

#35

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>



Fwd: Generations at Green Valley

1 message

The **BOSONE** <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Thu, Oct 19, 2017 at 4:12 PM

Kind Regards,

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530) 621-5650
CLICK HERE to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook

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

From: **Craig Campbell** <CCampbell@campbellkeller.com>
Date: Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 10:48 AM
Subject: Generations at Green Valley
To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>

John:

I will be out of town on business when the public hearing takes place on the 24th concerning the "Generations at Green Valley" previously known as Dixon Ranch. I live in the adjoining development of Highland Hills. I would like to express my lack of support for this project as designed as it is still too dense of a development given the surrounding development and the adverse impact on the already dangerous Green Valley Road. In addition, I am very concerned if the density is too high we will end up with traffic being routed into my development even though it is currently planned as an EVA only. Our development has steep down hills with blind corners and lack of stop signs. This could create a life-threatening condition in our development.

If the density was closer to the recent mailings I had for the "Vineyards" it seemed like this density is more in line with the surrounding space. The proposed density of the Generations is just out of step with the community at large and in conflict with why the majority of people have bought into the El Dorado Hills area.

I thank you in advance for considering the dramatic impacts of this development as currently planned and reject the level of density they propose.

Craig Campbell | President | Campbell Keller

3041 65th Street, Suite 3 | Sacramento, CA 95820

Direct (916) 231-9236 | Web

A valuable new resource for your furniture solutions, our Interactive Products Gallery is now available!



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Generations at Green Valley

2 messages

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Thu, Oct 19, 2017 at 4:12 PM

Kind Regards,

Cindy MuntAssistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530) 621-5650
CLICK HERE to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook

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

From: **Craig Campbell** <CCampbell@campbellkeller.com>
Date: Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 10:48 AM
Subject: Generations at Green Valley
To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>

John:

I will be out of town on business when the public hearing takes place on the 24th concerning the "Generations at Green Valley" previously known as Dixon Ranch. I live in the adjoining development of Highland Hills. I would like to express my lack of support for this project as designed as it is still too dense of a development given the surrounding development and the adverse impact on the already dangerous Green Valley Road. In addition, I am very concerned if the density is too high we will end up with traffic being routed into my development even though it is currently planned as an EVA only. Our development has steep down hills with blind corners and lack of stop signs. This could create a life-threatening condition in our development.

If the density was closer to the recent mailings I had for the "Vineyards" it seemed like this density is more in line with the surrounding space. The proposed density of the Generations is just out of step with the community at large and in conflict with why the majority of people have bought into the El Dorado Hills area.

I thank you in advance for considering the dramatic impacts of this development as currently planned and reject the level of density they propose.

Craig Campbell | President | Campbell Keller

3041 65th Street, Suite 3 | Sacramento, CA 95820

Direct (916) 231-9236 | Web

A valuable new resource for your furniture solutions, our Interactive Products Gallery is now available!

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fri, Oct 20, 2017 at 7:33 AM

Kind Regards,

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530) 621-5650
CLICK HERE to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook

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

From: **David Goldenberg** <golden59@pacbell.net>
Date: Thu, Oct 19, 2017 at 9:47 PM
Subject: Generations at Green Valley
To: John Knight <bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Ron Briggs <bosfour@edcgov.us>, The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>
Cc: Aidan Barry <abarry@thetruelifecompanies.com>

Dear Supervisors,

I am the past president of the Highland View Homeowners Association (HOA) and I'd like to provide some history when you consider the applicant's pre-application hearing on October 24. I will be out of state during the hearing, otherwise I would appear before you to state the following.

I have personally chaired countless meetings with the builder representatives and the HOA to air concerns from homeowners and the association regarding safety and density. I wish to state that the builder always listened and tried to accommodate our concerns. Our primary concern was safety because of the proposed pass through at Lima Way. Our second concern was housing density and resulting traffic on Green Valley. To accommodate our concerns the builder submitted a new Notice of Preparation (NOP) that contained an Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) at Lima Way and reduced the number of homes while adding an age restricted community. Those changes were a result of collaborative meetings with residents of Highland View and Sterlingshire. We also worked cooperatively with the Fire Marshall to be sure the EVA met the Department's Fire Code. Our over arching goal was to not increase the traffic load on Green Valley by cutting off the Lima Way pass through. Our streets would have become intolerable if thousands of car trips came speeding through our neighborhood. The age restricted homeowners have a different driving pattern than those residents traveling to work or taking their children to school. Therefore road congestion would have been somewhat relieved. The Board of Supervisors denied the petition on February 14, 2017. I gave testimony that day.

It is my understanding the developer is requesting your feedback on their third revised plan. They have attended our Board meetings to explain their latest plan. We are pleased to learn the Lima Way EVA is still in place. We also understand they have reduced the number of homes and they are keeping the age restricted community.

I have continually thought about this project and what is best for our community. It is my feeling that if not this project, it will eventually be some other. I can assure you this builder is sincere to accommodate concerns and will do what is necessary to make it right. I'm fearful that if this builder is denied and walks away, we have no assurances that the next builder will factor in the Lima Way EVA for two reasons. One, the County's plan always considered Lima Way to be a pass through. Secondly, the Fire Marshall may not approve the EVA under a totally new plan. This is a great concern of mine and our HOA.

As our elected officials, it's your prerogative to give feedback to the builder at the October 24 hearing. It is my sincere hope that you give the builder concise guidance on how the Generations at Green Valley meets your expectations for the future of El Dorado Hills. Thank you in advance for giving this project your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

David Goldenberg
Resident of El Dorado Hills
Past President
Highland View Home Owners Association

'Generations at Green Valley' PA17-0002, BOS 10/24/17 – Rural Communities United (RCU) Public Comment

Dear Supervisors:

This project has multiple nexus points to the RCU lawsuit against the 2015 General Plan and zoning update (TGPA/ZOU)¹, so it should be made clear that a project approval could potentially be invalidated pending outcome of that case. As a pre-application review, we hope your feedback to the proponent will accurately reflect local resident's many concerns, and not just those of a hopeful development community. Comments:

1. Low Density Land within the Community Region remains a conflict in the County. The 'Generations' project is dependent upon the site remaining within the Community Region (CR). But the RCU case alleges analysis of CR boundaries was erroneously dismissed from the TGPA/ZOU despite significant evidence submitted on prior projects² demonstrating how inappropriate it is for this property to remain in the CR.
2. Oak woodland removal necessary for the project exceeds both 2004 and 2015 Gen Plan standards. 'Generations' is dependent on new oak policies that could be overturned by the pending RCU case, which alleges that bifurcation of the environmental reviews of the biological update and the TGPA/ZOU violated CEQA.
3. The project site is part of the ZOU's agricultural conversion being challenged by RCU. Should the RCU case prevail in court, the project site could revert to its prior agricultural zoning, and the environmental review would need to incorporate the conversion impacts and mitigation for the site that were never addressed in the TGPA/ZOU county-wide mass rezoning.
4. Traffic safety vs. capacity on Green Valley Rd remains unresolved. Rural Green Valley Rd cannot carry traffic from a high-density project at this site without addressing safety issues that the prior Dixon Ranch proposal dismissed. The assumptions made in the updated 2015 Travel Demand Model exacerbate inconsistencies between the development potential of the Land Use Element and the level of service requirements of the Circulation Element, as is being challenged in the pending RCU case.
5. Proposed Open Space of 22% will not meet 2004 GP standards should the 2015 TGPA amendments be overturned. The applicant should be made aware of this difference in open space requirements.
6. The RCU case alleges that both the 2004 General Plan and its updated 2015 TGPA-version provide inadequate bases for project approval. Many 2004 Gen Plan policies mandated as mitigation for the impacts of development have not been implemented as required. The balance between development and the impacts mitigated by those policies, that the courts found as justification for the validity of that general plan, has been lost through implementation that placed higher priority on development approval than on timely mitigation implementation.

If the court finds the 2015 GP amendments invalid in the TGPA/ZOU case, projects approved under those amendments and timely challenged, will similarly be struck down. It is also likely that controversial projects will be challenged, and those with a nexus to the TGPA/ZOU flaws will have their approvals invalidated.

We strongly encourage the County to avoid approving projects with a nexus to the alleged General Plan flaws, but also to address the underlying issues. Please conduct the analysis to determine if this site belongs in the Community Region, because all evidence is to the contrary. Implement the General Plan's protective policies and not just those that ease development. End this cycle of wasting public resources to defend existing policy.

Ellen Van Dyke for Rural Communities United

¹ *RCU v. El Dorado*, PC 20160024, filed Jan. 13, 2016, El Dorado County Superior Court, Dept. 9

² Dixon Ranch, file 16-0477; Community Regions, file 13-0510; Green Valley Corridor [Traffic] Study, file 13-0889



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Generations project public meeting, October 24

1 message

Anthony Sarge <a.sarge@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Oct 20, 2017 at 12:42 PM

Reply-To: Anthony Sarge <a.sarge@sbcglobal.net>

To: bosone@edcgov.us

Cc: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors and Clerk of the Board,

I would like you to record and also read this letter at the subject meeting, which I plan to attend.

As an observer of the county planning process for many years, I have become increasingly frustrated by your apparent inability to recognize or acknowledge the concerns of many residents affected by new residential development proposals. Fundamentally, when concerns such as traffic congestion, public safety, natural resources, environmental impact, or infrastructure in general are raised by voters, we are largely ignored. What appears today to this writer is a poorly disguised re-do of the original proposal which earlier was soundly rejected by the citizens most affected.

I will address only one of these concerns, mostly as an "interested observer", since as a retiree, I am no longer encumbered by traffic congestion at peak commute hours. I do, however, need to cross the intersection of Green Valley Road and El Dorado Hills Boulevard at times, and even this simple task has become more difficult each year, in spite of turn lane additions and modifications to traffic light timing.

Can anyone on the board explain the impact of 400 to nearly 900 cars at this intersection each day? Short of a plan to build a four lane roadway on the existing Green Valley Road right-of-way from Placerville to El Dorado Hills, I cannot visualize an end to the gridlock and traffic hazards at this location. Even if this were to be done, I'm afraid the problem would just move elsewhere.

I was opposed to the prior development proposal, and I remain opposed to this warmed over version. The simple fact remains that high density housing is now and always will be out of character with the original design concept of El Dorado Hills. Has anyone on this board seen a "group of loosely connected villages connected by green space" lately? This is exactly why I moved here nearly 30 years ago. Even then, the mirage was beginning to fade. Something should be done before it's too late. I cannot afford to move 50 miles away from medical facilities, nor do I want to see a replica of Sunnyvale over my back fence in my lifetime.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Anthony Sarge
El Dorado Hills
916-933-5765