

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

PC 3/11/10
#13

COUNTY OF EL DORADO

<http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/devservices>



PLACERVILLE OFFICE:
2850 FAIRLANE COURT PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
BUILDING (530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 FAX
PLANNING (530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 FAX
Counter Hours: 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM

LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:
3368 LAKE TAHOE BLVD. SUITE 302
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150
(530) 573-3330
(530) 542-9082 FAX

Counter Hours: 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM

TO: El Dorado County Planning Commission
FROM: Michael C. Baron, Planning Services
DATE: March 11, 2010
RE: Proposed Staff Report and Environmental Checklist Changes to Malcolm Dixon Road Estates-Z05-0015/TM05-1401

Planning Services Staff request the following changes to the above referenced project staff report:

Project Description: The project request includes a Zone Change from Exclusive Agriculture (AE) to Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) and a Tentative Map to create 8 lots ranging in size from 5.0 acres to 5.6 acres. Each parcel would be served with public water and private septic systems. Access to the proposed subdivision would be from a proposed roadway connection to the south at the existing Malcolm Dixon Road extending further off-site to the south providing an additional connection to Green Valley Road. ~~Three Additional access points to the proposed subdivision would eventually come from two proposed roadway connections to the south one at the adjacent Diamante Subdivision existing Malcolm Dixon Road and another to the south onto Malcolm Dixon Road as well as a connection to the northwest onto at existing Salmon Falls Road through the La Canada Subdivision.~~ No Design Waivers from the Design and Improvement Standards Manual have been requested.

Site Description: The site is comprised of approximately 90 percent grassland with dispersed areas of heavy oak canopy comprising approximately eight percent of the site on moderately sloping terrain and is situated at an elevation range of approximately 800 to 900 feet. The site generally slopes from the northeast to the southwest. There is an existing residence in the north~~south~~west corner of the site. Two abandoned buildings are situated on the adjacent property to the southwest and ~~the~~ a residence is located adjacent to Malcolm Dixon Road in the southeast corner of adjacent to the project site. Surrounding land uses include residences, pastureland, and oak woodland.

Adjacent Land Uses:

	Zoning	General Plan	Land Use/Improvements
Site	AE	LDR	Existing Residence and Undeveloped
North	RE-5 PD	LDR	Vacant
South	AE RE-5	LDR	Vacant
East	RE-5	LDR	Existing Residential
West	RE-5	LDR	Vacant

15. *Existing land use patterns;*

Discussion: The project area is surrounded by existing residential land uses. The project is also surrounded by Estate Residential 5-acre zoned lands along the western boundaries. Rezone applications to Estate Residential 5-Acre (RE-5) and RE-5 PD have been ~~submitted~~ approved for the parcels immediately to the north as well as to the south and east of the project site. It has been determined that the proposed project is consistent with existing land use patterns within the immediate project area.

16. *Proximity to perennial water course;*

Discussion: According to the wetland delineation report submitted on January 19, 2006, prepared by Ecorp Consulting Inc., the total acreage of potential jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. at the subject site are ~~1.44~~ 0.45 acres. These water features include ~~0.36~~ 0.21 acres of intermittent drainage, ~~a 0.47 acre pond,~~ and ~~0.54~~ 0.24 acres of seasonal wetland swale. General Plan Policy 7.3.3.4 requires a minimum setback of 50 feet from the wetlands delineated on the Tentative Subdivision Map. All wetlands on the site are protected through the incorporation of 50 foot setbacks, as shown on the Tentative Map.

Access/Circulation: The project ~~would have~~ gain future access via an additional two encroachment onto Malcolm Dixon Road through the adjacent Diamante Estates Subdivision that with one eventually being connected to Green Valley Road to the south and one to Salmon Falls Road through an adjacent subdivision to the northwest (La Canada).

Other Issues:

EID Annexation: The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) reviewed the proposed subdivision and identified the need for the subject site to annex into the EID service area to receive public water and the El Dorado Hills County Water District to receive fire protection services. LAFCO requests that annexation into EID be added to the Conditions of Approval for the Tentative Map. LAFCO recommended the applicant contact LAFCO "near the end of the Tentative Subdivision Map process to inquire about annexation into" EID. LAFCO also identified potential issues to be addressed within the Initial Study. Most of the requested changes were made to the Initial Study, however a requested change to Section XVI. Utilities and Service Systems (d) which deals with the availability of sufficient water supply from

existing entitlements and resources and whether or not new or expanded entitlements would be needed were not made. The proposed language reads as follows:

“The subject parcel is within EID’s El Dorado Hills Supply Area, which primarily pumps water from Folsom Reservoir. The available supply in the El Dorado Hills area is restricted by infrastructure and currently, the water meter availability based on the infrastructure-based yield is less than the contractual commitments. According to EID’s 2009 Water Resources and Service Reliability Report, water meter availability in the EDH supply region is 3,597 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs), while contractual commitments total 4,192 EDUs. Even with the recent expansions to the El Dorado Hills Water Treatment Plant, the water meter availability based on the infrastructure-based yield is not currently sufficient to serve the existing contractual commitments or additional annexations. Thus, at this time, water meter availability in this region is currently limited to those parties with contractual commitments only.”

The change was not incorporated into the Initial Study because it implies that no water service would be available to the proposed project in the future. However, staff has been ensured by El Dorado Irrigation District. As stated in an e-mail correspondence dated 3/04/2010 that (Attached) “the District has adequate water supply (contingent on Warren Act contracts) to serve the El Dorado Hills service area that is restricted by existing infrastructure.”

In comity with requests from LAFCO, staff has added additional discussion to the Surrounding Land Uses and Setting Section and Mandatory Findings of Significance Section of the Environmental Checklist to adequately address potential cumulative impacts.

Planning Services Staff request changes to the project environmental checklist to the following Sections:

- APN-Updated Correction
- Surrounding Land Uses and Setting-Updated Correction and Clarification
- Other public Agencies- Minor Clarification of Agencies
- Project Description-Minor Clarification of Agencies
- I. Aesthetics (c)-Minor Clarification
- VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (h)-Minor Clarification of Agencies
- VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality (a,b)-Minor Clarification
- XII. Population and Housing (a,b,c)-Minor Correction
- XV. Transportation and Traffic (e)-Minor Clarification
- XVI. Utilities and Service Systems (b,d)-Minor Clarification
- XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance-Additional Clarification

The proposed changes do not require additional mitigation or create new potential environmental impacts and therefore are not considered substantial enough to require re-circulation of the document.

Attachments:

- E-mail from EID Staff clarifying water availability issue
- E-mail from Project Agent requesting staff report changes
- Revised Environmental Checklist with underline and strikeouts



"Mackay, Marc"
<mmackay@eid.org>
03/04/10 10:48 AM

To <mike.baron@edcgov.us>
cc "Mueller, Brian" <bmueller@eid.org>, "Wells, Elizabeth"
<ewells@eid.org>, "Megerdigian, Cindy"
<cmegerdigian@eid.org>

bcc

Subject RE: Malcolm Dixon Road T-map

History: This message has been forwarded.

Michael,

I would strongly recommend reviewing EID's 2009 Water Resources Report, it can be found on our website and I have included a link to the document as well. Section 5 of the report specifically addresses our water supply situation in El Dorado Hills and describes in detail what I tried to explain yesterday in our phone conversation. To state it simply the District has adequate water supply (contingent on Warren Act contracts) to serve the El Dorado Hills service area that is restricted by existing infrastructure. My understanding is that the Malcolm Dixon Road project is facing a number of challenges and it is likely to be a few years before they would be ready to purchase service. The District is confident at this time that the current "infrastructure restriction" in EDH will not be detrimental to this project and it is anticipated that general pool EDUs will be available to purchase eventually. Please send me the language you come up with, I would be happy to review it. If you have any more questions please feel free to contact me.
<http://www.eid.org/doc lib/02 dist info/2009WaterResourcesReport.pdf>

Marc Mackay

ASSISTANT ENGINEER

(530)642-4135-OFFICE

(530)919-5752-CELL

mmackay@eid.org



El Dorado Irrigation District
2890 Mosquito Road
Placerville, CA 95667

From: mike.baron@edcgov.us [mailto:mike.baron@edcgov.us]

Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2010 3:51 PM

To: Mackay, Marc

Subject: RE: Malcolm Dixon Road T-map

Mark,

Thankyou for clarifying this issue. I reported what we had talked about to my supervisor and he wanted me to ask if you (EID) could pass on some additional facts related to supply availability I can add to my document because improvements aside, availability of water is our only concern. Our Counsel feels that the way it is written sounds like there would never be any availability of water and we cannot bring it forward as written.



North Coast Resource Management

To: Mike Baron
 From: Kaycie Edwards
 CC: Martin Boone, Andrea Mayer, Casey Feickert
 Date: 2/10/2010
 Re: Malcolm Dixon Road Estates

Mike,

Based on our initial review of the staff reports, we would like to provide the following written comments:

Page	Item	Comment
2	Project Description	Currently the text reads: "Three access points to the proposed subdivision would eventually come from two proposed roadway connection to the south at the existing Malcolm Dixon Road and another to the west at existing Salmon Falls Road." Please revise to accurately reflect the access points for the site. There is one access point from the south, and a possible future connection to the north.
2	Site Description	Currently the text reads: "Two abandoned buildings are situated on the property to the southwest and the residence is located adjacent to Malcolm Dixon Road in the southeast corner of the project site." The existing residence is not located adjacent to Malcolm Dixon Road, and is located in the southwest corner of the property. Access to the existing residence is gained through the private road. Also, there are no abandoned buildings located on site. All existing structures are on the future lot 8. Possibly, clarify that the abandoned structures are located on the adjacent property.
3	Adjacent Land Uses	Land use to the south is not AE, it has been rezoned to RE-5
6	Item 15-Existing Land Us Patterns	All surrounding properties have been rezoned to RE-5



6	Proximity to perennial water course	The acreage from the wetland delineation is remaining from the Diamante Estates project. According to the wetland delineation for this project, there is a total of 0.45 acres. Please revise to accurately reflect the wetlands located onsite.
8	Other Issues: Access/Circulation	It is our belief that this is not an accurate description of the proposed access to the site. The project is only required to have one point of access based on Section 2.5.3.1 .B.10 of the Land Design Manual. The project does not have more than 12 lots and has a dead end road no longer than 2640 feet.
8	Condition 47	Please clarify, if the through access is not constructed, a temporary turn around will be constructed. A secondary access is not required.

Thank you for providing the staff report and conditions of approval to us for review. Please provide us with an anticipated timing and County's approach for correcting the above items. We look forward to hearing from you.