



# PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Phone: (530) 621-5355 Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

<https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-and-Building/Planning-Division>

RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
2026 MAY 29 PM 2:25

## APPEAL FORM

File Number: Tm - A26-0008

Receipt Number: R66725

Date Received: 5/29/2026

Amount: \$494.00

Appeals must be submitted to the Planning Division with the applicable fees as established by the Planning and Building Department fee schedule. Please contact the Planning Division at (530) 621-5355 with any questions.

Appellant Name: Tara Mccann

Appellant Address: [REDACTED] El Dorado Hills, Ca 95762

Appellant Phone Number: [REDACTED]

A Letter of Authorization form signed by the Appellant authorizing the Agent to act on their behalf must be submitted with this appeal, if necessary.

Agent Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Agent Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Agent Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Appeal being made to:  Board of Supervisors  Planning Commission  Agricultural Commission

Action being appealed (Please specify the action being appealed, i.e., approval of an application, denial of an application, conditions of approval, etc., and specific reasons for appeal. If appealing conditions of approval, please attach a copy of the conditions and specify appeal):

See Attached Exhibit A

Date of action being appealed: 5/14/2026

[Signature]

5/29/2026

Appellant/Agent Signature

Date

**Section 130.52.090 – Appeals**

Any decision by the review authority of original jurisdiction may be appealed by the applicant or any other affected party, as follows:

- A. An appeal must be filed within 10 working days from the decision by the review authority by completing the appeal form and submitting said form together with the applicable fee, as established by resolution of the Board, to the Department. The Department shall forward the appeal to the Clerk of the Board. The appellant shall clearly identify on the appeal form the specific reasons for the appeal and the relief requested.
- B. The hearing body for the appeal shall consider all issues raised by the appellant and may consider other relevant issues related to the project being appealed. The hearing body for the appeal shall be as follows:
  - 1. All decisions of the Director are appealable to the Commission and then to the Board.
  - 2. All decisions of the Zoning Administrator and the Commission are appealable to the Board.
  - 3. All decisions of the Agricultural Commissioner are appealable to the Ag Commission and then to the Board.
  - 4. All decisions of the Board are final.
- C. The hearing on an appeal should be set no more than 60 days from receipt of a completed appeal form and fee. If the Board meeting is canceled for any reason on the date on which the appeal would normally be heard, the appeal shall be heard on the first available regularly-scheduled meeting following the canceled meeting date. The 60-day time limitation may be extended by mutual consent of the appellant(s), and the applicant, if different from the appellant. Once the date and time for the hearing is established the hearing may be continued only by such mutual consent.
- D. In any appeal action brought in compliance with this Section, the appellant(s) may withdraw the appeal, with prejudice, at any time prior to the commencement of the public hearing. For the purposes of this Section, the public hearing shall be deemed commenced upon the taking of any evidence, including reports from staff.
- E. Upon the filing of an appeal, the Commission, the Ag Commission, or the Board shall render its decision on the appeal at the conclusion of the hearing or rendered at a subsequent meeting of the Board of Supervisors within 45 days of the hearing, unless it is stipulated by the parties that the matter may be submitted for a later decision upon a certain date. The decision shall be in the form of written findings.
- F. No person shall seek judicial review of a County decision on a planning permit or other matter in compliance with this Title until all appeals to the Commission and Board or to the Ag Commission and the Board as applicable have been first exhausted in compliance with this Section.

**RECEIVED**

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

TM - 426-0003

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Application for Appeal
2. Appeal Exhibit A
3. Application for TM25-003. PD25-005, Z25-0006
4. Conditions of Approval
5. Letter dated 5/13/2026 4:24pm
6. Letter dated 5/13/2026 2:06pm
7. Letter dated 5/13/2026 1:12pm
8. Letter dated 5/13/2026 12:25 pm

**RECEIVED**

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

26-0960 C 3 of 64

**Action Being Appealed:**

The Planning Commission's approval of Project Serrano Village M5 Project (TM25-0003 / PD25-0005/ Z25-0006) and its exemption Status from CEQA.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**1. Zoning and General Plan Amendment as part of the Project was Not Identified, Was not included in Hearing description, was not included in the Staff Report, was not included in the Staff Presentation, was not included in the Notice to Public, was not included in Legistar.**

The Project is misleading and documents were withheld, the Zoning ( Add PD overlay to R20K) is a critical part of the Project and has future consequences as a PD overlay can include lot sizing down to 6000 sf. This is critical for future projects that come up for review like next door the 30 plus acres in that it can be used as a compatibility test for higher density even though the Developer states these lots will be built at 20,000 sf minimums, the zoning approved is what dictates. With this PD Overlay future projects in the area can be justified higher density's based on a get around of a blanket overlay of this project, even though a higher density is never intended for this project under 20,000 sf. This is crucial that the Project's description and Application be complete, accurate and included in all formats that are listed as sources of information of the County Web Site in which the public, decision makers and stakeholders rely. The Project is Described as TM25-0003 and PD25-0005 not Zoning Change (Z) and General Plan Amendment (GP) .

I was told by County staff there was no Zoning Change several times during this project. from Cameron Welch County Planner to Tara Mccann. There is no location that the Application for the Project was findable in any advertised location for documents of the project.

- Legistar - Does not identify hearing is for Zoning Change and General Plan Amendment. States hearing to consider TM25-0003 and PD25-0005
- Planning Commission Hearing item # 2 - 26-0785 Does not identify hearing is for Zoning Change and General Plan Amendment. States hearing to consider TM25-0003 and PD25-0005
- Staff Report - does not identify the Zoning Change and General Plan Amendment; it states TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5.
- Staff Presentation - Does not identify Zoning Change and General Plan Amendment, only identifies and recommends approval TM25-0003 / PD25-0005 and Design Waivers - modify Standard Plan 101B for roadway right-of-way and improvement widths (including sidewalks, curbs and turnarounds). b. Modification

**RECEIVED**

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median.

- Public Notice - Does not identify Zoning Change and General Plan Amendment. Only TM & PD.

Here below is Email from Planner the day before the Planning Commission Hearing - Planner stated a Zoning Change and General Plan Amendment would not be required on this project in email on 5/13/2026 at 4:22pm and then sent an email with the Application that I saw for the first time at 8:22 pm on 5/13/2026 including the Zone Change and General Plan Amendment. This Application with Zone Change and General Plan Amendment was never made public on Legistar, not made public on Hearing Description, was not included in Staff Report, was not included in the Staff Presentation, was not included in the Notice to the Public or on County Web Site under Projects in Your Area. All locations only referred to the project as a TM25-0003 and PD25-0005. Here I've attached the Planners email to me after repeated requests for the current Application for the project that had expired in 2023.

*email 5/13/2026 4:22pm*

*Good morning, Tara Mccann,*

*I am re-sending an e-mail that was sent yesterday that might have reached you due to file size and being sent just a minute or two another e-mail was sent that also was large in size. Reiterating what it said, please note that during the review and processing of this application it was determined that a rezone would not be required for TM25-0003/PD25-0005, hence why the rezone is not part of the current project.*

*Sincerely,*

*Cameron Welch  
Senior Planner  
Planning Division*

In the attachment to this letter above there was a Tentative Map Application (TM25-0003), A Planned Development Application (PD25-0005) and a Zoning (Z25-0006) and General Plan Amendment Applications . The Zoning was not marked void, there was no indication on any part of this Application that the Zoning Change was not being applied for. The Zone Change Application Form was dated transmitted 9/24/2025. On all pages of the Application the TM/PD and ZC were all stamped **TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Z25-0006**. El Dorado County Planning had this in their

possession and files since Sept 2025. This was never disclosed until the day before the Planning Commission Hearing to the public.

*Restatement of Complete Agenda Item:*

**AGENDA ITEMS 2:** 26-0785 Hearing to consider **TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5** request for the following:

1. Tentative Subdivision Map for subdivision of an existing 8.42-acre lot into 10 residential lots ranging in size from 20,018 square feet to 73,063 square feet and four (4) landscaping lots ranging in size from 435 square feet to 3,484 square feet with multiple phases presented for Final Subdivision Map filing;
2. Planned Development Permit to ensure consistency with the existing specific plan (El Dorado Hills Specific Plan); and
3. Design Waivers requested for the following County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM):
  - a. Modify Standard Plan 101B for roadway right-of-way and improvement widths (including sidewalks, curbs and turnarounds) as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map.
  - b. Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 123-020-023, consisting of 8.42 acres, is located on the west side of Appian Way, at the intersection with Sangiovese Drive, in the El Dorado Hills area, submitted by Serrano Associates, LLC; Staff recommends the Planning Commission take the following actions:
    1. Find that the project is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines; and
    2. Approve Tentative Subdivision Map TM25-0003, Planned Development Permit PD25-0005, and the requested Design Waivers based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as presented herein.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**2. Conditions of Approval - Deviations from Project Description**

*Any deviations from the project description, exhibits, or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review.*

Further Environmental Review Warranted:

- Drainage
- Use of Allegheny Creek for runoff release from Project without a Drainage and Watershed study.

- Project is assuming tiered Fish & Game Permitting from 1988 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. This was never studied nor considered.
- Watershed
- Entitlements from Highland View subdivision adjacent to the project.
- Wetland identified and mapped
- Creation of a 4 Way Intersection ( Controlled or Uncontrolled)
- Zoning Z25-0006 ( Add PD overlay to R20K) Deviates from the project description that was originally advertised. It uses a density transfer provision of the Expired EDHSP Development Agreement (DA) and relies solely on the argument that residential unit caps have not been exceeded and therefore states the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map is found to be consistent with the EDHSP. This is circular logic and uses the EDHSP to circumvent CEQA review of a Project that proposes significant impacts to a location of high vehicle trips per day, no passable shoulders, conflicting vehicle movements due to the lack of existing transportation infrastructure, due to the build up to the road planning there is no way to Widen or add shoulder, turning lanes or a two way middle turn lane at location of easement entrance. The project parcel has a unique location away from the Serrano Gated Historical Community Boundary and omission from the original 1988 EIR scope. The project creates "new significant impacts" that were never previously evaluated. This project does not meet the language of the Specific Plan and could not be identified or analyzed in the 1988 EIR. Per Title 130 a project must clearly state zoning pre project and zoning post project. The Project Application that was not available on any public documents until the day before the PC Hearing Meeting shows handwritten note on Zoning Application Z25-0006 ( add PD overlay to R20K) . In the Zoning Ordinance it states this is shown as "Single-unit Residential, 20,000-square-foot minimum lot size, Planned Development Combining Zone" (written as R20K-PD). [1, 2]. The project must show both Zoning and General Plan designation before project and after project, or what is being applied for in the nomenclature of the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**3. The Zoning Change - 2.2.5.3 of the General Plan.** *Zone change applications may also be used to add an overlay zone such as planned development or design review. A General Plan amendment is required when the underlying land use designation must be changed to permit a proposed zone or use of the site.* No reason was given for the Zone Change when asked after receiving full Application from Planner the day before the Planning Commission Hearing. The Application sent from the Planner was Z25-0006. The Application was never provided on any advertised site for the Project. It wasn't

included in the Legistar, Under Project in Your Area documents. All references to the Project only referenced TM25-0003 / PD25-0005. It wasn't until the day before the Planning Commission Meeting the Application with the Z25-006 was emailed. This Application or any reference to Z25-0006 was not Identified on the project description, was not identified on the Planning Commission Hearing Agenda, Was not included in Planning Commission Hearing description, was not included in the Staff Report, was not included in the Staff Presentation, was not included in the Notice to Public, was not included in Legistar.

The County Planning Department went on record stating no Zoning Change is needed in an email, after the project was approved Planning Commission and County Staff verified a Zoning Change was approved as part of the Project.

Why Apply for a 6,000 sq. ft. Overlay if Building 20,000 sq. ft. Lots?  
( Add PD Overlay to R20K)

- **Flexibility for Future Phasing:** The current developer might build 20,000 sq. ft. lots today, but securing the 6,000 sq. ft. entitlement drastically increases the land's baseline value. If market conditions shift, they (or a future builder they sell the land to) can legally pivot to higher-density housing without going through the grueling re-entitlement process again.
- **Average Lot Size Mechanics:** In many Planned Development (PD) ordinances, density is calculated across the *entire* project footprint rather than on a strict lot-by-lot basis. A developer might build several large 20,000 sq. ft. estate lots on a premier ridge or corner, but use the 6,000 sq. ft. allowance to pack smaller cluster homes or townhomes into another corner of the bare land.
- **Creating a Compatibility Precedent:** Securing a 6,000 sq. ft. zoning designation on this bare tract creates a powerful legal anchor. In future arguments for adjacent parcels, the developer can point to this tract and argue that 6,000 sq. ft. density is now "compatible with the existing character of the surrounding neighborhood."
- **Clustering for Environmental Compliance:** If the bare land has steep hills, wetlands, or protected habitats, a PD overlay allowing 6,000 sq. ft. lots lets the developer "cluster" the homes tightly on the flat, buildable sections. This leaves the rest of the acreage as open space while maintaining the overall profit margins of the development.
- **Creative Infrastructure Placement:** Standard R20K zoning usually dictates rigid setbacks (e.g., 30-foot front yards, 15-foot side yards). An overlay allowing 6,000 sq. ft. dimensions gives the engineers massive flexibility to shrink setbacks, bend roads, and fit optimal stormwater infrastructure around the larger homes.

The Planning Commission committed a prejudicial abuse of discretion and acted ultra vires (beyond its legal authority) by issuing a final approval for Project Element Z25-0006. Under El Dorado County Zoning Code and California Government Code § 65853, a Zone Change is a legislative act that strictly requires a final vote by the Board of Supervisors. Because the project components (TM25-0003, PD25-0005, Z25-0006) are inherently bundled, the Planning Commission's failure to forward the Zone Change to the Board of Supervisors invalidates the entire project approval. Furthermore, the approval creates a de facto density inconsistency with the underlying General Plan land-use designation, which was obfuscated by the local agency's withholding of public records.

Regarding the specific situation where a developer claims they will only build R20K (20,000 square foot) lots but is legally securing an overlay that allows down to 6,000 square foot lots, there are several strategic, financial, and legal reasons a developer would do this.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**4. The Project violates the Design Exception Process by the Applicant incorrectly requesting a Waiver for a Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median for the Primary Easement/ Access to Project at Appian Way/ Sangeovese Drive.**

STD 110 is a portland cement concrete Special Commercial Frontage Entrance. That Standard does not apply to this location. The appropriate Standard Plan is Local Access Road Standard Plan 103D Multi Residential to Collector is a Standard Plan. Due to the unique geometrics of the private gated easement that Applicant wants to match with across the street this is a Design Exception.

This is the Applicants Design waiver Request for Project:

*3. Design Waivers requested for the following County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM):*

*a. Modify Standard Plan 101B for roadway right-of-way and improvement widths (including sidewalks, curbs and turnarounds) as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map.*

*b. Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 123-020-023, consisting of 8.42 acres, is located on the west side of Appian Way, at the intersection with Sangiovese Drive, in the El Dorado Hills area.*

Standard Plan 110 has no applicability for this Design Exception. A Design Exception, not a waiver, must be applied for and reviewed and approved by DOT prior to approval as stated in DOT.

An Applicant can propose a non-standard driveway or easement in El Dorado County. Because standard designs do not cover their unique elements, this requires Applicant to file a Design Exception and process the easement/ access/ driveway as a Discretionary Project. To have a unique design approved, an application must clearly prove that safety and functionality will not be compromised.

1. Pre-Application Consultation: Before formal submission, request a pre-application review with the [Community Development Agency](#). This allows DOT, Planning, and Fire officials to review your unique concept early and identify hard requirements.
2. Submit a Formal Design Exception Request: You will need to submit a written request outlining exactly how your design deviates from the DISM.
3. Hire a Registered Professional: Your application must include engineered drawings and a written justification from a California-licensed Civil Engineer or Architect explaining why the unique design is appropriate and safe. [\[1\]](#) [\[2\]](#)
4. Detail it on the Plans: Your project plans (Site Plan, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan) must explicitly call out the non-standard elements.
5. Conditions of Approval: If the exception is granted, the County will adopt a "Design Exception" as part of your project's Conditions of Approval, legally locking your unique design elements into the permitted project. [\[1\]](#)

To secure a Design Exception for a Multi-Residential to Collector Road Encroachment Permit in El Dorado County, a civil engineer must justify the deviation from standard County rules. Guidelines will be cited from the El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM) and the County Zoning Ordinance (Title 130), specifically referencing these three core requirements: [\[1\]](#) [\[2\]](#) [\[3\]](#) [\[4\]](#)

## 1. Sight Distance & Safety Design (DISM Standard Plan 103C-103F & 109)

- Citation Reference: [DISM Manual] and [County Encroachment Ordinance]
- Justification: You must provide an engineering evaluation of sight distance for the multi-residential access intersecting the collector road. If standard sight distance cannot be met due to topography or curves, the exception must

demonstrate that public safety is enhanced or maintained using alternative traffic control or design measures. [1, 2]

## 2. Driveway Spacing and Access Standards

- Citation Reference: [DISM Manual] and General Plan Policy TC-1
- Justification: Collector roads require specific spacing between driveways to maintain traffic flow. When requesting to encroach, you must prove that the deviation from access standards minimizes traffic conflicts, particularly because multi-residential units generate higher traffic volumes than single-family driveways. [1, 2]

## 3. General Plan and Zoning Consistency

- Citation Reference: [Title 130, Zoning Ordinance](#) (e.g., Cross Visibility Area (CVA) requirements)
- Justification: Any reduction in front setbacks, road right-of-way modifications, or encroachment designs must comply with CVA standards so that entering vehicles can see oncoming traffic on the collector road. [1, 2]

## The Review Criteria

When citing these standards, your licensed engineer must address the required findings for a Design Exception: [1]

1. The exception will substantially meet the intent of the standard.
2. Public safety will be enhanced or maintained by the exception.
3. Environmental impacts (such as grading or oak tree removal) will be lessened by granting the exception. [1]

[El Dorado County Department of Transportation](#) is consulted prior to submitting a formal Encroachment Permit application to confirm which specific DISM standard plans or Design Exception applies to your exact site.

Reference: *County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM)*: The Applicant is adding a Waiver to the Project for the newly proposed Encroachment off of Appian Way at Sangeovese stating they cannot meet the Standard Plan for a standard easement into the Planned Development because "it would create hardship". The Applicant never states what elements of the Design Standard it cannot meet or any justification for why it cannot meet Design Standard for the Sole Primary Easement for the Project. The Applicant cannot request a waiver unless Applicant defines why they cannot meet Standard Design. See Application and Staff Report.

There was no identifying of hardship in the Application or Staff Report, no request from Planning Department to identify and quantify the hardship or any indication why the Standard Plan Design of a critical Encroachment Easement could not be met on a high volume vehicle trips per day collector road to various residential areas. Leaving the result of the newly created intersection of Appian and the new Sangeoesse private gated road encroachment as stated in the

*Fehr and Pehr Traffic and Circulation Report dated Dec. 2025 having Site Distant constraints presented in data. Appian Way/Sangiovese Drive – All-way stop control is recommended for the Village M5 access, which will create the fourth (i.e., west) leg of the intersection, due to the sight distance constraints created by the geometry of Appian Way.*

Weather Controlled or Uncontrolled as stated in the *Fehr and Peer Traffic and Circulation Report dated Dec. 2025* the Project creates an intersection that has sight distance constraints. Although the report only mentioned vertical curve site distance constraints the cumulative horizontal curve compounding the restricted sight distance does not appear to have been analyzed and for that reason critical conditions deviate from the project description and for that reason the Project must be denied.

This is a location that is now 3946 vehicle trips per day on Appian ( 3946 VDT) per the Fehr and Peer Traffic and Circulation Report dated Dec. 2025. The existing Sangeovese Encroachment directly across from this new Easement requested is close to 2000 vehicle trips per day.

The Applicant is requesting a waiver and not the Design Exception as outlined in County documents. The plan sheet attached does not include the required information for design exception. The significance of this cannot be understated. Lots were graded on a land locked parcel, the Applicant is claiming the project is included in the 1988 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan but the 1988 EDHSP does not include it in its description or could not of included it as it has no access, there was no deeded Easement for this land, traffic circulation was not considered for this back in 1988 and as the Applicant

and the Planning Department both note Significant changes have occurred over 40 years.

This is the conclusion from the Fehr & Peer Report Dec. 2025 Traffic and Circulation Analysis:

*Conclusion:*

*The following summarize the conclusion of the access evaluation discussed above:*

***Fehr & Peer Report***

***Dec. 2025***

***Traffic and Circulation Analysis***

*Intersection created on a through road with 50% speed of 40mph where speed limit is 35 mph. Site Distant constraints presented in data.*

*Appian Way/Sangiovese Drive – All-way stop control is recommended for the Village M5 access, which will create the fourth (i.e., west) leg of the intersection, due to the sight distance constraints created by the geometry of Appian Way.*

County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM):

*References: County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM), Fehr and Peer Traffic and Circulation Report dated Dec. 2025*

STD PLAN Design to meet DOT criteria for multi residential to collector

- 8 ft taper offset at bigging/ end of driveway curve radius.
- 100ft taper from from End of Curve EC at 8 ft offset intersection of ETW.
- 15 ft back from ETW sight line is 10 x's speed limit.

Although these are not identified in the Waiver it appears from the project plan sheet that these may be the reason for request of a Design Exception for Special Access with the which are the basic elements of access/easement design. DOT stated it will wait until after approval of the project to require a design and analysis of the design of the Easement. That clearly negates the availability of information to the decision makers, the public and stakeholders as to how the new creation of a 4 way intersection will operate safely. We request the County deny this project until the Easement for the project is adequately identified, designed and a full review is done of the proposed intersection and Easement and the significant impacts that have been brought up by the public are mitigated. It is clear from the request by Serrano & Associates for a Special Easement that may not meet County Standard Plans that the intention is to not follow County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM) in using a Required Standard Plan for residential to collector but to implement a non-standard Serrano

Specific Gated Easement although the Applicant is not applying for the required Design Exception. The Applicant must follow the County process for Design Exceptions.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**5. Violations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Plan Inconsistency.**

The Planning Commission's approval relies on an erroneous assumption that this landlocked parcel, which currently lacks legal access or easements, was analyzed under the 1988 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (EDHSP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A nearly 40-year-old EIR could not have analyzed localized traffic, fire hazards, and drainage impacts for a parcel that was entirely outside its original scope. Consequently, the Project fails to demonstrate environmental review inclusion or consistency with the EDHSP.

Summary: Project failed to follow the process as set in Public Resources Code § 21166 and CEQA Guidelines § 15162, a project is not exempt if it introduces new, unconsidered, or substantially more severe environmental impacts due to changed circumstances, conditions of the project not well defined and by not providing clear defining conditions of project significant impacts are minimized. A new Private Road Gated Easement directly across from the existing Gated Sangeovese Private Road which now creates an intersection with Appian Way where two of the legs are private gated roads that would control queuing and backup due to gates is a significant impact. The Fehr & Peer Traffic Circulation Report Dec 2025 state vehicle trips per day for Appian Way Total 3946. The project failed to include in discussion and take into consideration the impacts that would result due to the changed circumstances of the Village M increase to 156 dwellings that now creates almost 2000 vehicle trips per day at the existing Sangeovese Private Gated Easement and 3946 at Appian just south of Sangeovese.

The "New Impact" or Substantial Change Rule: Under California Public Resources Code § 21166, the reliance on a previous Specific Plan EIR can be legally challenged if there are substantial changes in the project or surrounding circumstances, or new information that shows a vulnerability not previously analyzed. A gate backup causing gridlock onto an older, established subdivision street (Appian Way) may constitute a localized traffic safety hazard that the 1988 regional EIR never properly anticipated or evaluated.

The Applicant mentioned 2 (two) AM trips potentially from the new easement, two trips in the AM. No mention was made of the 1000's of vehicle trips per day at this proposed newly created intersection ( controlled or uncontrolled) that would create significant traffic impacts due to conflicting vehicle movements at arterial road speeds (controlled or uncontrolled) that is created by adding another private road gated easement across from the existing Sangeovese Private Gated Easement over and across a public road with no passable shoulders and restricted sight distance, (Fehr & Peers Dec 2025). The significant sight distance constraints on top of the waivers that are not clearly defined and not following the Design Exception Process as outlined by DOT it is not clear to the Decision Makers, the Public and all Stakeholders what Serrano and Associate wants to change from the Standard Plan and makes this project not a complete project to come before the Planning Commission for evaluation.

A Specific Plan designates logical, analyzed circulation and utility networks. If a parcel is landlocked and requires entirely new, unanalyzed infrastructure or easements to function, it fundamentally violates the connectivity requirements of the 1988 plan.

#### "ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is a residential project and a part of an adopted Specific Plan, this project is statutorily exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to Section 15182 stating that a residential project is exempt where a public agency has prepared an EIR on a specific plan after January 1, 1980. and No impacts have been identified which were not discussed and mitigated in the 1988 EIR. No further environmental analysis is necessary. "

#### Staff Report Discussion:

The discussion in the Staff Report is a generic description of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan that gives a vague statement on refinement and expansion. It goes on to say (EDHSP) was approved by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on July 18, 1988. The EDHSP was designed to be consistent with and represent a refinement and expansion of the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Area Plan. Coupled with the Development Agreement (DA), which is now expired. The Applicant and the County's Staff Report rely on justification that the project is already considered in the 1988

EDHSP and therefore no analysis is needed for CEQA. The Applicants assumption is predicated on not exceeding the allowable dwelling units of the Specific Plan and therefore with this limited scope make the Tentative Map consistent. This parcel is not in the Serrano Gated Boundary. It is a separate parcel outside of the boundary of the Serrano Gated County Club across a public county maintained road and is a land locked parcel with no deeded easement. It has a single proposed new access/ easement that was never considered or could be considered in 1988. A CEQA Exemption is not valid and an EIR must be done to analyze all the impacts from this project that could not have been considered in the 1988 EIR.

#### Staff Report Discussion:

1988 EDHSP Description of Village M: Village M is then described in the Specific Plan as follows:

“Village “M” constitutes a variation from the mix of housing types found elsewhere in the Specific Plan. This is due to the sensitive character of the village in terms of dense tree cover, wildlife habitat, and rolling-to-steep topography. As a result, this village is reserved for the largest lots within the Specific Plan area, Ranch Estates (RE) of 4-7 acres in size. These rural lots also act as a buffer between the edge of the Plan Area and the large rural lots to the north and the agricultural preserve to the east. The rural character of Village “M” will be maintained by the use of a standard rural road system of aggregate or chip seal surface. Water and sewer lines will be located within the public road right-of-way. Road connections to the north are not expected to result in incompatible traffic volumes that would impact the rural setting and natural amenities of the village. Village “M” although large in acreage, is appropriate for approximately 37 dwelling units.” In the nearly four (4) decades since the adoption of the EDHSP, the lots to the north outside the Specific Plan area are no longer large rural lots, but rather single-family residential lots approximately 0.5 to 2 acres in size, and the land to the east is no longer within an agricultural preserve.

The applicant admits to a significant change in conditions, the Village M did a density transfer and increased Village M to 156 lots which added a considerable and never before considered jump in Vehicle Trips Per Day which now results in almost 2000 vehicle trips per day at the Sangeovese Gate / Appian and the 3946 vehicle trips per day at Appian just south of Sangeovese.

The description of Village M in the 1988 EDH Specific Plan did not include this parcel. The original EIR could not of included the traffic circulation for this land as it was a land locked parcel with no access.

## Specific Reason Being Appealed:

### 6. Complete Failure to Address Traffic & Circulation Impacts

The current project creates a brand-new subdivision outside the historical gates of Serrano, establishing an entirely new ( controlled or uncontrolled ) 4 way intersection.

- **Incorrect Process:** The developer is attempting to use "Design Waivers" to bypass standard Department of Transportation (DOT) reviews. They are legally required to apply for a standard Encroachment Permit for a private gated easement off Appian Way (a County-maintained road). DOT must review and approve an Encroachment Permit for the primary and only access for this planned development. By approving a project before approving its easement and then stating a waiver will be granted for the easement when it is permitted after the approval of the project doesn't comply with the General Plan and violates the Transportation Element Policy TC-1a & TC-1b.
- **Policy 5.7.4.1 (Fire Safe Standards):** Mandates that all new development must conform to local fire safe regulations. This includes the California Board of Forestry Fire Safe Regulations (Title 14), which strictly require a minimum of two points of continuous, unhindered emergency vehicle access for subdivisions.
- **Policy TC-1a & TC-1b (Transportation Element):** Explicitly states that the County shall not approve any discretionary permit (such as a TM or PD) unless there is adequate infrastructure and safe, lawful vehicular access connecting the project to a county-maintained roadway.
- **Title 120.44 (Subdivision Ordinance):** Requires that every parcel created by a subdivision must have approved, direct access to a maintained public street or highway. [1, 2, 3]
- **Dangerous Intersection Dynamics:** The proposed easement sits directly across from Sangiovese Drive, an existing gated Serrano private road that generates almost **2000 Vehicle Trips per Day (VTD) with Appian Way at 3946 (VDT)** . The new intersection would now include two private, gated legs controlling traffic queuing on Appian Way/ Sangeovese just below a vertical curve crest on a horizontal curve.
- **Misleading Testimony:** During the Planning Commission hearing, Serrano representative Kirk Bone misleadingly testified that the project would only generate "about 2 AM trips per day." He completely omitted the significant compounding impact of introducing a new intersection leg directly across from a road that has an existing 1092 Vehicle trips per day at Appian Way/ Sangeovese Drive and almost 4000 vehicle trips per day on Appian Way.
- **Application from Applicant not addressing significant offsite impacts at newly proposed intersection -**

## **TRANSPORTATION**

**27. Will the project create any traffic problems or change any existing roads, highways or existing traffic patterns? \_\_\_\_\_NO\_\_\_\_\_**

Serrano & Associates answer to the question #27 of the Application "will project create any traffic problems" was simply NO. According to DOT regulations, intersection controls must facilitate continuous, predictable traffic flow. Security gates and guard house procedures regularly stall incoming vehicles for significant periods. This is obvious to the user and very concerning that staff who should be objective is ignoring the significant safety issues created by the serious and very significant offsite conditions that will be created. The resulting traffic queues will spill backward directly into the active public 4-way intersection, again controlled or uncontrolled the gates will create stopped traffic on Appian Way. This forces public through-traffic to remain trapped behind idling security queues and risk rear ends or those wanting to jump out and get side swiped.

- **Geometric Discrepancies and Lack of Turn Lanes** - Anywhere else with this level of VDT's a two way turn lane would be required to mitigate. The developer proposes a standard curb cut to match the gate across the street, providing no acceleration lanes, deceleration pockets, or physical splitters/ two way turn lanes to handle turning movements. Forcing through-traffic to interact with decelerating, queue-bound vehicles on an uncontrolled public alignment violates basic intersection layout rules.
- **1988 EDHSP does NOT CONSIDER this project** - This project impacts could not have been considered in the 1988 EDHSP EIR.
- **Encroachment Permit** - Conditions of Approval Statement not met - *The developer shall obtain an encroachment permit from the County Department of Transportation (DOT) and construct the roadway encroachment at Appian Way to the provisions of County Standard Plans as directed by DOT.* This is a vague statement with no timeline, no design criteria, only "as directed". The County's Standards Plans are Engineering Standards that ensure safe movement of traffic, drainage and infrastructure. Policy TC-1a & TC-1b of the Transportation Element Explicitly states that the County shall not approve any discretionary permit (such as a TM or PD) unless there is adequate infrastructure and safe, lawful vehicular access connecting the project to a county-maintained roadway. There is no further discussion of such a significant intersection created with high volume VDT's. The Highland View Subdivision is restricted to only 2 primary exits. This new private gated Encroachment off of Appian directly across from the other private gated Encroachment will serve to create significant bottleneck congestion issues. Controlled or Uncontrolled, 4 way stop or no 4 way stop it will still create significant back up and congestion with

now two private gated easements that hold much of their off site traffic, deliveries, visitors, vendors, contractors 10 minutes or more at a time. This is unconscionable that the County would put 1000's of people at risk in the event of a fire evacuation. Almost yearly we have fires across Malcom Dixon, it would only take one fire crossing a short distance of land to create this reality. This puts an impossible burden on the primary exit/ access for not only Highland View but Serrano for the 1000's of residents living at the northern side of Serrano. If there were to be an evacuation there would be no way to get that many people out with no passable shoulders and the congestion from all the subdivisions to the north including Sterlingshire and parts of Highland View. Fire equipment would not be able to get in with the compounded lack of shoulders and bottleneck congestion. This is just unfathomable that this project not only dismisses any offsite needed evaluation of this proposed intersection, safety, and adequate design elements of an Easements but dismisses its own Policy. Both the County in the Staff Report and the Applicant Serrano & Associates LLC on their Application state that "The Project Will Not Create Any Traffic Problems". This was refuted by there own Traffic Consultant.

*Conditions of Approval, Local Circulation Analysis was prepared by Fehr & Peers dated December 8, 2025., Standard Plans Collectors and Major Transportation Facilities:A Local Circulation Analysis was prepared by Fehr & Peers dated December 8, 2025.*

i. Appian Way/Sangiovese Drive intersection:

The report identified the project to construct all-way stop control of the existing intersection at Appian Way and Sangiovese Drive at the Village M5 access.

Conclusions

The following summarize the conclusion of the access evaluation discussed above:

Appian Way/Sangiovese Drive – All-way stop control is recommended for the Village M5 access, which will create the fourth (i.e., west) leg of the intersection, due to the sight distance constraints created by the geometry of Appian Way.

- **Entitlements** Conditions of Approval - The developer shall demonstrate to the County that the project has entitlements for use of the off-site roads and public utility easements for access to the project. Are there entitlements for drainage into Highland View Subdivision as shown on drainage plan where Allegheny Creek through Highland View Subdivision. The Project shows primary runoff to be released to Allegheny Creek through an 18" pipe and into Highland Subdivision Lot that is Allegheny Creek. There is limited downstream controls through Highland View Subdivision that have limited capacity.
- **Subdivision and/or Private Roadway Gates** - Installation of any gates associated with the project or individual parcels shall comply with Section

130.30.090 (Gates) of the County Zoning Ordinance. The 1988 Specific Plan largely anticipated standard circulation networks. Installing new gates outside the original contiguous Serrano Country Club Boundary alters access dynamics. If the gate causes private traffic to back up onto a public county roadway, it forces the public infrastructure to absorb private operational burdens. According to DOT regulations, intersection controls must facilitate continuous, predictable traffic flow. Security gates and guard procedures regularly stall incoming vehicles for significant periods. The resulting traffic queues will spill backward directly into the newly created intersection. This forces vehicle through-traffic on Appian Way to remain trapped behind idling vehicles queuing to get into private security gates on the private roads of Senegalese Drive. The proposed intersection splits functionality across two entirely different road systems (either controlled or uncontrolled):

- **Two public legs:** Appian Way, which acts as the critical collector and historical access route for the established Highland View, Stirlingshire, and Highland Hills subdivisions (A- Staff R... p. 7)
- **Two private legs:** Gated entries controlled by guardhouses and mechanical security gates (the existing Sangiovese Drive gate and the proposed Village M5 entry) (A- Staff R... p. 1)
- **Infrastructure Availability:** Development is strictly contingent upon the availability of safe fire service response times (minimum of 8 minutes for 80% of the population)
- **Geometric Discrepancies and Lack of Turn Lanes** The developer proposes a standard curb cut to match the gate across the street, providing no acceleration/ deceleration lanes, or physical two way turn lanes in the middle to handle turning movements. Forcing through-traffic to interact with decelerating, queue-bound vehicles on an uncontrolled public alignment violates basic intersection layout rules.
- **Violations of State Responsibility Area (SRA) Fire Safe Regulations** The proposed gated layout introduces physical hazards that conflict with Title 14 California Code of Regulations (SRA Fire Safe Regulations) and El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Section 130.30.090.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**7. Significant Downstream Environmental Impacts (CEQA Required)**

Because this parcel was not historically or functionally integrated into the 1988 EDHSP EIR, its localized environmental impacts have never been evaluated. The project creates new, severe impacts that require site specific analysis as well as cumulative impacts:

- **Unverified Hydrologic Runoff Impacts:** The applicant's engineering memo estimates pre-project and post-project peak flow rates but lacks an integrated, downstream systemic analysis (D.2 Staff ... p. 7). The site's extreme 40% slopes drain directly into Allegany Creek via a small retention basin onsite and downstream into the Highland View open space (A- Staff R... p. 7). Converting this graded parcel into impermeable residential structures will dramatically boost stormwater volume and velocity (D.2 Staff ... p. 7,) The small, single bioretention basin proposed at the far eastern corner remains unproven to protect downstream properties from seasonal flooding and erosion (D.2 Staff ... p. 8,)
- **Increased Wildfire Fuel Loads:** Discharging unmitigated runoff quantities directly into the Highland View Open Space and Allegany Creek channel will accelerate invasive vegetation growth. This directly worsens the seasonal wildfire fuel load, forcing neighboring subdivisions to handle an elevated, costly fire mitigation risk.
- **Downstream watershed capacity:** The project fails to verify the downstream watershed can handle the increased runoff and fails to prove post construction flows will be at near pre construction flows. The subdivision of Highland Hills and Stirlingshire have small storm drain controls that did not account for steep slope runoff from this 8.5 acre parcel.
- **Drainage, Hydrology, and Severe Slope Erosion:** The 1988 Element: The [Specific Plan Design Guidelines \(Grading & Drainage\)](#) strictly command that grading and drainage controls "reduce soil erosion and control surface drainage." They mandate matching natural runoff patterns and protecting downstream properties. The 1988 EIR did not assume or clear concentrated offsite torrents directed straight into Allegany Creek, Highland View, and potentially undersized downstream culverts in Sterlingshire. This constitutes a physical change in the environment (flooding risk) demanding a localized site specific updated drainage study and an EIR.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**8. Failure to Address Onsite Wetlands**

- **The 1988 Element:** The Specific Plan requires the mapping, preservation, and minimal disturbance of natural drainage swales, streams and jurisdictional waters of the State.
- **A wetland** is identified onsite as well as the project drains directly into the perinneal stream known as Allegany Creek. If an active wetland exists on the project site that wasn't delineated or fully mitigated in the 1988 master plan, using a blanket exemption bypasses modern regulatory protections. Impacts waters of the State require Clean Water Act section 401/404 permits, which

trigger modern environmental reviews independent of a 40 year-old EIR document.

**Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

**9. Specific Reason Being Appealed:**

- **General Plan Consistency:** The project must align with the entire El Dorado County General Plan, which mandates acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) and traffic safety protocols on county-maintained neighborhood roads.

Appellant reserves the right to submit additional evidence, testimony, and documentation in support of these stated grounds prior to the close of the Board of Supervisors' public hearing.

**RELIEF REQUESTED:**

The Appellant(s) request that the Board of Supervisors uphold this Appeal and grant the following:

1. Deny the Project due to unmitigated CEQA impacts, violations of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Policies, which include but are not limited to the Transportation and Safety Elements of the General Plan.
2. Deny the Project as presented for violation of process and procedure of Design Exceptions as required in Title 130, County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM).
3. Deny the Findings that the project is Statutorily Exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15182 Projects Pursuant to a Specific Plan. This project is a land locked parcel outside of the historical boundary of the Serrano Private Gated Community. This parcel, a flag lot, land locked with no deeded easement and could not have been considered in the 1988 EDHSP. The 1988 EIR is legally obsolete for this parcel, we ask nothing more than the expectation of safe planning, and safe traffic infrastructure and we have our County Policy's that guarantee this. To qualify for the Section 15182 exemption, the project must meet the following baseline conditions. No new Impacts. There are no project-specific significant environmental effects that were not examined in the Specific Plan's 1988 EIR, and no major revisions are required to the EIR. We demand a site-specific environmental review that is representative of actual current conditions and

transparent in what the project infrastructure will be built to before the project is approved.

For the County to state we will approve a design for the Easement for the planned development after approval of the Project but give a generic and non specific waiver in the Approval of the project before for the Easement/ Access design is analyzed for what standards can or cannot be met is to effectively put the cart before the horse, creating an unenforceable approval loop where the County delegates its statutory duty to evaluate critical access standards and inappropriately grants developers unvetted exemptions without guaranteeing that safety, fire, and zoning codes can actually be met. Pushing the easement design to the back of the line strips the public of their ability to assess the true impacts during the approval process.

The location has significant constructability limitations and significant inherent safety issues by virtue of the geometries of the road, high VDT's, and conflicting turning movements, the Applicant is proposing two easements off Appian ( one being the Primary Easement and the other a maintenance driveway a short distance away). The Design Exception Process must be followed for the site specific special design as it States in Title 130, County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM), and Policy TC-1a & TC-1b of the Transportation Element Explicitly states that the County shall not approve unless there is adequate infrastructure and safe, lawful vehicular access connecting the project to a county-maintained roadway.

Administrative Findings 2.2 Specific Plan Village M relies on consistency with a density transfer provision of the Expired EDHSP Development Agreement (DA) and that net residential caps are not exceeded and basis only this flawed analogy that therefore the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map is found to be consistent with the 1988 EDHSP.

Staff Report states No impacts have been identified which were not discussed and mitigated in the 1988 EIR. No further environmental analysis is necessary. This is significantly flawed. Deny project due to the stated project elements that differ from the 1988 assumptions. The County cannot rely on the blanket exemption and must require a new EIR. An EIR is legally inadequate if it fails to evaluate the environmental impacts of the whole of the project. Require Applicant to complete a discretionary review of the project and include identification of significant impacts both mitagable and un-mitagable in a new EIR. The Project must preserve a safe traffic circulation that has limited access.

4. Request the County to require a complete PEER review of design exceptions for both driveways of the project. A. The Encroachment Access/ Easement. B. The Maintenance Driveway off of Appian to access the Bio Retention Basin close to the main Easement. Require DOT, Department of Transportation, perform a complete review of Easement designs and offsite conditions as well as disclosure of all Standards that can not be met and what waivers specifically are being asked for. If safe Project Easements cannot be provided then a no project alternative must be considered until such time.

Tara Mccann



# PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Phone: (530) 621-5355 Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

<https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-Services>

Proj 25-0008

APPLICATION TYPE: Tentative Subdivision Map

FILE# TM 25-0003

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.(s) 123-020-023

PROJECT NAME/REQUEST: (Describe proposed use) Serrano Village M5 - 10 single-family lots

APPLICANT/AGENT Kirk Bone, Director of Government Relations

Mailing Address 4525 Serrano Parkway, Suite 100, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone 916-939-4060 Email: kbone@parkerdevco.com ahoward@parkerdevco.com

PROPERTY OWNER Serrano Associates, LLC

Mailing Address Same as Agent

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

LIST ADDITIONAL PROPERTY OWNERS ON SEPARATE SHEET IF APPLICABLE

ENGINEER/ARCHITECT REY Engineers, Attn: Rich Radoycis

Mailing Address 905 Sutter Street, Suite 200, Folsom, CA 95630

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone 916-366-3040 Email radoycis@reyengineers.com

LOCATION: The property is located on the north side of Appian Way

\_\_\_\_\_ N/E/W/S \_\_\_\_\_ Street or Road \_\_\_\_\_  
immediately feet/miles west of the intersection with Sangiovese Drive

\_\_\_\_\_ N/E/W/S \_\_\_\_\_ Major Street or Road \_\_\_\_\_  
in the El Dorado Hills area. Property Size: 8.42 ac.

X [Signature] Date 9/22/25 \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of property owner or authorized agent

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date 9-23-25 Fee 8629.01 Receipt # RB 3007 Rec'd by SCD Census 030709.1026

Zoning R20K GPD AP Supervisor District 1 Sec 26 Twn 10N Rng 08E

ACTION BY \_\_\_\_\_ PLANNING COMMISSION  
\_\_\_\_\_ ZONING ADMINISTRATOR  
\_\_\_\_\_ PLANNING DIRECTOR

ACTION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_

Findings and/or conditions attached

Findings and/or conditions attached

APPEAL

X \_\_\_\_\_

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_

Executive Secretary

TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Z25-0006

Revised 07/2024

**RECEIVED**

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT



# PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

## PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Phone: (530) 621-5355 Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

<https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-and-Building/Planning-Division>

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 24 2025

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

### TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP

The following information must be provided with all applications. If all the information is not provided, the application will be deemed incomplete and may not be accepted. For your convenience, please use the applicant column on the right to be sure you have all the required submittal information. All plans and maps must be folded to 8 1/2" x 11".

**NOTE:** Submittal of the materials required in this application packet does not necessarily constitute a complete application for purposes of the California Permit Streamlining Act; the County may require further submittals or clarification of materials for staff to begin processing the project. If so, you will receive a letter within 30 days stating what additional materials must be submitted. Tentative Subdivision Map applications will need to be deemed complete for processing before the environmental review of the project can be started in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To prepare an environmental document to comply with CEQA, the County may require the applicant to submit additional information or studies after the application has been deemed complete for processing. Note that studies may be required at the applicant's expense to analyze potential impacts from off-site improvements. Studies typically required for a complete application (e.g.: traffic study) would be deferred when an EIR is to be prepared and said EIR would address the impact.

	REQUIRED SUBMITTAL INFORMATION	Applicant	County
1	Completed and signed application form.	✓	
2	Completed and signed Agreement for Payment of Processing fees.	✓	
3	Letter of authorization from all property owners authorizing agent to act as applicant when applicable.	n/a	
4	One (1) copy of a title report (no more than six months old) for the project. Proof of ownership (Grant Deed) if the property has changed title since the last tax roll.	✓	
5	Provide name, mailing address, phone number and email address of all property owners and their agents.	✓	
6	If public sewer or water service is proposed, obtain, and provide a Facilities Improvement Letter if the project is located within the EID service area, or a similar letter if located in another sewer and/or water district.	✓	
7	If on-site wastewater treatment systems are proposed to serve the project, provide a wastewater feasibility report as described in the adopted Design and Improvement Standards Manual.	n/a	
8	If off-site sewer or water facilities are proposed to serve the project, provide four copies of a map showing the location and size of the proposed facilities.	n/a	
9	If groundwater is to be used for domestic water, provide proof of a safe and reliable water source as described in the adopted Design and Improvement Standards Manual.	n/a	
10	One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of a preliminary grading, drainage plan and drainage reports. The plan should be of sufficient detail to identify the scope of grading, including quantities, depths of cut and fills for: roads, driveways where cuts/fills exceed six feet, retaining walls, and mass pad graded lots.	✓	

	Show location of existing drainage, proposed modifications, and impacts to downstream facilities. See <u>Chapter 110.14</u> of the County Grading Ordinance for submittal detail of the grading plan. See Section 1.8.3 of the <u>County Drainage Manual</u> for submittal requirements of the drainage plan and report.	✓	
11	One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of a Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Study as described in the adopted Design and Improvement Standards Manual.	✓	
12	An on-site biological study shall be required to determine if the site contains special status plant or animal species or natural communities and habitats, including riparian vegetation and plant habitat. The report should include proposed mitigation measures if applicable. The survey can only occur from March 15 through August 15 when plants are easily identifiable. One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium), with attachments, shall be submitted. The biological study shall include a plant survey to determine the extent and location of rare plants on the project site if located within Rare Plant Mitigation Area 0 ("EP" overlay designation on the General Plan land use map) or Mitigation Area 1 (within the gabbro soils area as shown on maps on file at the Planning Division).	EIR - EPA specific plan	
13	Name and address of Homeowner's Association, CSA 9 Zone of Benefit, or other road maintenance entity if it exists in the project area.	✓	
14	A record search for archaeological resources shall be conducted through the North Central Information Center located at CSU-Sacramento, 7667 Folsom Blvd., Folsom Hall, Suite 2042, Sacramento, CA 95826, phone number (916) 278-6217, email <a href="mailto:ncic@csus.edu">ncic@csus.edu</a> . Email is preferred. If the record search identifies a need for a field survey, a survey shall be required. Archaeological surveys shall meet the " <u>Guidelines for Cultural Resource Studies</u> " approved by the Board of Supervisors.	EIR	
15	A site-specific wetland investigation shall be required on projects with wetlands as determined by the biological study. One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.		
16	An acoustical analysis shall be provided to demonstrate consistency with General Plan Policies (see policies following <u>General Plan Objective 6.5.1</u> ). The analysis shall comply with standards set forth in <u>Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.37</u> . The analysis shall include descriptions of construction noise, traffic noise generated from the project, and impacts of traffic noise to the residences within the project. One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.		
17	An air quality impact analysis shall be provided utilizing the Air Quality Management District's <u>AQMD Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Determining Significance of Air Quality Impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act</u> (February 2002) available <a href="#">here</a> . Emissions modeling should utilize the statewide land use emissions computer model CalEEMod, available <a href="#">here</a> , to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.		
18	If required by the El Dorado County Department of Transportation based on submittal of a Traffic Impact Study – Initial Determination Form, a traffic study shall be provided utilizing their Traffic Impact Study Protocol and Procedures or other latest traffic study requirements, as determined by DOT. Applications shall: a) Demonstrate consistency with 2004 General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element Policies. b) Identify access to County Road(s); describe proposed road and intersection improvements (on-site and off-site). One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.	✓	

19	A Snow Removal and Storage Plan for subdivisions above 3,000 feet elevation (Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM Volume I, Section 5, A.). One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.	n/a	
20	A discussion of passive solar opportunities for proposed lots having 20,000 square feet or less (DISM Volume I, Section 5. B.). One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.	<del>n/a</del> n/a	
21	Copy of previous parcel map, subdivision map, or record of survey if one exists.	✓	
22	Application fees pursuant to the adopted fee schedule.	✓	
23	Five (5) copies plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of the tentative map detailing what exists on the site at the time of application shall be submitted on 24" x 36" sheets, drawn to scale, and of sufficient size to clearly show all details and required data. All plans must be folded to 8½" x 11", plus one 8½" x 11" reduction that includes a graphic scale. No rolled drawings will be accepted.	✓	
24	Five (5) copies plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of a Phasing Plan, if proposed; and one 8 ½" x 11" reduction that includes a graphic scale.	n/a	
25	One full-sized copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of a slope map noting the following slope range categories: 10 to 15 percent; greater than 15 to 20 percent; greater than 20 to 25 percent; greater than 25 to less than 30 percent; and 30 percent or greater; and one 8 ½" x 11" reduced copy.	✓	
26	One full-sized copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of an aerial photograph with the tentative map overlaid. Scale should be 1"=100' or the same scale as the tentative map.	✓	
27	A Fire Safe Plan approved by the applicable fire district and Cal Fire shall be submitted if the project is in a high or very high wildland fire hazard area; or in an area identified as "urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of Federal lands that are a high risk for wildfire," as listed in the most current Federal Register. One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.	✓	
28	A description of all proposed deviations or waivers to County design standards. The four findings required for approval of the deviation(s) or waiver(s) listed in County Code Section 120.40.010.A.2.a through d must be addressed by the applicant to justify granting the request(s). One hard copy plus an electronic PDF copy (CD-ROM or other medium) shall be submitted.	✓	

**OAK TREE/OAK WOODLAND REMOVAL**

The following supplemental information shall be required if any Oak Woodlands, Individual Native Oak Trees, or Heritage Trees, as defined in Section 130.39.030 (Definitions) will be impacted by the project (i.e. cut down) consistent with Section 130.39.070 (Oak Tree and Oak Woodland Removal Permits – Discretionary Development Projects).

	<b>REQUIRED SUBMITTAL INFORMATION</b>	Applicant	County
1	Completed and signed Oak Resources Code Compliance Certificate. <i>EP's see OAK tabulation</i>		
2	Oak Resources Technical Report prepared by a Qualified Professional consistent with Section 2.5 (Oak Resources Technical Reports) of the Oak Resources Management Plan.		
3	Completed Oak Resources Technical Report Checklist, including the supplemental data for impacted Individual Native Oak Trees within Oak Woodlands, as applicable.		
4	Security deposit for on-site oak tree/oak woodland retention and/or replacement planting (if proposed as part of project mitigation) consistent with <u>Section 130.39.070.F</u> (Security Deposit for On-Site Oak Tree/Oak Woodland Retention) and <u>Section 130.39.070.G</u> (Security Deposit for On-Site Oak Tree/Oak Woodland Replacement Planting).		
5	Reason and objective for impact to oak trees and/or oak woodlands.		

	<b>REQUIRED INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE MAP</b>	Applicant	County
1	Proposed subdivision name.	✓	
2	Date, north arrow and scale.	✓	
3	Project boundaries with dimensions.	✓	
4	The approximate dimensions and area of all lots (gross and net). Net area of lots excludes non-buildable areas such as road rights-of-way, bodies of water, and areas of 30 percent or greater slope. Parcel sizes must be consistent with General Plan and Zoning standards unless the application is accompanied by a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and/or Planned Development application.	✓	
5	Adjacent ownership with book and page number of recorded deeds or Parcel Map references.	✓	
6	Location and names of rights-of-way, width of adjacent streets, highways, and alleys.	✓	
7	Access easements to a connection with a public road, together with deed or map reference that documents the access.	N/A	
8	Existing encroachments to the public road on adjacent parcels. If a new access is proposed through adjacent parcels, provide a letter of authorization, if available, and a description of the access easement.	N/A	

9	Purpose, width, and approximate location of all existing and proposed easements, other than roads, together with the deed or map reference that documents the easement.	✓	
10	Approximate radii of centerline on all street curves.	✓	
11	Names of adjacent subdivisions with the recording reference.	✓	
12	Grades and widths of existing and proposed roads or road easements, showing typical improvement cross-section for all existing and proposed roads, including cul-de-sac roads and turnarounds.	✓	
13	All existing structures, buildings, utility transmission lines and dirt roads, and distances to existing and proposed property lines. Show structures within 50 feet of the property.	n/a	
14	Show location of all structures for which permits have either been applied for or granted, but not yet constructed.	n/a	
15	Existing and proposed fire hydrant locations.	✓	
16	Existing water and sewer line locations.	✓	
17	Contour lines shown at 5-foot intervals if any slopes on the property exceed 10 percent (contours not required if all slopes are 10 percent or less). Contours may be shown at 10-foot or 20-foot intervals on parcels of 10 acres or larger (using U.S.G.S. interpolation or field survey), if said contours reasonably identify significant site features (e.g., benches or abrupt topographical changes, etc.).	✓	
18	Areas of 30 percent or greater slope shall be identified.	✓	
19	The location, if present, of rock outcroppings, lava caps, drainage courses, ponds, lakes, canals, reservoirs, rivers, perennial streams, creeks, spring areas subject to inundation and wetlands. Show respective 50-foot and 100-foot septic system setbacks when a septic system is proposed. Setbacks from <u>riparian and wetland areas</u> consistent with Section 130.30.050.G of the Zoning Ordinance shall be shown on the tentative map.	✓	
20	Identify areas subject to a 100-year flood; and show high water level (100-year) on map. Where this data is not readily available, January 1997 flood level can be shown if known.	n/a	
21	Show any other subdivision-related improvements such as: street lighting, subdivision signage, landscaping, parking, storm drains, catch basins, storm water quality treatment areas, parks, and utility facilities (e.g.: electric, gas, phone, cable TV). The depiction of these improvements may be submitted on a separate exhibit map if appropriate.	✓	
22	The following information is to be listed on the tentative map in the order listed below:		
	a. Owner of record (name and address).	✓	
	b. Name of applicant (name and address).	✓	
	c. Map prepared by (name and address).	✓	
	d. Scale.	✓	

e. Contour interval if applicable.	✓	
f. Source of topography.	✓	
g. Section, Township and Range.	✓	
h. Assessor's Parcel Number(s).	✓	
i. Present and proposed General Plan land use designation(s).	✓	
j. Present and proposed Zoning designation(s).	✓	
k. Total area.	✓	
l. Total number of lots.	✓	
m. Total number of lettered lots.	✓	
n. Minimum parcel area.	✓	
o. Water supply.	✓	
p. Sewage disposal.	✓	
q. Proposed fire district or agency.	✓	
r. Date of preparation.	✓	
s. In the lower right-hand corner of each map, a signature block should be shown, giving space for: Planning Commission: _____ Approval/Denial Date: _____ Board of Supervisors: _____ Approval/Denial Date: _____	✓	

The Planning Division reserves the right to require additional project information as provided by Section 15060 of the California Environmental Quality Act, or as required by the General Plan development policies, or when such is necessary to complete the environmental assessment.



# PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  
924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150  
Phone: (530) 621-5355 Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)  
<https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-Services>

Proj 25-0008

APPLICATION TYPE: Planned Development

FILE# PD25-0005

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.(s) 123-020-023

PROJECT NAME/REQUEST: (Describe proposed use) Serrano Village M5 - 10 single-family lots

RECEIVED  
SEP 24 2025  
EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

APPLICANT/AGENT Kirk Bone, Director of Government Relations

Mailing Address 4525 Serrano Parkway, Suite 100, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone 916-939-4060 Email: kbone@parkerdevco.com ahoward@parkerdevco.com

PROPERTY OWNER Serrano Associates, LLC

Mailing Address Same as Agent

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

LIST ADDITIONAL PROPERTY OWNERS ON SEPARATE SHEET IF APPLICABLE

ENGINEER/ARCHITECT REY Engineers, Attn: Rich Radoycis

Mailing Address 905 Sutter Street, Suite 200, Folsom, CA 95630

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone 916-366-3040 Email rradoycis@reyengineers.com

LOCATION: The property is located on the north side of Appian Way

immediately feet/miles west of the intersection with Sangiovese Drive

in the El Dorado Hills area. Property Size: 8.42 ac.

X [Signature] Date 9/22/25  
Signature of property owner or authorized agent

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date 9-23-25 Fee 5,156.41 Receipt # R63006 Rec'd by SCO Census 0307091026  
Zoning RZDK GPD MP Supervisor District 1 Sec 26 Twn 10N Rng 08E

ACTION BY \_\_\_\_\_ PLANNING COMMISSION  
\_\_\_\_\_ ZONING ADMINISTRATOR  
\_\_\_\_\_ PLANNING DIRECTOR

ACTION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_  
Findings and/or conditions attached \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_  
Findings and/or conditions attached \_\_\_\_\_

X \_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Secretary

APPEAL  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_



# PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

## PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Phone: (530) 621-5355 Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

<https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-and-Building/Planning-Division>

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 24 2025  
EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

### PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

The following items 1 through 9 must be provided with all applications. The remaining items shall be required where applicable. If all the required and applicable information is not provided, the application will be deemed incomplete and will not be accepted. For your convenience, please use the check the applicant column on the right to be sure you have all the required and applicable information. All plans and maps MUST be folded to 8½" x 11".

	REQUIRED SUBMITTAL INFORMATION	Applicant	County
1	Completed and signed application form and Agreement for Payment of Processing Fees form.	✓	
2	Letter of authorization from all property owners authorizing agent to act as applicant, when applicable.	n/a	
3	Proof of ownership (Grant Deed) if property has changed title since the last tax roll.	n/a	
4	A copy of the official Assessor's map, showing the property outlined in red.	✓	
5	An 8 ½" x 11" vicinity map showing the location of the project in relation to major roads, intersections, and town sites.	✓	
6	Completed and signed Environmental Questionnaire form.	✓	
7	Provide the name, mailing address, phone number, and email address of all property owners and their agents.	✓	
8	A record search for archaeological resources shall be conducted through the North Central Information Center (NCIC) located at California State University Sacramento, 7667 Folsom Boulevard., Folsom Hall, Suite 2042, Sacramento, CA 95826, phone number (916) 278-6217, email <a href="mailto:ncic@csus.edu">ncic@csus.edu</a> . Email is preferred. If the record search identifies a need for a field survey, a survey shall be required. Archaeological surveys shall meet the "Guidelines for Cultural Resource Studies" approved by the Board of Supervisors.	EIR; Eoat specific plan	
9	A traffic impact determination shall be provided utilizing El Dorado County's "Transportation Impact Study (TIS) – Initial Determination Form", located on the Planning Division website under "Applications".	✓	
10	If public sewer or water service is proposed, obtain, and provide a Facilities Improvement Letter if the project is located within the EID service area, or a similar letter if located in another sewer/water district.	✓	
11	If off-site sewer or water facilities are proposed to serve the project, provide four (4) copies of a map showing the location and size of any proposed facilities. If ground water is to be used for domestic water, submit a report noting well production data for adjacent parcels, or submit a hydrological report prepared by a geologist noting the potential for water, based on the nature of project site geology.	n/a	
12	In an accompanying report, provide the following data for the area on each proposed parcel which is to be used for sewage disposal:	n/a	
	a) The percolation rate and location of test on 4.5 acres or smaller.	n/a	

	b) The depth of soil and location of test.	n/a	
	c) The depth of groundwater and location of test.		
	d) The direction and percent of slope of the ground.		
	e) The location, if present, of rivers, streams, springs, areas subject to inundation, rock outcroppings, lava caps, cuts, fills, and easements.		
	f) Identify the area to be used for sewage disposal.		
	g) Such additional data and information as may be required by the Director of Environmental Management to assess the sources of potable water, the disposal of sewage and other liquid wastes, the disposal of solid wastes, drainage, and erosion control.		
13	Preceding parcel map, final map, or record of survey if any exists.	✓	
14	Preliminary grading, drainage plan, and report. The plan should be of sufficient detail to identify the scope of grading, including quantities, depths of cuts and fills (for roads and driveways where cuts/fills exceed 6 feet, and mass pad graded lots), location of existing drainage, proposed modifications, and impacts to downstream facilities. See <u>Chapter 110.14</u> of the County Grading Ordinance for submittal detail of the grading plan. See Section 1.8.3 of the <u>County Drainage Manual</u> for submittal requirements of the drainage plan and report.	✓	
15	If located within one of the five Ecological Preserve – EP overlay zones (Mitigation Area 0), rare plants may exist on-site. The State Department of Fish & Wildlife will require an on-site biological plant survey to determine the extent and location of rare plants on the project site. Such a survey can only occur from March 15 through August 15 when plants are readily visible. Therefore, if the State Department of Fish & Wildlife requires the plant survey, a substantial delay in the processing of your application could result. To avoid potential delays, you may choose to provide this survey with application submittal.	EIR	
16	Name and address of Homeowners' Association, CSA 9 Zone of Benefit, or other road maintenance entity if it exists in the project area.	✓	
17	A site-specific wetland investigation shall be required on projects with identified wetlands as delineated on the applicable U.S.G.S. Quadrangle and/or by site visit, when proposed improvements will directly impact the wetland (reduce the size of the wetland area) or lie near the wetlands. Available from the Planning Division are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requirements for a wetlands delineation study.	EIR 	
18	An acoustical analysis shall be provided whenever a noise-sensitive land use (residences, hospitals, churches, libraries, etc.) are proposed adjacent to a major transportation source, or adjacent or near existing stationary noise sources. Such study shall define the existing and project noise levels and define how the project will comply with standards set forth in the General Plan.		
19	Where potential for special status plant and/or animal habitats are identified on the parcel(s), an on-site biological study shall be required to determine if the site contains special status plant or animal species or natural communities and habitats.		
20	An air quality impact analysis shall be provided utilizing the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District's "Guide to Air Quality Assessment".		

**OAK TREE/OAK WOODLAND REMOVAL**

The following supplemental information shall be required if any Oak Woodlands, Individual Native Oak Trees, or Heritage Trees, as defined in Section 130.39.030 (Definitions) will be impacted by the project (i.e., cut down) consistent with Section 130.39.070 (Oak Tree and Oak Woodland Removal Permits – Discretionary Development Projects).

	<b>FORMS AND MAPS REQUIRED</b>	Applicant	County
1	Completed and signed Oak Resources Code Compliance Certificate.	EIR	
2	Oak Resources Technical Report prepared by a qualified professional consistent with Section 2.5 (Oak Resources Technical Reports) of the Oak Resources Management Plan.		
3	Completed Oak Resources Technical Report Checklist, including supplemental data for impacted Individual Native Oak Trees within Oak Woodlands, as applicable.		
4	Security deposit for on-site oak tree/oak woodland retention and/or replacement planting (if proposed as part of project mitigation) consistent with <u>Section 130.39.070.F</u> (Security Deposit for On-Site Oak Tree/Oak Woodland Retention) and <u>Section 130.39.070.G</u> (Security Deposit for On-Site Oak Tree/Oak Woodland Replacement Planting).		
5	Reason and objective for impact to oak trees and/or oak woodlands.		

**SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS**

Five (5) copies plus an electronic copy (CD-ROM or other medium) of the site plan detailing what exists on the site at the time of application shall be submitted on 24" x 36" sheets or smaller, drawn to scale, and of sufficient size to clearly show all details and required data. All plans must be folded to 8 1/2" x 11", plus one 8 1/2" x 11" reduction. No rolled drawings will be accepted. For your convenience, please check the Applicant column on the right to ensure you have all the required submittal information.

	<b>FORMS AND MAPS REQUIRED</b>	Applicant	County
1	Project name, if applicable.	✓	
2	Name and address of applicant and designer, if applicable.	✓	
3	Date, north arrow, and scale.	✓	
4	Entire parcel(s) of land showing perimeter with dimensions.	✓	
5	All roads, alleys, streets, and their names.	✓	
6	Location of easements, their purpose and width.	✓	
7	All existing and proposed uses (i.e., buildings, driveways, dwellings, utility transmission lines, etc.).	n/a	
8	Driveways, parking and loading stalls with dimensions (refer to Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.35 and the Community Design Standards – <u>Parking and Loading Standards</u> ).	n/a	
9	Trash and litter storage or collection areas, and propane tank location(s).	n/a	

10	Total gross square footage of proposed buildings.	n/a	
11	Existing or proposed fences or walls. <i>Standard single family, rear side</i>	n/a	
12	Sign location and sizes if proposed. (Refer to Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.36). <i>PLS</i>	n/a	
13	Pedestrian walkways, courtyards, etc., if proposed.	n/a	
14	Exterior lighting plan, if proposed, along with a Photometric Study and fixture specifications (refer to Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.34 and the Community Design Standards – Outdoor Lighting Standards).	n/a	
15	Existing or proposed water, sewer, septic systems, and wells, if applicable.	✓	
16	Existing or proposed fire hydrants.	✓	
17	Tentative subdivision or parcel map, if applicable.	✓	
18	Adjacent parcel owner(s) Assessor's Parcel Number, unless this is included on the tentative map.	✓	
19	Public uses (schools, parks, etc.).	n/a	
20	The location, if present, of rock outcroppings, lava caps, drainage courses, lakes, canals, reservoirs, rivers, streams, spring areas subject to inundation and wetlands. Show respective 100-foot and 50-foot septic system setbacks when a septic system is proposed.	✓	
21	Identify areas subject to a 100-year flood on perennial streams or creeks and show high water level (100-year) on map. Where this data is not readily available, January 1997 flood level can be shown if known. Refer to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) website.	n/a	
22	Note any proposed trails within the project; and where applicable, connection to existing or proposed trail systems.	n/a	

**PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN REQUIREMENTS**

Required when parking facilities are proposed or otherwise at Planner's discretion. (Refer to Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.33). Five (5) copies plus an electronic copy (CD-ROM or other medium), folded to 8 ½" x 11", plus one 11" x 17" reduction.

	FORMS AND MAPS REQUIRED	Applicant	County
1	Location, quantity, and a gallon size of proposed plant material, see Zoning Ordinance Section 130.18.090.	n/a	
2	Note quantity and type of trees to be removed.		
3	Location, general type (pine, oak, etc.) and size of all existing trees, in those areas that are subject to grading or otherwise may be removed or affected by the proposed improvements. Note quantity of trees to be removed.		
4	List of both common and botanical names of plant material, use of drought tolerant species is highly recommended. A list of recommended drought tolerant species is available from the Planning Division.		

5	Location of irrigation proposed. The final Landscape Plan will be required to meet the County's Water Conserving Landscape Standards. Copies are available from the Planning Division.	n/a	
---	--	-----	--

**PRELIMINARY GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN**

Required whenever any grading is proposed. Five (5) copies plus an electronic copy (CD-ROM or other medium), folded to 8 1/2" x 11", plus one 11" x 17" reduction.

	FORMS AND MAPS REQUIRED	Applicant	County
1	Contours or slope data, pursuant to <u>Chapter 110.14</u> of the County Code, Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Ordinance.	✓	
2	Drainage improvements, culverts, drains, etc.	✓	
3	Limits of cut and fill.	✓	

**PLAN OF BUILDING ELEVATIONS**

Required whenever a new structure or addition is proposed. Five (5) copies plus an electronic copy (CD-ROM or other medium), folded to 8 1/2" x 11", plus one 11" x 17" reduction.

	FORMS AND MAPS REQUIRED	Applicant	County
1	Building design, elevations of all sides.	n/a	
2	Exterior materials, finishes, and colors.		
3	Existing and proposed signs showing location, height, and dimensions. Include a sign plan for a project with multiple businesses.		

The Planning Division reserves the right to require additional project information as provided by Section 15060 of the California Environmental Quality Act, or as required by the General Plan development policies, when such is necessary to complete the environmental assessment.



# PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Phone: (530) 621-5355 Email: [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)  
<https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Land-Use/Planning-Services>

SEP 24 PM 2:24

APPLICATION TYPE: Zone Change/General Plan Amendment

FILE# 325 RECEIVED PLANNING DEPARTMENT

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.(s) 123-020-023

PROJECT NAME/REQUEST: (Describe proposed use) Serrano Village M5 - 10 single-family lots  
(add PD Overlay to R20K)

APPLICANT/AGENT Kirk Bone, Director of Government Relations

Mailing Address 4525 Serrano Parkway, Suite 100, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone 96-939-4060 Email: kbone@parkerdevco.com ahoward@parkerdevco.com

PROPERTY OWNER Serrano Associates, LLC

Mailing Address Same as Applicant

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

### LIST ADDITIONAL PROPERTY OWNERS ON SEPARATE SHEET IF APPLICABLE

ENGINEER/ARCHITECT REY Engineers, Attn: Rich Radoycis

Mailing Address 905 Sutter Street, Suite 200, Folsom, CA 95630

P.O. Box or Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State & Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone 916-366-3040 Email rradoycis@reyengineers.com

LOCATION: The property is located on the north side of Appian Way

immediately feet/miles west of the intersection with Sangiovese Drive

in the El Dorado Hills area. Property Size: 8.42 ac.

X [Signature] Date 9/24/25 acreage/square footage \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of property owner or authorized agent

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date 9-24-2025 Fee 2,264.45 Receipt # RG3027 Rec'd by [Signature] Census \_\_\_\_\_  
Zoning R20K GPD AP Supervisor District 1 Sec \_\_\_\_\_ TwN \_\_\_\_\_ Rng \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION BY \_\_\_\_\_ PLANNING COMMISSION  
\_\_\_\_\_ ZONING ADMINISTRATOR  
\_\_\_\_\_ PLANNING DIRECTOR

ACTION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_  
Findings and/or conditions attached \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_  
Findings and/or conditions attached \_\_\_\_\_

X \_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Secretary

APPEAL  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_\_

TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Z25-0006

**RECEIVED**

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

**Tentative Subdivision Map TM25-0003/  
Planned Development Permit PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5  
Planning Commission/May 14, 2026**

1. This Tentative Subdivision Map and Planned Development Permit request is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, the Conditions of Approval set forth below, and the following hearing Exhibits:

- Exhibit F.....Tentative Subdivision Map
- Exhibit H.....Tentative Grading and Drainage Plan

Any deviations from the project description, exhibits, or Conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above-described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows:

- A. Subdivision of an existing 8.42-acre lot into 10 residential lots ranging in size from 20,018 square feet to 73,063 square feet and four (4) landscaping lots ranging in size from 435 square feet to 3,484 square feet, with multiple phases presented for final map filing;
- B. Planned Development Permit to ensure consistency with the existing specific plan (El Dorado Hills Specific Plan); and
- C. Design Waivers requested for the following County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM):
  - 1. Modification to Standard Plan 101B for roadway right-of-way and improvement widths (including sidewalks, curbs and turnarounds) as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map.
  - 2. Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median.

Development of these production lots is subject to building permit review for building setbacks, location of the driveway entrance, and oak tree measures. The Serrano Architectural Review Committee will also review for similar development standards as they relate to their adopted design guidelines prior to building permit application submittal to the County. Landscape Lots A, B, C and D are located at the entrance to the subdivision. Lots 1 and 2 contain a deed-restricted riparian area that includes a non-development area.

The gated subdivision would be served by a 36-foot wide (road width) internal road off Appian Way and dead ends into two (2) separate cul-de-sacs. The roads would be

constructed based on the Standard Plan 101B of the County DISM, as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map. All lots are accessed exclusively via this internal road. Water and sewer services would be provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID). EID currently has an eight-inch potable water line located in Appian Way. A six-inch sewer line exists along Appian Way and Sangiovese Drive, and an eight-inch off-site sewer line in Highland View Subdivision, Unit 1. These sewer lines have adequate capacity at this time. In order to receive service, these existing lines would be extended in accordance with EID standards.

The grading, development, use, and maintenance of the property, the size, shape, arrangement, and location of structures, parking areas and landscape areas, and the protection and preservation of resources shall conform to the project description and the hearing exhibits above and the Conditions of Approval below. The property and any portions thereof shall be sold, leased or financed in compliance with this project description and the approved hearing exhibits and Conditions of Approval hereto. All plans must be submitted for review and approval and shall be implemented as approved by the County.

2. **Tentative Subdivision Map Limits:** This Tentative Subdivision Map shall expire 36 months from the date of approval unless a timely extension has been filed consistent with Section 120.74.020 (Expiration Period of Approved or Conditionally Approved Maps) of the Subdivision Ordinance. Multiple final maps may be completed for this project. The applicant has stated that the proposed phasing plan is approximate only, and the subdivider is not required to define the number or configuration of the proposed multiple final maps, according to the subdivision Map Act 66456.1 (Multiple final maps on one tentative map).
3. **Fees:** All fees associated with the Tentative Subdivision Map shall be paid prior to filing the Final Subdivision Map.
4. **Landscaping:** Landscape and irrigation plans shall be consistent with the Serrano Owners Association adopted design guidelines for landscaping and ancillary improvements. The landscaping design guidelines provide for a variety of deciduous and non-deciduous tree and shrub species to help designers study and select the proper shading patterns and/or solar warming opportunities as part of their landscape design. Where applicable, landscaping shall comply with County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.33 (Landscaping Standards) and the County Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO).
5. **Lighting:** All exterior lighting and outdoor lighting shall conform to Chapter 130.34 (Outdoor Lighting) of the County Zoning Ordinance and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. Any light fixture that does not have a specification sheet submitted with the building permit that specifically states that fixture meets the full cutoff standards, shall require a fixture substitution that meets that requirement.
6. **Parking:** Parking shall be improved consistent with Chapter 130.35 (Parking and Loading) of the County Zoning Ordinance.

7. **Condition Compliance:** Prior to Final Subdivision Map recordation, issuance of any building or grading permit, or commencement of any use authorized by this permit, the applicant shall provide a written description, together with appropriate documentation, showing conformance of the project with each Condition imposed as part of the project approval.
8. **Indemnity:** In the event of any legal action instituted by a third party challenging the validity of any provision of this approval, the developer and landowner agree to be responsible for the costs of defending such suit and shall hold El Dorado County (County) harmless from any legal fees or costs County may incur as a result of such action.

The developer and landowner shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless County and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of County concerning this Tentative Subdivision Map and Planned Development Permit.

The County shall notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense.

9. **Permit Implementation:** Implementation of the project must occur within 36 months of approval of this Planned Development Permit in accordance with Chapter 130.54.060 of the County Zoning Ordinance, otherwise the permit becomes null and void unless it is otherwise extended. If any extension of the Tentative Subdivision Map is granted, the Planned Development Permit shall be automatically extended for the same amount of time as provided for in County Code Section 130.52.040(F)(2). It is the responsibility of the applicant to monitor the time limit and make diligent progress toward implementation of the project and compliance with the Conditions of Approval.
10. **Human Remains:** In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work shall cease and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to subdivision(c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. The Coroner shall make his or her determination within two (2) working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or in his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American.

Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, with the most likely

descendants regarding their recommendations. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of their notification by the Native American Heritage Commission. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials or other proper method(s) for handling the remains in accordance with Section 5097.98(b-h). Any additional costs as a result of complying with this section shall be borne by the project applicant. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken.

11. **Subdivision and/or Private Roadway Gates:** Installation of any gates associated with the project or individual parcels shall comply with Section 130.30.090 (Gates) of the County Zoning Ordinance.
12. **Adequate Utilities:** Prior to approval of the Final Subdivision Map, applicant shall provide Planning Division with a “will serve” letter from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), and any other public utility required for the development of the site, for the proposed new parcels.
13. **Liens and Bonds:** Prior to filing a Final Subdivision Map, if the subject property is subject to liens for assessment of bonds, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 66493, the owner or subdivider shall either: (a) Pay the assessment or bond in full, or (b) File security with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, or (c) File with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors the necessary certificate indicating provisions have been made for segregation of bond assessment responsibility pursuant to Government Code Section 66493(d).
14. **Easements:** Prior to approval of the Final Subdivision Map, the applicant shall ensure that the County Surveyor’s Office conducts a final easement review of the project parcels, as part of standard procedure, to further ensure no potential easement conflicts will occur on the project site.
15. **Rare Plants:** Impacts to rare plants in the project area will be minimized by requiring the applicant to pay mitigation fees in conformance with local policies. Prior to issuance of grading and building permits, in coordination with the project applicant, Planning Division shall verify that payment of fees for development within El Dorado County Rare Plant Mitigation Area 2 are implemented. As of this writing, the current fee for development of single-family residential in Mitigation Area 2 is \$386.00 per dwelling.
16. **Construction Activities:** The following measures shall appear as notes on any grading and construction plans and be incorporated into the project construction activities:
  - All noise-producing project equipment and vehicles using internal-combustion engines shall be equipped with manufacturers-recommended mufflers and be maintained in good working condition.

- All mobile or fixed noise-producing equipment used on the project site that is regulated for noise output by a Federal, State, or local agency shall comply with such regulations during project activity.
- Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion-powered equipment, where feasible.
- Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable from noise-sensitive uses.
- Project area and site access road speed limits shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

### **Planning Division**

17. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall remit payment of any outstanding fees as detailed and required in the *Agreement for Payment of Processing Fees* authorized for this project.
18. A Final Subdivision Map shall not be recorded until an EID Water Meter Award Letter or similar document has been issued for all of the lots included in the Final Subdivision Map and a copy filed with the Planning Division.
19. All applicable Conditions of the development plan shall be satisfied prior to recordation of the Final Subdivision Map.
20. Where the subdivider is required to make improvements on land which neither the subdivider nor the County has sufficient title or interest to make such improvements, prior to filing of any Final Subdivision Map or Parcel Map, the subdivider shall submit to the Planning and Building Department Director for approval:
  - a. A legal description prepared by a civil engineer or land surveyor of the land necessary to be acquired to complete the off-site improvements.
  - b. Improvement plans prepared by a civil engineer of the required off-site improvements.
  - c. An appraisal prepared by a professional appraiser of the cost of land necessary to complete the off-site improvements.
21. Prior to the filing of the Final Subdivision Map, the subdivider shall enter into an agreement pursuant to Government Code Section 66462.5 to complete the required off-site improvements including the full costs of acquiring any real property interests necessary to complete the required improvements.

22. In addition to the agreement, the subdivider shall provide a cash deposit, letter of credit, or other acceptable surety in an amount sufficient to pay such costs including legal costs subject to the approval of County Counsel.
23. Approval of an Administrative Permit will be required prior to the installation of any gate across any public or private road.
24. The applicant shall stop work if Cultural Resources are discovered during construction. It is possible that vegetation, siltation, or historic activities may have obscured surface evidence of additional sites in the project area. If artifacts or unusual amounts of stone, bone, or shell are uncovered during construction activities, work should be halted within 100 feet of the find and a qualified archeologist consulted for on-the-spot evaluation. If the bone appears to be human, the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted.

**Department of Transportation (DOT)**

25. **On-Site Road Improvements:** The developer shall construct the on-site roadways consistent with County DISM Standard Plan 101B to the widths as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map.
26. **Offer of Dedication:** The developer shall irrevocably offer to dedicate road and public utility easements for on-site access roadways with the Final Subdivision Map. Also offer any appurtenant slope, drainage, pedestrian, public utility, or other public service easements as determined necessary by the County. The offer(s) will be rejected by the County.

The irrevocable offer of dedication shall be subject to that agreement between Serrano and the County, recorded as document 1998-0015833-00 on March 26, 1998. Subject to the above agreement, all roads are offered in fee to the Serrano El Dorado Owners' Association simultaneously with the filing of the Final Subdivision Map.

27. **Encroachment Permit:** The developer shall obtain an encroachment permit from the County Department of Transportation (DOT) and construct the roadway encroachment at Appian Way to the provisions of County Standard Plans as directed by DOT.
28. A Vehicular Access Restriction for lots contiguous to Appian Way shall be shown on the Final Subdivision Map(s) for those corner lots having access to intersecting minor roadways.
29. The developer shall demonstrate to the County that the project has entitlements for use of the off-site roads and public utility easements for access to the project.

30. **Off-Site Improvements – Collectors and Major Transportation Facilities:**

A. The project is responsible for design, Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E), utility relocation, right of way acquisition, and construction of following improvements as identified in the Access and Local Circulation Analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers dated December 8, 2025.

i. Appian Way/Sangiovese Drive intersection:

The project shall construct all-way stop control of the existing intersection at Appian Way and Sangiovese Drive at the Village M5 access.

The construction of the required improvements shall be completed prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the first building.

31. **Subdivision Improvement Agreement & Security:** The developer shall enter into a Subdivision Improvement Agreement (SIA) with the County for all roadway, grading, drainage, and other support infrastructure as required by the County Subdivision Ordinance, prior to filing of the Final Subdivision Map.

For improvements not completed at the time of recordation of the Final Subdivision Map, the subdivider shall provide a 100 percent performance surety and a 50 percent labor and materialmen's surety by separate bond, cash deposit, assignment, or letter of credit from a financial institution. For improvements which have been completed, the subdivider shall provide a 10 percent maintenance surety in any of the above-mentioned forms.

The developer's Engineer of Record shall prepare a "Certificate of Partial Completion" as attachment to the SIA, which sets forth the total cost of the project, percent complete, and the estimated remaining cost of the work to complete the project. Verification of the Certificate of Partial Completion shall be determined by the County.

32. **Easements:** All existing and proposed easements shall be shown on the project grading plans, improvement plans, and on the Final Subdivision Map.

33. **Import/Export Grading Permit:** Any import, or export to be deposited or borrowed within El Dorado County, shall require an additional grading permit for that offsite grading.

34. **Grading Plan Review:** Grading and improvement plans shall be prepared and submitted to the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District (RCD) and the DOT. The RCD shall review and make appropriate recommendations to the County. Upon receipt of the review report by the RCD, the DOT shall consider imposition of appropriate conditions for reducing or mitigating erosion and sedimentation from the project. Grading plans shall incorporate appropriate erosion control measures as provided in the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance and El Dorado County Storm Water Management Plan. Appropriate runoff controls such as berms, storm gates, detention basins, overflow collection areas,

filtration systems, and sediment traps shall be implemented to control siltation, and the potential discharge of pollutants into drainages.

35. **RCD Coordination:** The timing of construction and method of re-vegetation shall be coordinated with the RCD. If grading activities are not completed by September, the developer shall implement a temporary grading and erosion control plan. Such temporary plans shall be submitted to the RCD for review and recommendation to the DOT. DOT shall approve or conditionally approve such plans and cause the developer to implement said plan on or before October 15.
36. **Geotechnical Report:** At the time of the submittal of the grading or improvement plans, the applicant shall submit a soils and geologic hazards report (meeting the requirements for such reports provided in the El Dorado County Grading Ordinance) to and receive approval from the DOT. Grading design plans shall incorporate the findings of detailed geologic and geotechnical investigations and address, at a minimum, grading practices, compaction, slope stability of existing and proposed cuts and fills, erosion potential, ground water, pavement section based on TI and R values, and recommended design criteria for any retaining walls.
37. **Off-site Improvements (Security):** Prior to the filing of a Final Subdivision Map, the applicant shall enter into an agreement pursuant to Government Code Section 66462.5 to complete the required offsite improvements, including the full cost of acquiring any real property interests necessary to complete the required improvements. In addition to the agreement, the applicant shall provide a cash deposit, letter of credit, or other acceptable surety in the amount sufficient to pay such costs, including legal costs, subject to the approval of County Counsel.
38. **Consistency with County Codes and Standards:** Obtain approval of project improvement plans and cost estimates consistent with the DISM (as may be modified by these Conditions of Approval or by approved Design Waivers) from DOT and pay all applicable fees prior to filing of the Final Subdivision Map.

Ensure the project improvement plans and grading plans conform to the County *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, Grading Design Manual, the Drainage Manual, Storm Water Ordinance (Ord. No. 5022), Off-Street Parking and Loading Ordinance, all applicable State of California Water Quality Orders, the State of California Handicapped Accessibility Standards, and the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).*

39. **Entrance Gates:** Pursuant to Article 2, Section 1273.11 of the State Responsibility Area (SRA) Fire Safe Regulations, all gates providing access from a road to a driveway shall be located at least 30 feet from the roadway and shall open to allow a vehicle to stop without obstructing traffic on that road. Gate entrances shall be at least two (2) feet wider than the width of the traffic lane(s) serving that gate. All gates shall be designed and constructed with turnarounds acceptable to the County and Fire Department.

40. **Curb Returns:** Where sidewalks are provided, include pedestrian ramps with truncated domes conforming to Caltrans Standard Plan A88A, including a 4-foot sidewalk/landing at the back of all ramps. Alternate plans satisfying the current accessibility standards may be used, subject to review and approval by County.
41. **Maintenance Entity:** Prior to filing a Final Subdivision Map, form an entity, or join an existing entity, for the maintenance of public and private roads and drainage facilities. When joining an existing entity, amend and modify (as necessary) the existing entity to equitably incorporate maintenance of the project improvements.
42. **Common Fence/Wall Maintenance:** Responsibility and access rights for maintenance of any fences and walls constructed on property lines shall be included in the Covenants Codes and Restrictions (CC&Rs).
43. **Drainage (Cross-Lot):** Avoid cross lot drainage. Contain any concentrated cross lot drainage, or natural sheet flow drainage increased by the project, within dedicated drainage easements. Convey concentrated flows via closed conduit or open channel, to natural drainage courses or storm drain system. Show drainage easements for on-site drainage facilities on the Project Grading and Improvement plans.
44. Drainage maintenance shall be the responsibility of the Serrano El Dorado Owners' Association. Therefore, all easements for drainage facilities shall first be offered to the County of El Dorado with rejection; the offer shall be subject to that agreement between Serrano and the County recorded as document 1998-0015834-00 on March 26, 1998. Pursuant to the terms of said agreement, upon rejection by the County, all drainage easements will be subsequently offered to the Serrano El Dorado Owners' Association simultaneously with the filing of the Final Subdivision Map.
45. A final drainage plan shall be prepared in accordance with the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual, subject to review and approval by the County DOT. Drainage facilities shall be designed and shown on the project improvement plans consistent with the final drainage plan and the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Master Drainage Study. The developer shall install said drainage facilities with the respective phase of construction, or as specified in the final drainage plan.
46. The Final Subdivision Map shall show all drainage easements consistent with the County of El Dorado Drainage Manual, the project final drainage plan, and the project improvement plans.
47. **Water Quality Stamp:** Include a stormwater quality message stamped into the concrete on new or reconstructed drainage inlets, conforming to the Storm Water Quality Design Manual for the Sacramento and South Placer Regions, Chapter 4, Fact Sheet SD-1. Obtain approval of proposed message from County Engineer prior to construction.

48. **Stormwater Management:** The County is subject to the State of California's Phase II MS4 Permit. Thus, the County's post construction water quality requirements follow those outlined in that permit or any superseding permit at the time of application submittal. Projects typically qualify as "Small" or "Regulated/Hydromodification" projects under the current MS4 Permit / West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Stormwater Plan Requirements if improvements will create or replace 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface, including offsite improvements. Show detention and/or retention facilities on the project improvement plans to fully mitigate any increased runoff peak flows and volumes in accordance with the County Drainage Manual.
49. **Construction Hours:** Construction activities shall be conducted in accordance with the County Health, Safety, and Noise Element and limited to the daylight hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on any weekday, and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends and federal holidays.
50. **Regulatory Permits and Documents:** Incorporate all regulatory permits and agreements between the project and any State or Federal Agency into the Project Grading and Improvement Plans prior to the start of construction of improvements. Grading or Improvement plans for any phase may be approved prior to obtaining regulatory permits or agreements for that phase, but grading/construction of improvements may not proceed until the appropriate permits or agreements are obtained and the grading/improvement plans reflect any necessary changes or modifications to reflect such permits or agreements. Project Conditions of Approval shall be incorporated into the Project Improvement Plans when submitted for review.
51. **Electronic Documentation:** Upon completion of the required improvements, provide As-Built Plans to the County Engineer in Portable Document Format (PDF), and provide final Drainage and Geotechnical reports, and structural wall calculations to the County Engineer in PDF format.
52. This project is subject to the El Dorado County Traffic Impact Fee Program. Traffic fees shall be due upon the issuance of a building permit. If prior to the application for a building permit for said project a revised fee is established, such revised amount shall be paid.
53. Subdivision improvements shall include rough grading of driveways for all lots with street cuts or fills along the frontage of six (6) feet or more difference in elevation, or as found necessary for reasonable access by the County Engineer. Construction of said driveways shall conform to the DISM and the Encroachment Ordinance.
54. Bus turnouts and shelters shall be constructed at locations required by El Dorado Transit and the appropriate school district.
55. The final grading plan shall comply with the provisions of the Grading Ordinance pertaining to terracing on slopes exceeding 25 feet in height, including accessibility, intervals, and cross section geometry.

56. Improvement Plans shall incorporate protective measures toward existing oak trees pursuant to Volume IV, DISM, Oak Tree and Wetlands Preservation Requirements and Specifications (County Resolution No. 199-91).
57. Erosion control and drainage design from residential areas into the open space areas shall employ natural appearing methods. The use of native plant materials is required where revegetation is proposed.
58. Should asbestos-containing rock be exposed during grading, construction of roads, excavation for underground facilities, building foundations or any construction related activity, County Ordinance No. 4548 shall apply.

**Environmental Management Department (EMD)**

59. A minimum of 65 percent of the waste materials generated from covered Construction and Demolition projects must be diverted from being landfilled by being recycled or reused on site. The applicant may visit the website to view El Dorado County's Construction & Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance Program information and requirements. If after reviewing this information there are still questions, the applicant is welcome to call EMD at (530) 621-5300.
60. All residential dwellings shall have an organics recycling program for the following types of organic wastes: green waste, landscape, pruning waste, food waste, and food-soiled paper.

**El Dorado Hills Fire Department (EDHFD)**

61. The project is located in a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone within a CAL FIRE SRA. The applicant shall provide a Wildfire Hazard Real Estate Disclosure to all future property owners regarding this risk.

**Prior to Recordation of the Final Subdivision Map (unless otherwise stated in the individual Condition):**

62. Emergency Water Supply: The project area is currently provided with an adequate means of emergency water supply, storage, or conveyance facilities. Prior to new buildings or structures being placed on one (1) or more of these parcels, the applicant will need to demonstrate that they can meet the required emergency water supply provisions found in Chapter 5 of the California Fire Code (CFC), along with local ordinances and standards of EDHFD.
  - a. Approved fire hydrants capable of providing the required fire flow for the protection of any and all structures shall be located along the fire apparatus access roadway. Fire hydrant quantities and locations shall be in accordance with the CFC,

as amended locally. The required fire hydrants shall be installed and operational prior to any construction (including foundations).

63. Roads and Driveways: Roads and driveways, whether public or private, shall comply with California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14 §§ 1270.00 - 1276.04 and CCR of Title 24 – Part 9 (CFC), Section 503 (Fire Apparatus Access Roads), as amended locally. The required fire access road(s) shall be installed prior to any construction (including foundations).

a. Fire access roadways shall be of not less than 20 feet of unobstructed width, 13 foot 6 inches of vertical clearance, and a minimum turning radii within the same traffic lane of 30 feet inside and 50 feet outside dimensions on the improvement plans. Fire access roadways adjacent to fire hydrants shall be a minimum 26 feet in width. The access roadway shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any proposed building. The use of turf-block or Grass-Crete or similar alternate road surfaces is not approved for installation in fire apparatus access roadways.

A minimum 30-foot inner and 50-foot outer turning radius within the same traffic lane shall be provided at turn(s) from Appian Way onto Sangiovese Drive.

b. Fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided an approved fire apparatus turnaround. Fire apparatus turnarounds shall be in accordance with CCR Title 14 and EDHFD Standard B-003. Driveways in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved turnout. Turnouts shall be in accordance with CCR Title 14.

c. Fire access roadways shall be built to bear a minimum of 75,000 pounds and meet DOT standards for roadways. A report, prepared by a registered geotechnical or California-licensed Civil engineer, verifying the ability of the road to bear the required minimum weight, shall be submitted with any plan indicating the construction of the roadway. Verification of constructed roadways shall be provided by a registered geotechnical or California-licensed Civil engineer prior to the final of the project.

d. Where a bridge or elevated surface is part of a fire apparatus access road, the bridge shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition – 2002 (HB-17).

e. Traffic calming measures along fire access roads are prohibited unless approved by EDHFD.

f. Gates or barriers across fire access roads or pedestrian egress shall be approved prior to installation and shall be in accordance with the CFC and EDHFD

Standards.

- g. When a road is required, it shall be named in accordance with the requirements identified by the County Surveyor's Office. An approved street sign shall be placed at the entrance to the road.
  - h. Fire lane identification shall be provided along required fire access roadways. Fire lane identification shall be in accordance with the California Vehicle Code and EDHFD Standards. Vehicle parking is prohibited on any street less than 30 feet in width. Vehicle parking is permitted on both sides of streets 40 feet or more in width. Roadway widths shall be measured between the gutter line or edge of pavement on opposite sides of the road. Identification of fire apparatus access roadways may be required on private roads.
  - i. All essential road and driveway improvements shall be complete and meet all of the requirements of CCR Title 14 and the CFC prior to the approval of the Final Subdivision Map for the project.
64. Fire Protection Plan (Fire Safe Plan): A preliminary Fire Safe Plan shall be prepared to determine the acceptability of fire protection and life safety measures designed to mitigate wildfire hazards. The Fire Safe Plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 49 of the CFC and EDHFD standards. The applicant shall record a Notice of Restriction (NOR) prior to or concurrent with recordation of the Final Subdivision Map that states that all lots illustrated in the Final Subdivision Map shall adhere to the conditions of the applicable Fire Safe Plan. The specific language of the NOR shall be approved by EDHFD prior to Final Subdivision Map recordation. A Fire Safe Plan approved within the last five (5) years will meet this requirement.

**Prior to Issuance of Building Permits**

- 65. Fire Safe Plan: A final Fire Safe Plan shall be prepared to determine the acceptability of fire protection and life safety measures designed to mitigate wildfire hazards. The Fire Safe Plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 49 of the CFC and EDHFD standards. A Fire Safe Plan approved within the last five (5) years will meet this requirement.
- 66. Plan submittal (residential). The applicant shall meet the following: Civil Site Plans and New Residential Building Plans shall be submitted and approved prior to final building permit being issued. Fire Sprinkler plans shall be submitted prior to final building permit being issued. Please note: EDHFD does not allow deferred submittals for fire sprinkler plans.
- 67. Roof Coverings: Residential roof coverings shall consist of materials having a minimum Class A rating.
- 68. New Buildings and Structures: New buildings and structures placed on a parcel shall

comply with all applicable fire safety regulations found in the CCR Titles 14, 19, 24, and EDHFD ordinances and regulations.

- a. All parcels shall provide a minimum 30-foot setback for all buildings from all property lines and/or the center of a road in accordance with CCR Title 14 – Section 1276 (Setback for Structure Defensible Space).
  - b. Residential structures, due to topography or parcel dimensions, that encroach the 30-foot setback shall be constructed to meet Insurance Institute for Business Home & Safety (IBHS) Wildfire Prepared Home.
69. Open Space Fencing: Lots that abut open space shall be required to utilize non-combustible type fencing abutting the open space.

**Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy**

70. Address (residential). All parcels shall be provided with an approved address number as issued by the County Surveyor's Office. Approved numbers or addresses shall be placed on all new or existing buildings in such a position as to be easily read from the street or road fronting the property. The minimum size of the numbers shall not be less than four (4) inches. Address shall be internally illuminated or mounted immediately adjacent to a light source and shall also contrast with their background. When a residential building is located more than 150 feet from the provided road serving the residence, an address sign shall be placed at the driveway entrance onto the parcel. Remote address numbers shall be reflective and contrasting in color to the sign background, and with a number height of not less than four (4) inches and with a stroke width of 1/2-inch.
71. If this property is sold prior to development, the seller shall disclose the above EDHFD requirements to the buyer.

**County Surveyor's Office**

72. Upon project approval from the Planning Division, a Final Map Package will need to be submitted with the County Surveyor's Office.
73. All survey monuments must be set prior to filing the Final Subdivision Map or the developer shall have surety of work to be done by bond or cash deposit. Verification of set survey monuments and the amount of the bond or deposit to be coordinated with the County Surveyor's Office prior to the filing of the Final Subdivision Map.
74. The roads serving the development shall be named by filing a completed Road Name Petition, with the County Surveyor's Office. Proof of any signage required by the County Surveyor's Office must be provided prior to filing the Final Subdivision Map.

75. Situs addressing for the project shall be coordinated with the County Surveyor's Office prior to filing the Final Subdivision Map.
76. Prior to filing the Final Subdivision Map, a letter will be required from all agencies that have placed Conditions on the map. The letter will state that "all conditions placed on TM25-0003 by (that agency) have been satisfied." The letter is to be sent to the County Surveyor's Office and copied to the consultant and the applicant.
77. All boundary monuments that may be disturbed or destroyed during project construction shall be identified and referenced and/or reset by a Professional Land Surveyor or Qualified Engineer as defined by Section 8771 of the California Business and Professions Code (Land Surveyors Act).
78. Applicant must coordinate with the County Surveyor's Office for any parcel designated as "remainder" to have a Certificate of Compliance filed concurrently with the recording of the Final Subdivision Map.

**County Air Quality Management District (AQMD):**

79. Fugitive Dust: A Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan (FDP) Application with appropriate fees shall be submitted to and approved by the AQMD prior to the start of project construction if, during the course of the project a Grading Permit is required from the Building Department, Dust control measures shall comply with the requirements of AQMD Rule 223, Fugitive Dust – General Requirements and Rule 223.1 – Construction, Bulk Material Handling, Blasting, Other Earthmoving Activities and Trackout Prevention.
80. Open Burning: Burning of waste vegetation that results from "Land Development Clearing" must be permitted through the AQMD. Only dry vegetative waste materials originating from the property may be disposed of using an open outdoor fire. Burning shall adhere to AQMD Rule 300, Open Burning.
81. Paving: Road construction shall adhere to AQMD Rule 224, Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials.
82. Painting/Coating: The application of architectural coatings shall adhere to AQMD Rule 215, Architectural Coatings.
83. New Point or Stationary Source: Prior to construction/installation of any new point/stationary source emissions units (e.g., emergency standby engine greater than 50 horsepower, etc.), Authority to Construct applications shall be submitted to the AQMD. Submittal of applications shall include facility diagram(s), equipment specifications and emissions estimates, and shall adhere to AQMD Rules 501, General Permit Requirements and 523, New Source Review.

84. Construction Emissions: During construction, all self-propelled diesel-fueled engines greater than 25 horsepower shall be in compliance with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fueled Fleets (§ 2449 et al, title 13, article 4.8, chapter 9, CCR). The full text of the regulation can be found at CARB's website here: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/topics/construction-earthmoving-equipment>. Questions on applicability should be directed to CARB at 1.866.634.3735. CARB is responsible for enforcement of this regulation.
85. Portable Equipment: All portable combustion engine equipment with a rating of 50 horsepower or greater shall be registered with CARB. A copy of the current portable equipment registration shall be with said equipment. The applicant shall provide a complete list of heavy-duty diesel-fueled equipment to be used on this project, which includes the make, model, year of equipment, and daily hours of operations of each piece of equipment.
86. Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging – Residential: The residential portion of the project shall comply with the Residential Mandatory Measures identified in the 2022 Cal Green Building Code §4.106.4.1 to facilitate future installation and use of EV chargers. Please refer to: CHAPTER 4 RESIDENTIAL MANDATORY MEASURES, 2022 California Green Building Standards Code, Title 24, Part 11 (CALGreen) | ICC Digital Codes (iccsafe.org)
87. The applicant shall submit a list to the AQMD stating which of the following mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts on air quality from equipment exhaust emissions during all construction involved in this project for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit or grading permit:

The AQMD's goal is to strive to achieve and maintain ambient air quality standards established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and CARB and to minimize public exposure to toxic or hazardous air pollutants and air pollutants that create unpleasant odors. The following are measures used to reduce impacts on air quality from equipment exhaust emissions:

- Use low-emission on-site mobile construction equipment.
- Maintain equipment in tune per manufacturer specifications.
- Retard diesel engine injection timing by two (2) to four (4) degrees.
- Use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline or diesel generators.
- Use reformulated low-emission diesel fuel.
- Use catalytic converters on gasoline-powered equipment.

-Substitute electric and gasoline-powered equipment for diesel powered equipment where feasible.

-Do not leave inactive construction equipment idling for prolonged periods (i.e., more than two [2] minutes).

-Schedule construction activities and material hauls that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours.

-Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.

88. Develop a construction traffic management plan that includes but is not limited to: Providing temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow; Rerouting construction trucks off congested streets; and provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off-site.

**County Stormwater Division:**

89. The project is subject to the provisions of the County Stormwater Ordinance and Drainage Manual regarding drainage and water quality.
90. The project shall comply with the West Slope Development and Redevelopment Standards and Post Construction Stormwater Plan.
91. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will need to be included in the plan submittal. If the project will disturb over one (1) acre of land, the Legally Responsible Person (LRP) is required to obtain Construction General Permit (CGP) coverage through the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The CGP requires the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). CGP requirements can be found at the following link:  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.html)

**El Dorado Irrigation District (EID):**

92. As shown in the Facilities Improvement Letter (Exhibit Q), the project shall adhere to applicable requirements from EID for connection to public sewer and water services, including easement requirements, prior to issuance of grading and building permits.

**Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)**

93. The following language be expressly stated in the offer of dedication for Public Utility Easements (PUEs):

“I/We the undersigned, as Owner(s) of the land shown hereon, do hereby state that I/we am/are the only person(s) whose consent is necessary to pass clear title to said land and do

hereby consent to the preparation and recordation of this map and offer for dedication and do hereby dedicate for public uses the Public Utility Easements (PUEs) shown on this map for public utility purposes including electric, gas, communication facilities and all other public utility purposes; together with any and all appurtenances thereto, including the right from time to time to trim and to cut down and clear away or otherwise control any trees or brush. The PUEs hereby offered for dedication are to be kept open and free of buildings, or any other structures of any kind.”

The Final Subdivision Map must contain such a statement setting forth the offer of dedication and such offer must be accepted by the county or municipality. The PUEs must also be of sufficient width, acceptable to PG&E, for PG&E to occupy with its distribution and service facilities. If the County or municipality has declined the offer of dedication, the applicant may be required to grant or secure easements in gross satisfactory to PG&E.

Cameron W. Welch <cameron.welch@edcgov.us>

5/13/2026 4:24 PM

**RE: ENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 submitted by Serrano Associates. Graded pads adjacent to Sangevese off Appian Way**

To tara.mook@[REDACTED] Copy Karen L. Garner <karen.l.garner@edcgov.us> • Robert J. Peters <robert.peters@edcgov.us> • Aaron D. Mount <aaron.mount@edcgov.us> • Ande Flower <ande.flower@edcgov.us> • Brendan Ferry <brendan.ferry@edcgov.us> • Thea A. Graybill <thea.graybill@edcgov.us> • Angelic M. Madson <angelic.madson@edcgov.us> • Debra R. Ercolini <debra.ercolini@edcgov.us> • Patricia M. Soto <patricia.soto@edcgov.us> • Rhiannon R. Guilford <rhiannon.guilford@edcgov.us> • Christopher A. Smith <christopher.smith@edcgov.us> • David A Livingston <david.livingston@edcgov.us> • Jefferson B. Billingsley <jefferson.billingsley@edcgov.us> • Adam J. Bane <adam.bane@edcgov.us> • Zachary S. Oates <zach.oates@edcgov.us> • Renee I. Jensen <renee.jensen@edcgov.us> • MaryJane E. Smith <elizabeth.x.smith@edcgov.us> • Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Good afternoon, Tara Mccann,

As requested and inquired below, please find attached the current application being used (part 1 of 2 due to file size; part 2 will follow shortly) for TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 being heard by the Planning Commission tomorrow, 5/14. Please note that during the review and processing of this application it was determined that a rezone would not be required for TM25-0003/PD25-0005, hence why the rezone is not part of the current project.

The applicable Project in Your Area webpage is expected to be updated by the end of today.

Sincerely,

Cameron Welch  
Senior Planner  
Planning Division

County of El Dorado Planning and Building Department  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
Direct: (530) 621-5816  
Main: (530) 621-5355  
[cameron.welch@edcgov.us](mailto:cameron.welch@edcgov.us)  
[Planning Division - El Dorado County](#)

**RECEIVED**

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT



*Elevate to El Dorado*

A Great Place to Live, Work & Play

**From:** tara.mook [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2026 2:06 PM  
**To:** Planning Department <[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)>  
**Cc:** Karen L. Garner <[Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us](mailto:Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us)>; Robert J. Peters <[Robert.Peters@edcgov.us](mailto:Robert.Peters@edcgov.us)>; Aaron D. Mount <[aaron.mount@edcgov.us](mailto:aaron.mount@edcgov.us)>; Ande Flower <[Ande.Flower@edcgov.us](mailto:Ande.Flower@edcgov.us)>; Brendan Ferry <[brendan.ferry@edcgov.us](mailto:brendan.ferry@edcgov.us)>; Thea A. Graybill <[Thea.Graybill@edcgov.us](mailto:Thea.Graybill@edcgov.us)>; Angelic M. Madson <[Angelic.Madson@edcgov.us](mailto:Angelic.Madson@edcgov.us)>; Debra R. Ercolini <[debra.ercolini@edcgov.us](mailto:debra.ercolini@edcgov.us)>; Patricia M. Soto <[Patricia.Soto@edcgov.us](mailto:Patricia.Soto@edcgov.us)>; Rhiannon R. Guilford <[Rhiannon.Guilford@edcgov.us](mailto:Rhiannon.Guilford@edcgov.us)>; Christopher A. Smith <[Christopher.Smith@edcgov.us](mailto:Christopher.Smith@edcgov.us)>; David A Livingston <[david.livingston@edcgov.us](mailto:david.livingston@edcgov.us)>; Jefferson B. Billingsley <[Jefferson.Billingsley@edcgov.us](mailto:Jefferson.Billingsley@edcgov.us)>; Adam J. Bane <[adam.bane@edcgov.us](mailto:adam.bane@edcgov.us)>; Zachary S. Oates <[Zach.Oates@edcgov.us](mailto:Zach.Oates@edcgov.us)>; Renee I. Jensen <[Renee.Jensen@edcgov.us](mailto:Renee.Jensen@edcgov.us)>; MaryJane E. Smith <[Elizabeth.x.Smith@edcgov.us](mailto:Elizabeth.x.Smith@edcgov.us)>; Cameron W. Welch <[Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us](mailto:Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us)>  
**Subject:** Re: ENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 submitted by Serrano Associates. Graded pads adjacent to Sangevese off Appian Way

Thank You for your response, What Application is being used?

This is what is stated in the County documents for this project:

**STATUS OF PROPOSED PROJECT :**

**Tentative Subdivision Map/ Planned Development/ Serrano Village M5** - A Tentative Subdivision Map and Precise Development Plan Revision for Phase 5 of Village M (Village M5) was approved on July 12, 2007, resulting in a total of 10 residential lots. Subsequently, the applicant submitted a substantial compliance review for minor revisions to the approved tentative map to place the wetland protected area into a unique open space lot.

**A small lot final map was never recorded**, so the tentative subdivision map that was approved in 2007 ( for these 10 residential lots ) eventually expired in 2023 along with the precise development plan revision.

**A separate application, TM24-0001/Z24-0001/PD24-0001**, was made for 20 residential lots instead of the 10 lots now expired, the 20 residential lots was denied. March 13, 2025.

**Current Status as of 5/13/2026** - There is no approval for 10 lots for this project, or any lots for this project at this time. The 10 lot approval expired, 20 lot request was denied, now Serrano Associates LLC is coming to the County May 14, 2026 to request approval for a project. Is this correct? Where is their Application? It is not in the exhibits on Legistar. Please Provide.

Tara Mccann  
El Dorado County Resident

On 05/13/2026 1:12 PM PDT Planning Department <[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Your public comment sent on May 13, 2026, at 12:26 PM has been received for the Tentative Subdivision Map/Planned Development Permit, TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 project. This project is on the agenda for the Planning Commission's May 14, 2026, Meeting.

Thank you,

**County of El Dorado**  
**Planning Division**  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5355  
[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)



---

**From:** [tara.mook@](mailto:tara.mook@) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2026 12:25 PM  
**To:** Cameron W. Welch <[Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us](mailto:Cameron.Welch@edcgov.us)>  
**Cc:** Planning Department <[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)>; Bob Williams <[Bob.Williams@edcgov.us](mailto:Bob.Williams@edcgov.us)>; Patrick Frega <[Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us](mailto:Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us)>; Jeff Hansen <[Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us](mailto:Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us)>; Tim Costello <[Tim.Costello@edcgov.us](mailto:Tim.Costello@edcgov.us)>; David Spaur <[David.Spaur@edcgov.us](mailto:David.Spaur@edcgov.us)>; BOS-District I <[bosone@edcgov.us](mailto:bosone@edcgov.us)>; BOS-District II <[bostwo@edcgov.us](mailto:bostwo@edcgov.us)>; BOS-District III <[bosthree@edcgov.us](mailto:bosthree@edcgov.us)>; BOS-District IV

<[bosfour@edcgov.us](mailto:bosfour@edcgov.us)>; BOS-District V <[bosfive@edcgov.us](mailto:bosfive@edcgov.us)>

**Subject:** ENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 submitted by Serrano Associates. Graded pads adjacent to Sangevese off Appian Way

**County Planner, Cameron Welch**

[cameron.welch@edcgov.us](mailto:cameron.welch@edcgov.us)

**Planning Commission, [planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us),**

Bob Williams, District 2, [bob.williams@edcgov.us](mailto:bob.williams@edcgov.us)

Patrick J. Frega, Chair, District 5, [patrick.frega@edcgov.us](mailto:patrick.frega@edcgov.us)

Jeff Hansen, First Vice- Chair, District 3, [jeff.hansen@edcgov.us](mailto:jeff.hansen@edcgov.us)

Tim Costello, Second Vice-Chair, District 4, [tim.costello@edcgov.us](mailto:tim.costello@edcgov.us)

David Spaur, District 1, [david.spaur@edcgov.us](mailto:david.spaur@edcgov.us)

**Clerk of the Planning Commission, Rhiannon Guilford,**  
**Planning Director, Karen L. Garner, Executive Secretary**  
[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us),

**Planning Director, Karen L. Garner, Executive Secretary**

TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 submitted by Serrano Associates.

TO: Cameron Welch, Planner

What is the application being used for tomorrows item #2 before the Planning Commission? Please provide the current and updated Application from Serrano Associates LLC for tomorrow's Planning Commission hearing of

**Tentative Subdivision Map/ Planned Development Permit TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5.**

I am confused, as well as many others, on the El Dorado County Web Site under Projects in your Area, this project is coming up as the last submittal for the requested 20 lots that was denied. It is not consistent with what is now shown on Legistar that was updated 2 weeks ago on May 1, 2026. This project that is reflected on the El Dorado County Web Site under Projects in your Area left side is still showing as an active application and does not give anyone looking at it the accurate and updated information that this application was denied March 13, 2025.

This is what is showing currant on County Web Site for the project Serrano Village M5. This was the old application that was denied March 13, 2025 that was forward back to the Planning Commission for evaluation of a revised proposal and deny TM24-0001/Z24-0001/PD24-0001.

*Application Date: 1/30/24*  
*TM24-0001; Z24-0001; PD24-0001*

*Proposed development of a new 20-unit residential subdivision on 20 lots, ranging in size from 7,000 to 19,763 square feet, located on an 8.42-acre site. The project would include single-family attached residential development and open space, in addition to roadway improvements and new utility hook-ups. The proposed map is provided in the linked PDF. The current zoning of the project site is Single-unit Residential, minimum lot size 20,000 square feet (R20K) and the General Plan land use designation for the project site is AP (Adopted Plan). The project would require a Subdivision to 20 lots ranging in size from 7,000 sf to 19,763 sf, a Zone Change from R20K to R1-PD (Single-unit Residential, Planned Development Combining Zone) and OS (Open Space), and a Planned Development to add the PD overlay to the Zone Change.*

This is not what is coming before the Planning Commission tomorrow.  
Item #2 is:

*Hearing to consider TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, TM25-0003/PD25-0005/Serrano Village M5 request for the following:*

*1. Tentative Subdivision Map for subdivision of an existing 8.42-acre lot into 10 residential lots ranging in size from 20,018 square feet to 73,063 square feet and four (4) landscaping lots ranging in size from 435 square feet to 3,484 square feet with multiple phases presented for Final Subdivision Map filing;*

*2. Planned Development Permit to ensure consistency with the existing specific plan (El Dorado Hills Specific Plan); and*

*3. Design Waivers requested for the following County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM):*

*a. Modify Standard Plan 101B for roadway right-of-way and improvement widths (including sidewalks, curbs and turnarounds) as shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map.*

*b. Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 123-020-023, consisting of 8.42 acres, is located on the west side of Appian Way, at the intersection with Sangiovese Drive, in the El Dorado Hills area, submitted by Serrano Associates, LLC;*

*Staff recommends the Planning Commission take the following actions:*

*1. Find that the project is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines; and*

*2. Approve Tentative Subdivision Map TM25-0003, Planned Development Permit PD25-0005, and the requested Design Waivers based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as presented herein.*

Where is the Application for this? Please provide in the Exhibits on Legistar and email me a copy of the Application that is being used and heard by the Planning Commission tomorrow 5/14/2026 item #2. The original application was for 10 lots expired 2023 here is the status El Dorado County shows to date:

**STATUS OF PROPOSED PROJECT :**

**Tentative Subdivision Map/ Planned Development/ Serrano Village M5** - A Tentative Subdivision Map and Precise Development Plan Revision for Phase 5 of Village M (Village M5) was approved on July 12, 2007, resulting in a total of 10 residential lots. Subsequently, the applicant submitted a substantial compliance review for minor revisions to the approved tentative map to place the wetland protected area into a unique open space lot.

**A small lot final map was never recorded**, so the tentative subdivision map that was approved in 2007 ( for these 10 residential lots ) eventually expired in 2023 along with the precise development plan revision.

**A separate application, TM24-0001/Z24-0001/PD24-0001**, was made for 20 residential lots instead of the 10 lots now expired, the 20 residential lots was denied. March 13, 2025.

**Current Status as of 5/13/2026** - There is no approval for 10 lots for this project, or any lots for this project at this time. The 10 lot approval expired, 20 lot request was denied, now Serrano Associates LLC is coming to the County May 14, 2026 to ask for approval for a project. Where is their Application? It is not in the exhibits on Legistar. Please Provide.

Tara Mccann  
El Dorado County Resident

Please include in my comments for the Planning Commission Meeting for 5/14/2026  
**WARNING:** This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

**WARNING:** This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.

- Application Packet\_TM25-0003, PD25-0005,Z25-0006 part 1.pdf (24 MB)
- image001.png (138 KB)
- image002.png (36 KB)



# Cash Register Receipt

County of El Dorado

**Receipt Number**  
**R66775**

DESCRIPTION	ACCOUNT	QTY	PAID
<b>ProjectTRAK</b>			<b>\$494.00</b>
TM-A26-0003 Address: APN: 123020023			\$494.00
<b>APPEALS FEES</b>			\$494.00
ALL APPEALS	3720200 0240	0	\$494.00
<b>TOTAL FEES PAID BY RECEIPT: R66775</b>			<b>\$494.00</b>

# RECEIVED

MAY 29 2026

EL DORADO COUNTY  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Date Paid: Friday, May 29, 2026

Paid By: Tara Mccann

Cashier: BLD

Pay Method: CHK-PLACERVILLE [REDACTED]



You can check status of your Permit/Project/Case using e-TRAKIT at <https://edc-trk.aspgov.com/etrakit/> or using the above QR code. You must create an account to see reviews and inspections.

Your local Fire District may have its' own series of inspection requirements for your permit/project. Please contact them for further information. Fire District inspections (where required) must be approved prior to calling for a frame and final inspection through the building department.

Printed: Friday, May 29, 2026 1:22 PM

