and scenic highway corridors;*
- D. *Delineating open space for public health and safety including, but not limited to, areas which require special management or regulation because of hazardous or special conditions such as earthquake fault zones, unstable soil areas, flood plains, watersheds, areas presenting high fire risks, areas required for the protection of water quality and water reservoirs, and areas required for the protection and enhancement of air quality; and*
- E. *Providing for open spaces to create buffers which may be landscaped to minimize the adverse impact of one land use on another.*

Policy 7.6.1.2: The County will provide for Open Space lands through:

- A. *The designation of land as Open Space;*
- B. *The designation of land for low-intensity land uses as provided in the Rural Residential and Natural Resource land use designations;*
- C. *Local implementation of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Flood Insurance Program;*
- D. *Local implementation of the State Land Conservation Act Program; and*
- E. *Open space land set aside through Planned Developments (PDs).*

Policy 7.6.1.3: The County shall implement Policy 7.6.1.1 through zoning regulations and the administration thereof. It is intended that certain districts and certain requirements in zoning regulations carry out the purposes set forth in Policy 7.6.1.1 as follows:

- A. *The Open Space (OS) Zoning District is consistent with and shall implement the Open Space designation of the General Plan land use map and all other land use designations.*
- B. *The Agricultural and Timberland Production zoning districts are consistent with Policy 7.6.1.1 and serve one or more of the purposes set forth therein.*

- C. *Zoning regulations shall provide for setbacks from all flood plains, streams, lakes, rivers and canals to maintain Purposes A, B, C, and D set forth in Policy 7.6.1.1.*
- D. *Zoning regulations shall provide for maintenance of permanent open space in residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and residential agricultural zone districts based on standards established in those provisions of the County Code. The regulations shall minimize impacts on wetlands, flood plains, streams, lakes, rivers, canals, and slopes in excess of 30 percent and shall maintain Purposes A, B, C, and D in Policy 7.6.1.1.*
- E. *Landscaping requirements in zoning regulations shall provide for vegetative buffers between incompatible land uses in order to maintain Purpose E in Policy 7.6.1.1.*
- F. *Zoning regulations shall provide for Mineral Resource Combining Zone Districts and/or other appropriate mineral zoning categories which shall be applied to lands found to contain important mineral deposits if development of the resource can occur in compliance with all other policies of the General Plan. Those regulations shall maintain Purposes A, B, C, D, and E of Policy 7.6.1.1.*

Comments state that the consistency analysis ignores Goal 7.6 and its policies regarding open space conservation for outdoor recreation. The comments state that the CEDHSP's proposed redesignation of the 100-acre former golf course site would conflict with this policy and that no offset for this loss of open space is provided.

This goal and its policies are directed at the County to implement the Open Space Land Use designation on the General Plan land use map for purposes of addressing various policies in the General Plan regarding the function of open space (e.g., buffers between land uses, preservation of scenic resources, preservation of natural resources, avoidance of natural hazards). Policy 7.6.1.1 does not establish a mandatory standard on development projects. It is important to note that the goal and associated policies do not prohibit the County (through amendments to the General Plan) from redesignating land areas designated as Open Space or modifying designated Open Space land use boundaries, and they do not require matching open space land offsets for previously designated open space areas. It is acknowledged that the proposed CEDHSP would result in the conversion of the 100-acre former golf course site (General Plan–designated Open Space and zoned Recreational Facilities) to residential, open space, and community park uses. The CEDHSP would designate a total of 190 acres of open space and park uses that would be consistent with General Plan Policies 2.2.4.1 (open space for residential planned developments), 2.5.1.1 (buffering from communities), 2.5.1.2 (community separations), 7.1.2.1 (development prohibition on 30 percent slopes), 7.3.3.4 (setbacks and protection of riparian areas and wetlands), 7.4.4.3 and 7.4.4.4 (oak woodland preservation), 7.6.1.1 (open space designated for natural resources, recreation, natural hazards, and buffer), and 7.6.1.2 and 7.6.1.3 (designation of open space, setbacks for waterways, and open space set asides). The General Plan also does not establish a priority for open space use types (e.g., recreation uses over natural resource conservation).

Goal 9.1: Parks and Recreation Facilities. Provide adequate recreation opportunities and facilities including developed regional and community parks, trails, and resource-based recreation areas for the health and welfare of all residents and visitors of El Dorado County.

Policy 9.1.1.1: The County shall assist in the development of regional, community, and neighborhood parks, ensure a diverse range of recreational opportunities at a regional, community, and neighborhood level, and provide park design guidelines and development standards for park development. The following national standards shall be used as guidelines for the acquisition and development of park facilities:

<i>Guidelines for Acquisition and Development of Park Facilities</i>	
<i>Park Types</i>	<i>Developed</i>
<i>Regional Parks</i>	<i>1.5 ac/1,000 population</i>
<i>Community Parks</i>	<i>1.5 ac/1,000 population</i>
<i>Neighborhood Parks</i>	<i>2.0 ac/1,000 population</i>
<i>Specific Standards (Neighborhood and Community Parks)</i>	
<i>Cameron Park Community Services District</i>	<i>5.0 ac/1,000 population</i>
<i>El Dorado Hills Community Services District</i>	<i>5.0 ac/1,000 population</i>
<i>Planned Communities</i>	<i>5.0 ac/1,000 population</i>

The parkland dedication/in-lieu fees shall be directed towards the purchase and funding of neighborhood and community parks.

Comments state that the project is inconsistent with Policy 9.1.1.1 regarding justification of needing additional parks in comparison to deficiencies in existing park space. The comments also question the adequacy of the parks provided.

Policy 9.1.1.1 identifies a standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population for the El Dorado Hills CSD. Assuming maximum development of the CEDHSP at 1,000 residential units, the project’s parkland dedication would be approximately 13 acres. The proposed CEDHSP would provide a 15-acre community park, as well as a 1-acre private park site (but publicly accessible), that would exceed this standard. As identified for Topic Area 12, Park Location and Exposure to TACs from US 50, the proposed community park site would not be exposed to TAC concentrations that would exceed established thresholds.

Topic Area 2 – Hazards Associated with Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) and the Adequacy of the Studies Prepared to Date

The potential impact related to NOA is addressed in Impact AQ-4d in the EIR, and Mitigation Measure AQ-4 requires asbestos dust mitigation in compliance with El Dorado County Air Quality Management District Rule 223-2. The measure was refined in the RFEIR. Master Response 3 in the RFEIR addresses concerns raised in comments on the original Draft EIR.

As stated in Master Response 3, the level of testing performed by Youngdahl Consulting Group, Inc., in support of the 2012 study is appropriate to the level of review, and further testing would not change the results of the study or the conclusions of the EIR. Until the exact locations that would be graded are identified, testing locations cannot be determined. When specific grading plans have been prepared for any development area within an NOA area in the CEDHSP, testing will be performed in accordance with Rule 223-2.

Public comment on the original Final EIR (released in 2019) raised concerns about the validity of the 2012 studies, and the comments indicated there were new regulations related to NOA that should be addressed. Youngdahl reviewed the comments and prepared a memo addressing those concerns (Youngdahl 2020). As discussed in this memo, the studies remain valid for determining the potential for significant environmental impacts under CEQA, and there are no new applicable regulations.

Topic Area 3 – Impacts on Public Schools Related to School Capacity

Many comments stated that schools in El Dorado Hills are already overcrowded, with already congested traffic at the schools, and that the project would exacerbate these conditions, as well as result in the need for students to travel to out-of-attendance-area schools due to overcrowding.

Project impacts on public schools, including Oak Ridge High School, are addressed in the discussion of Impact PSU-1 in Section 3.12, Public Services and Utilities, in the original Draft EIR and were updated in Volume I of the RFEIR (**Attachment 5**). The EIR identifies the existing school capacities and additional students that would be generated by the project. School crowding is not subject to CEQA review (*Chawanakee Unified School District v. County of Madera* [2011] 196 Cal.App.4th 1016; *Goleta Union School District v. Regents of U.C.* [1995] 37 Cal.App.4th 1025).

Increased enrollment is not a significant environmental effect but is rather a social effect. School impact fees levied on development projects are full and complete mitigation to address capacity as provided by state law (California Government Code Section 65995 et seq.). It is not within the County's jurisdiction or discretion to determine which high school students attend. That decision is made by the school district.

The Buckeye Union School District (BUSD) has identified that it will serve any middle school and elementary school students anticipated from implementation of the CEDHSP. BUSD has also confirmed that the construction of a new school would not be required to serve the middle school and elementary school students anticipated under the CEDHSP (BUSD 2020).

El Dorado Union High School District 2020/2021 Demographics and Enrollment Projections identify that 14,075 residential units (including the CEDHSP) are planned in the district. These projections assume that if 3,315 of the 14,075 planned residential units are completed over a 6-year period, there would be an average of 553 new housing units per year. The district anticipates that this residential development will result in 60 students next year and a total of 461 students in the next 6 years. Not all these students would attend the comprehensive schools. It is also important to note that this projection does not suggest that enrollment would increase by 513 students within the next 6 years.

Based on 2020/2021 Demographics and Enrollment Projections, the district is projected to have a declining enrollment over the next 6 years, with a projected 6,218 students in the 2026/27 school year. This is a total loss of 643 students, a decrease of 9.37 percent. Oak Ridge High School's 2020/2021 enrollment was 2,433 students (school capacity is 2,530).

Future enrollment in Oak Ridge High School resulting from the CEDHSP has been accounted for in the district's projections. Based on the most current and publicly available district information, there is no indication to date that students would need to travel to other district schools as a result of the project. Consequently, an analysis of traffic impacts related to out-of-attendance-area enrollments, as some commenters stated should be analyzed, is not necessary.

Topic Area 4 – Impacts on Cultural and Historic Resources

The County has received comments regarding cultural resources within the project area, in both the Pedregal and Serrano Westside planning areas. Implementation of the project would require a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit, which requires that Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) be addressed. Therefore, all cultural resources were evaluated for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and consultation with Native American groups was conducted as required under Section 106 of the NHPA and under the state requirements of Senate Bill 18 (see Appendix G of the RFEIR in **Attachment 5**).

Prehistoric cultural resources, including bedrock mortars, are located on the Pedregal property, as discussed in the EIR and detailed in Table 3.4-1 of Volume I of the RFEIR (**Attachment 5**). These resources were evaluated, and it was determined through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that they represented contributing elements to a district of prehistoric resources on the property (the Pedregal Archaeological District). Mitigation Measure CUL-1a in the Draft EIR requires that a site-specific Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) be prepared and implemented. This mitigation measure addresses the requirements of both CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Since public circulation of the Draft EIR, the HPTP has been drafted and approved by the County and the SHPO. Additionally, consultation with Native American groups has continued.

Public comments suggested that the former Executive Golf Course in the Serrano Westside planning area should be considered a cultural resource. A historic evaluation was completed in 2020 by ECORP Consulting that has determined the golf course is not a historic property under Section 106 of the NHPA or a historical resource in accordance with CEQA (ECORP 2020).

Topic Area 5 – El Dorado Hills CSD Request to Retain the 100-Acre Former Golf Course Site as Open Space and a 45-Acre Park Site Alternative

During project processing, the El Dorado Hills CSD has identified interest in the retention and acquisition of the 100-acre former golf course site as recreational open space as part of modifications to the CEDHSP. The CSD has also requested that if the proposed CEDHSP includes the redesignation of the 100-acre former golf course site, the CEDHSP land plan should be modified to eliminate the 11-acre Civic-Limited Commercial site, and the land area should be transferred to

establish a 45-acre park site as a compromise for the loss of existing recreational open space land area. The El Dorado Hills CSD noted that the 11-acre Civic-Limited Commercial site has significant constraints that would limit its use as a park site.

The El Dorado Hills CSD and the applicant began discussions regarding the CSD's potential purchase of the 100-acre former golf course in March 2020. Evaluation of the purchase and use of the site occurred from March 2020 to October 2020. Based on the estimated property evaluation, the El Dorado Hills CSD board determined in October 2020 that the site's price was too high to move forward with the purchase.

Topic Area 6 – Definition of “Infill”

Several comments state that the characterization of the CEDHSP as an infill project is not correct based on its size. They reference General Plan Policy 2.4.1.5 as the County's definition of “infill.” As described for Topic Area 1, CEDHSP Consistency with the General Plan, this policy directs the County to establish a program to promote infill development but does not set forth a County definition of “infill.” Infill sites are generally defined as undeveloped sites that are designated for urban or suburban development and that are surrounded by existing development. The CEDHSP meets this definition.

Topic Area 7 – Use of Outdated Reports in the EIR

Several commenters expressed concern that the technical studies used for the EIR analysis are now outdated, which invalidates the analysis in the EIR, and that new studies should be conducted.

Technical studies to support the original Draft EIR, which circulated in late 2015, were conducted largely between 2012 and 2014. Technical studies do not typically expire based on the age of the study. The technical studies and the EIR are not the end of consideration for any resource area. However, for the purposes of CEQA, it is necessary to freeze a moment of time to identify baseline or existing conditions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a) states that the baseline for an EIR normally should be the existing conditions when the Notice of Preparation is released. The guidelines provide some flexibility in using a future condition where conditions fluctuate, but caution must be taken not to include hypothetical conditions. The use of 2012–2014 as a baseline remains appropriate. However, the RFEIR does provide updates to the setting and technical analysis that includes analyses in the RDEIR and the Second RDEIR (e.g., air quality, cultural resources, biological resources, greenhouse gases, utilities, transportation, alternatives). These updates were incorporated in the EIR technical analysis and are provided in Volume I of the RFEIR. None of these updates constitutes “significant new information” requiring recirculation of the EIR (Public Resources Code Section 21092.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5).

Topic Area 8 – Traffic

Several commenters identified traffic operational analysis concerns that were included in the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee comments dated January 6, 2020. These concerns consisted of traffic impacts associated with the Saratoga Way extension and related intersection impacts, Park Drive and El Dorado Hills Boulevard intersection impacts from CEDHSP traffic, the

Country Club Drive extension, and identification of intersections that were not analyzed in the EIR and the associated traffic analysis. **Attachment 10** includes the County's responses to El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee comments dated January 6, 2020, and the Peter B. Eakland dated December 11, 2019.

As previously noted, pursuant to Senate Bill 743, Public Resources Code Section 21099, and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has replaced congestion as the metric for determining transportation impacts under CEQA. A project's effect on automobile delay (i.e., level of service (LOS)) is no longer a consideration when identifying a significant environmental impact. Transportation Improvements TRA-1a, TRA-b, TRA-1c, and CUM-A identified in the RFEIR, which address operational impacts, would still apply as requirements on the project in order to comply with General Plan policies TC-Xa, TC-Xf, and TC-Xg related to maintaining level of service (LOS) standards for County roads and highways.

The Second RDEIR included a VMT analysis and concluded that the CEDHSP would not result significant VMT impacts.

Adequacy of the Technical Analysis for Intersection Impacts

The transportation analysis for the CEDHSP was performed by the consulting firm Fehr & Peers. The scope of the study that evaluated impacts on intersections and traffic volumes was approved by County staff. As the project evolved and time passed, additional supplemental studies were conducted to address the changed circumstances. All the studies were peer reviewed by County staff and an independent outside licensed transportation consultant under contract to the County. The independent consultant does not perform work for developers. The traffic analysis is provided in Appendix L of the RFEIR.

School Traffic Impacts

The transportation analysis was performed for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. School traffic typically is accounted for in the a.m. peak hour, and any project impacts would consider the existing condition without the project. The a.m. and p.m. peak-hour traffic counts were collected when local schools were in session. The cumulative conditions analysis includes planned enrollment levels at local schools, consistent with planned population growth.

Intersection Impacts at Saratoga Way/El Dorado Hills Blvd. and at the Proposed Improvement of Park Drive/El Dorado Hills Boulevard Intersection

See response to El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee January 6, 2020, letter Comment 1 and response to Peter B. Eakland December 11, 2019, letter Comments 1 and 7 in **Attachment 10**.

Wilson Boulevard Operations

As documented in the CEDHSP transportation impact analysis, Wilson Boulevard would operate acceptably (LOS C or better) with the proposed project during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Impact of Country Club Drive Extension

See response to El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee January 6, 2020, letter Comment 4 and response to Peter B. Eakland December 11, 2019, letter Comment 2 in **Attachment 10**.

Delivery Truck Traffic Impacts

Delivery truck traffic is captured to some degree in the general mix of traffic that was collected to document existing conditions, which included a.m. and p.m. peak-hour traffic counts. The increasing prevalence of delivery vehicles is due to the substitution of internet shopping and home delivery for some shopping and meal-related trips. In other words, these delivery trips are replacing trips that would have been made by the residents receiving the delivery.

Turning Movement Level of Service at Intersections

See response to El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee January 6, 2020, letter Comment 1 in **Attachment 10**.

Cumulative Traffic Impacts (Future Costco at Silva Valley Parkway)

The cumulative analysis included approved projects and reasonably foreseeable projects. Since completion of the traffic analysis, the County has received and is processing an application for the proposed EDH 52 Commercial Center project. A Notice of Preparation for the EDH 52 Commercial Center project was released in August 2021. Development on the EDH 52 site is a separate project and is not part of the CEDHSP. As a separate project, it will be subject to CEQA and be required to conduct a transportation impact analysis, identify and mitigate transportation impacts, and demonstrate consistency with El Dorado County General Plan policy. The cumulative traffic analysis for CEDHSP assumed that the EDH 52 would develop as commercial consistent with its current General Plan land use designations.

Topic Area 9 – Open Space Loss and Aesthetic Impacts

Several comments identify visual and aesthetic impacts from the loss of open space character under the CEDHSP. The aesthetic impacts of development under the CEDHSP were addressed in detail in the original Draft EIR on pages 3.1-9 through 3.1-17. The CEDHSP would retain the existing open space character of the visually prominent ridgeline east of El Dorado Hills Boulevard (see Volume I of the RFEIR visual simulations in Figure 3.1-4 in **Attachment 5**). Mitigation Measures AES-2 and AES-4 would require development features to blend into the natural conditions of the site. The commenters did not provide an aesthetic analysis or visual simulations to counter the conclusions of the EIR.

Topic Area 10 – Wildland Fire Hazards

Comments identified concerns related to potential wildland fire hazards associated with development of the CEDHSP.

As documented in Section 3.7 of Volume I of the RFEIR (**Attachment 5**), several factors contribute to the susceptibility of wildfire danger in El Dorado County, including climate, winds, steep terrain, vegetation, subdivision design, and water supply. The community of El Dorado Hills includes open space areas that consist of grassland habitat that are at current risk of fire. The Pedregal planning area is designated as a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone and the Serrano Westside planning area is a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Of 336 total acres in the project area, the proposed project would leave 133 acres of undeveloped open space in the Serrano Westside planning area and 42 undeveloped acres in the Pedregal planning area. Introducing construction activities, electrical service, structures, and people to this area would expose them and the surrounding community to potential wildfire risk and associated impacts from tree and habitat loss and air quality impacts from smoke.

Development of the CEDHSP would be required to comply with state and El Dorado Hills Fire Department (EDHFD) requirements that are designed to minimize the potential for wildfire events as well as limit the extent of fire events. Title 14 and 24 California Code of Regulations and EDHFD Ordinance 2019-01 and 51-01 require that new subdivisions and buildings on the project site comply with specific requirements intended to provide defensible space, adequate emergency access, water for firefighting, and structure construction to improve fire resistance. Land areas surrounding both planning areas consist primarily of developed/managed land uses that have limited fuels (unmanaged vegetation conditions) and access to water infrastructure for firefighting (residential, commercial, roadways, and US 50) that reduces (though not eliminates) the potential for wildfire events to extend beyond the project site or occur adjacent to the project site.

Future development of the project would be subject to compliance with the following CEDHSP policies that address fire hazards.

CEDHSP Policy 5.32: Prior to the submittal of the first small lot tentative subdivision map, prepare a Wildfire Safety Plan (WSP) based on standards and mitigation measures appropriate to the moderate and high fire classifications of the Plan Area on the Cal Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map for El Dorado County. The WSP shall include the following:

- Site and project description;
- Applicable codes and regulations;
- Fire department response capabilities;
- Site fire risk assessment (weather, fuels, topography, fire and ignition history, and potential fire behavior);
- Fire safety requirements (vegetation management, structural hardening site access, water availability, alternative materials and methods); and
- Project-specific recommendations.

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the responsible fire protection district shall review and approve the WSP prior to the approval of the first small lot tentative subdivision map.

CEDHSP Policy 6.19: The local fire protection district shall review and approve all discretionary applications for tentative subdivision maps, parcel maps, and planned development permits prior to County approval to ensure the adequacy of emergency water supply, storage, conveyance facilities, and access for fire protection. Recommendations may be incorporated as conditions of approval.

Reducing fuels (e.g., vegetative management anticipated in a Wildfire Safety Plan) has been found to be effective at reducing fire frequency, fire severity, and annual area burned over an extended period of time (Kim et al. 2013; Martinson and Omi 2013; Tubbesing et al. 2019). Where treatments have occurred, the pattern of wildfire progression may be limited to low-intensity underbrush and surface burning, which can create safe conditions for firefighters to successfully suppress fires in areas near homes or other structures, or around areas of high resource value.

Implementation of the above state, EDHFD, and CEDHSP requirements and standards would minimize the potential for wildfire and would not result in substantially greater potential to exacerbate existing wildfire hazards in the project area from development under the CEDHSP.

Topic Area 11 – Concerns Regarding the Development Agreement (DA)

Development Agreements are authorized by Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5 and County Zoning Ordinance 130.85. A DA is adopted by ordinance. The purpose of a DA “is to provide assurance to an applicant for a development project that upon approval of the project the applicant may proceed in accordance with existing policies, rules and regulations, and subject to conditions of approval, will strengthen the public planning process, encourage private participation in comprehensive planning and reduce the economic costs of development” (County Zoning Ordinance Section 130.58.005). The proposed DA would provide vested rights to the developer to develop the project as approved by the County, in conformance with the County rules, regulations, policies, standards, specifications, and ordinances in effect when the ordinance for the DA is adopted. The applicant would not be obligated to comply with any future amendments to County rules, regulations, policies, standards, specifications, or ordinances. The applicant would be obligated to provide facilities and funding for public and community benefit.

Several comments on the content of the previous DA (2019) identified issues and suggested the need for edits. Comments received will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration and potential revision of the DA if the CEDHSP is approved. The 2019 proposed DA has been updated and will be provided to the Planning Commission prior to the second public hearing on the project.

Topic Area 12 – Park Location and Exposure to TACs from US 50

Commenters expressed concern about the proximity of the Village Park (now referred to as Community Park) location next to US 50 and the effects of vehicle emissions on children at the

park.

Table 3.2-11, in Section 3.2, Air Quality, of Volume I of the RFEIR (**Attachment 5**), presents cancer and noncancer background health risks from receptor exposure to vehicle emissions on US 50. The El Dorado County Air Quality Management District does not have an adopted standard for ambient or cumulative health risks, but references the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's thresholds of 100 per million for cancer risk and a 10.0 hazard index for noncancer risk. The risks identified in Table 3.2-11 were estimated using the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's (SMAQMD) Roadway Protocol (2011) and were calculated for the nearest residential receptor, which would be approximately 400 feet from US 50. As shown in Table 3.2-11, background cancer risk from US 50 at this receptor location was estimated to be 83 per million. Since the original Draft EIR was circulated in late 2015, SMAQMD has published updated guidance and tools for estimating health risks from receptor exposure to highway traffic. According to the SMAQMD 2019 risk mapping tool, which is part of its Mobile Source Air Toxics Protocol, ambient cancer risk from vehicle emissions on US 50 at the nearest residential receptor (400 feet from the roadway) is now estimated to be 57 per million. The assumed location of a sports field would be approximately 150 feet from US 50. Ambient cancer risk at this distance is 77 per million, per the risk mapping tool. Duration of exposure is a key factor in risk estimation. The cancer risk estimates from the SMAQMD risk mapping tool assume residential exposure to emissions, which assumes constant exposure for 30 years from the third trimester in utero. Because the exposure at a park would be intermittent (several hours several times a week during the sports season, for instance), risks would likely be lower for a recreational receptor who would be exposed to pollution from US 50 for only a short duration.

Topic Area 13 – Water Supply

Several comments identify concerns regarding the adequacy of water supplies to accommodate the CEDHSP. The Water Supply Assessment (WSA) approved by the El Dorado Irrigation District in August 2013 determined that EID has water supplies sufficient to serve the proposed CEDHSP, and subsequent review finds that the document remains valid. Residential development of the CEDHSP would be subject to all applicable drought-related water conservation measures as enforced by EID.

In 2021 the authors of the WSA (Tully & Young) prepared a technical memorandum titled *Revalidation of Previously Adopted Water Supply Assessments for the Village of Marble Valley, Lime Rock Valley, and Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plans* to re-evaluate the water supply conclusions of these WSAs (see **Attachment 5**, RFEIR Appendix K). The memorandum concluded that it is expected that the water demand for the proposed project would be lower than calculated in the EID-approved 2013 WSA. This decrease would be due to current assumptions about residential and nonresidential water use that has been driven by continued statutory, regulatory, and common-practice considerations. These factors, as well as a continued conservation ethic among water-using customers, have resulted in a lowering of EID's per-capita water demand factors compared to those used for the 2013 WSA. The proposed project is recognized in EID's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) as part of planned future customer demands. EID's 2020 UWMP concludes that the district has sufficient water supplies for all current and planned future customers through 2045 during normal, single-dry years, and droughts lasting 5 years. Therefore, EID's

conclusions of water availability and sufficiency to meet the proposed project's estimated water demands as articulated in the 2013 WSA are still valid, and the 2020 UWMP provides necessary concurrence of these prior conclusions.

No data or technical analysis counter to that presented in the WSA has been provided by commenters.

Topic Area 14 – Responses in the Final EIR

There are comments that disagree with the County's responses to comments received on the original Draft EIR, which were provided in the original Final EIR and were updated in the RFEIR. A review of the comments received on the original Final EIR indicates that no issues pertaining to the analysis of environmental impacts were raised that are not adequately addressed in the RFEIR or this staff report. CEQA requires that public and agency comments on the Final EIR be considered by the lead agency in its decision whether to certify the EIR. The RFEIR and its technical analysis are based on substantial evidence that is referenced in these documents. Disagreement with the analysis or conclusions in the RFEIR does not constitute inadequacy under CEQA.

Topic Area 15 – Processing of One Versus Two Projects

Some commenters questioned why the two planning areas are not considered two separate projects.

The CEDHSP application by the applicant proposed the inclusion of both planning areas in a single specific plan development request. The applicant intends to develop both planning areas. Although specific plan areas commonly consist of contiguous land areas, there are no state or County policies or regulations that prohibit the applicant's request for the County to consider these two separate but related planning areas within a single development request. As identified above, the existing maximum development potential that is currently allowed under the existing General Plan and zoning for both planning areas is 759 dwelling units (see Table 1). The inclusion of both sites in a single specific plan would allow for the reallocation of these dwelling units between the two planning areas to address slope, oak woodland, and other natural resource constraints in the two planning areas to address pertinent requirements established in General Plan policies concerning these resources.

Topic Area 16 – Pedregal Planning Area Seeps and Wetlands

Several comments expressed concerns that there are wetland features and seeps in the Pedregal planning area and that the area may have contained a reservoir in the past. Volume I of the RFEIR Section 3.3, Biological Resources, describes in detail the wetland resources and seeps on the site, consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 (**Attachment 5**). Volume I of the RFEIR Figure 3.3-1 identifies the location of the seeps and wetland resources on the site. No comments provide any technical information that counters the wetland information provided in the EIR.

CEQA does not intend environmental review of or mitigation for historic or pre-project conditions. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a) states that the baseline physical conditions are the basis by which a lead agency determines whether an impact of the project would be significant. In *Center*

for Biological Diversity et al. v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 214 (183 Cal.Rptr.3d 736), the Fourth Appellate District upheld the baseline conditions and ruled that the baseline condition must reflect the physical conditions at the time the environmental analysis begins even if the current conditions include unauthorized and even environmentally harmful conditions that never received environmental review. Other published court decisions that support this interpretation of CEQA are *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428 (91 Cal.Rptr. 2d 322) and *Fat v. County of Sacramento* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1270 (119 Cal.Rptr.2d 402).

Topic Area 17 – Affordable Housing and Regional Housing Needs for El Dorado County

Comments identified issues on whether the project would assist in meeting the County’s housing needs. Table B-3 (Residential Vacant Land Inventory) of the 2013–2021 Housing Element update identified 187.74 acres of multifamily residential land area with a development potential of 1,495 dwelling units for the west slope portion of the County. The CEDHSP would consist of 26 acres designated for multifamily development that could generate 530 dwelling units.

The 2021–2029 RHNA for El Dorado County is 4,994 dwelling units (not including the Tahoe Basin). County staff believe that the County has sufficient land use capacity to meet the RHNA. Although the CEDHSP proposes multifamily-designated land areas, the project does not currently commit to the development of affordable housing.

Topic Area 18 – Consistency with the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E Results

Several comments state that the proposed CEDHSP should not be considered based on the 2015 El Dorado Hills CSD Advisory Measure E voting results. The measure was placed on the ballot for the November 2015 elections by the governing body of the Community Services District pursuant to District Resolution 2015-12 as an advisory election to obtain public input on the following statement:

Should the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors re-zone the approximately 100 acres of the former executive golf course in El Dorado Hills from its current land use designation as “open space recreation” to a designation that allows residential housing and commercial development on the property?

In the November 2015 elections, 9,047 votes were cast on this measure. Of those who voted, 8.96 percent were in favor of the measure and 91.04 percent of voters against. However, this was an advisory election, which does not prevent the project from being processed by the County in accordance with County policy and state law.

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15090 and 15091, Findings of Fact are provided in **Attachment 8** detailing the statements of evidence in

support of the environmental analysis and conclusions of the EIR, subject to adoption by the Board of Supervisors.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

In accordance CEQA Guidelines Section 15074(d), a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) is provided detailing the mitigation measures necessary to mitigate the identified environmental impacts to less than significant impact. The MMRP is included as **Attachment 9**.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments to Staff Report:

Attachment 1	Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan
Attachment 2	Proposed Changes to the Specific Plan
Attachment 3	Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Public Facilities Financing Plan
Attachment 4	Draft Development Agreement for Central Dorado Hills Specific Plan
Attachment 5	Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan RFEIR
Attachment 6	General Plan Consistency Analysis
Attachment 7	Fiscal Impact Analysis for Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan
Attachment 8	CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
Attachment 9	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Attachment 10	Technical Responses to Traffic Comments
Exhibit A	Location Map
Exhibit B.....	Proposed CEDHSP Land Use Diagram
Exhibit C.....	El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Amendments
Exhibit D	Proposed CEDHSP Zoning
Exhibit E.....	Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map
Exhibit F.....	Assessor Parcel Map
Exhibit G	Circulation Plan
Exhibit H	Park Drive Reconfiguration
Exhibit H-1	Country Club Drive Extension Circulation Option
Exhibit I.....	Bicycle and Trails Plan
Exhibit J.....	Existing General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit K	Existing Zoning Map