



35

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

New development

1 message

Mary Bohlman <mbohlman@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Oct 23, 2017 at 5:15 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

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

Dear members of the board of supervisors,

My husband and I are unable to attend the meeting tomorrow but feel very strongly about the new development. Increasing the density is a very bad idea and will negatively impact not only the existing roads and schools where there is not capacity, but also affect the environment in a very negative way.

I am not against development just against putting high or even medium density in an area where homes are one per five or 10 acres.

When I was at Sacramento airport recently, I saw several advertisements on the walls for Serrano showing wonderful acreage and beautiful natural scenes. That is what draws people to our area. Please only allow development that is consistent with existing tracts.

Traffic has become unbelievable on the major streets that would be used by the people living in the new development.

Thank you so much for your time and service.

Mary Bohlman

Sent from my iPhone



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Agenda Item 17-1023 Oct 24 2017

1 message

Susan McClurg <smcc6286@icloud.com>

Mon, Oct 23, 2017 at 8:19 PM

To: Edc Cob <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, The Bosone <bosone@edcgov.us>

Oct. 23, 2017

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors:

I am writing in opposition of the proposed rezone of the parcels 126-020-01, 126-020-02, 126-020-03, 126-020-04, and 126-150-23 collectively comprising property referred to as the proposed Generations at Green Valley submitted by True Life Companies (Pre-Application PA17-0002)

Although this proposal has fewer homes than under the previous Dixon Ranch high-density housing project proposed for this site, Generations at Green Valley is still not appropriate for this rural area. The proposal would bring too much traffic to the area, result in unsafe conditions along Green Valley Road and its adjoining roadways and private driveways, and would remove too much of the native oak habitat.

This site is not suitable for a high-density project such as this for which there is NO existing water, sewage or utility service capable of handling 400-plus homes. The developer has downsized it from the Dixon Ranch proposal but has not adequately provided buffer zones on ALL SIDES of this proposed development that abut the adjacent 5-acre and 10-acre RURAL parcels.

This area of the county should remain rural and any proposed development projects should meet the existing General Plan and zoning designations.

Sincerely,

Sue McClurg

1871 Carl Road

Rescue



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Destinations

1 message

dlg <dflsg@pacbell.net>
Reply-To: dlg <dflsg@pacbell.net>
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Tue, Oct 24, 2017 at 12:10 AM

Dear Clerk of Board,

Changing the name and reducing the development by a few dozen houses does not improve the many flaws of such project and its magnitude of impacts on many fronts that are detailed below. We have not seen any changes the would resolve what we have brought to the supervisors attention back when this project was called Dixon Ranch

The EIR has some serious flaws. I have been a resident of El Dorado Hills for >21 years. The rear of my property backs up against Green Valley Road. What was an intermittent roar of pickup truck or car noise back 10+ years ago has growing into a fairly steady higher tone roar from a larger number of pickup trucks, cars and now larger than car SUV's which did not exist back 15-20 years ago. My wife and I have a hard time holding a conversation in our back yard at 3ft without yelling to be heard and it was not that way before. Adding almost 4,931 additional trips per day from Destinations will make a conversation impossible because of a steady traffic roar from 6am - 8pm, and this is NOT INSIGNIFICANT even though the EIR states differently. We have gotten very adept to knowing when school is in session and the seasons of the year as noise levels are very distinct on these factors. Spring and summer bring increased foliage which helps absorb some of the increased noise. We have also come to not needing an alarm clock as we have identified unique vehicle noise occurring at the same time Monday – Friday that wakes us. The EIR noise modeling was completed on 4/28 which skews the data because of the increased spring foliage. Data should have been collected in Jan/Feb when there is no foliage to absorb noise. The modeling does not provide details of where the measuring device was placed in the various locations (none was done in my back yard). The most impacted stretch of road is between Silva Valley Pkwy and the Dixon Ranch entry both from sound and number of vehicles. The #03 noise model (Green Valley-Silva Valley-Loch Way) has existing noise of 60Lnd at 212.4 ft. with Dixon Ranch this goes to 262.0 ft and with "Dixon Ranch and Approved" it goes to 294.3 ft. At 50ft of road centerline existing noise level is 68.7, with Dixon Ranch 70.1 add in "Approved" it goes to 70.8db. Quiet Urban day and night levels are 50 and 40 db levels as indicated in the EIR. Even though county ordinance has a 1.5db increase limit for existing >65db levels it is interesting that the study just happens to come in at an 1.4db increase for Silva Valley to Loch Way, what a coincidence just 0.1 under, which is probably more than the modeling statistical error. What is 0.1 the sound of a feather dropping? This means I would have to live with a constant droning noise level of 70.1db from approximately 6 am to 8 pm with the added 4,931 new trips from Dixon Ranch. It is interesting in that for mitigation level #2 lots 2, 3, 4 of Dixon Ranch has to have structures > 294ft from Green Valley or some sound attenuation such as berm, wall etc. provided. What about those of us who have been here longer than 20 years and are located closer than 294ft? I guess we are SOL and have to live with > 70db because someone (who doesn't have to experience it 365 days, or live next to Green Valley) has decided it is a less than a significant impact.

Water – The EID water study was completed in 2013 before the severity of the 2014 and 2015 drought years. There is no work being done to see if there is reclaim water capacity available and the cost to get reclaim water to Destinations so it could become part of the recycled water service area.

Traffic – The intersection of Green Valley and Loch Way has the 3rd highest increased queue time behind Green Valley/EDH Blvd and EDH Blvd/Franciscan with Destinations. I have seen queuing at Loch Way go from being non-existent 20 years ago to now can be in the minutes, add 4,000+ more trips from Destinations and it will make entering Green Valley from Loch Way like a NASCAR driver entering pit row from his pit stall after a pit stop under yellow with 50 other drivers jockeying for position. The mitigating measure of

adding turn lanes onto Loch from both east and west directions while helpful in preventing the recent increase in rear end collisions will make this intersection more complex. Adding the turn lanes will replace rear end collision with an increase in t-bone collisions as people try to deal with the turning and non-turning cars and squeeze into even smaller traffic gaps while entering onto Green Valley because of the extra 4,000+ trips from Destinations. I bet statistics show t-bone collisions are of a far greater severity and fatality prone collision than rear end ones. The Loch Way intersection presently sees the largest amount of peak volume vehicles (greater than EDH Blvd and Franciscan), a.m. (560 west bound/357 east bound and will increase to 774/496 with Dixon Ranch) p.m. (286 west bound/641 east bound and will increase to 364/875 with Dixon Ranch). The Loch Way intersection will go from a LOS C to D for a.m. and C to E for p.m. peaks with Dixon Ranch. Add in the "Approved" and this intersection goes to an E and F. This is NOT less than significant! Mitigation measures (band aid measures!) like measure #1 for a.m. peak of Green Valley/EDH Blvd. of adding south bound turn lane, one already exists (south bound turns increases to 157 from 60, more than doubling which is based on what?) and right turn lane to Salmon Falls goes from 47 to 53, not much advantage or impact reduction of having a right turn lane. The balance of the 708 (existing) and 805 (with Dixon Ranch) continue west bound and that in there lies the problem as this mitigation measure does not reduce it to less than significant. On most mornings I see cars queuing back toward and sometime to and past Loch Way from the Silva Valley/Green Valley intersection but yet this intersection isn't even mentioned or has any mitigation measures and it will become the newest additional bottleneck with Destinations. There is a mitigation measure to add stop lights at Appian and Silva Valley, why? With Lima Rd. being an EVH designation no Destinations traffic will go through Highland View and Appian/Silva Valley.

Fire Safety – Hope all can out run a wildfire on foot as traffic gridlock will have one charred sitting in their cars along with the other 1200+ vehicles that travel past Green Valley and Loch at peak commute times each day. Need we say "SANTA ROSA"

4,000+ new trips from Destinations each day on an already over taxed Green Valley Rd. and marginal mitigation measures that will not address the significant noise and traffic impacts on Green Valley from Silva Valley to Loch Way. These are significant impacts that the developer needs to address other than a few road light timing mitigations and less than 0.2 miles of some additional traffic lanes. We need to comply with the voter approved General Plan and deny many of the county codes the developer is asking to be changed for this development.

It is a great play by the developer to insert a senior package to the project. How can one refuse the project now that it has a senior housing component, that would be very insensitive! What happens when the senior fill rate of the project doesn't meet the developer's financial goals because of the high price point? They convert to regular housing and the project is back to the developer's original desired plan, a no lose position for the developer by incorporating a senior component to get the project approved.

We ask you send Destinations Development back to the developer to adhere to present zoning requirements and implement the necessary refinements that actually makes a difference on reducing the many significant impacts from the Destinations Development.

Regards,

Dale and Linda Gretzinger



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Malcolm Dixon Project

1 message

ml MI <mlreise@hotmail.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Tue, Oct 24, 2017 at 7:31 AM

Good morning. I have lived on the small rural road of Malcolm Dixon for 30 years. I bought here because it was a small road with 2 lovely creeks in the area. Peaceful.

That peaceful feeling is changing.

We were just subjected to a project that added 20+ new houses up the road on less than 1 acre lots. A ridiculous-looking fence was erected on MD across from the old schoolhouse.

If all that isn't bad enough, the developers of the Vineyards project want to build 90 houses. Those lots will have access to Malcolm Dixon Rd. This is a rural road with 2 beautiful old bridges that are really one lane bridges. The traffic will increase with the addition of 180+ cars. Malcolm Dixon cannot handle this increase.

I would like to see this project rejected by the board. The 5 acre zoning that is in place right now should be left as is.

Another solution would be to install a gate at the area just above the cul-de-sac that would block usage of the lower part of Malcolm Dixon and the bridges. The access would be straight out to Green Valley for all the new projects.

Please consider this option at the next meeting.

Thank you,

MaryLynn Reise

1164 Malcolm Dixon Rd,

El Dorado Hills 95762

mlreise@hotmail.com

-



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Generations development

1 message

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

Tue, Oct 24, 2017 at 8:20 AM

Kind Regards,

Cindy Munt

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

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

From: **Oli** <oohlman@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Mon, Oct 23, 2017 at 7:13 PM

Subject: Generations development

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us

Dear members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please vote no regarding this proposed development. My wife and I live in Highland view and will be significantly impacted by this development. The proposed high density in this development is inconsistent with the surrounding communities. The traffic and the impact on our local schools Will negatively affect the lives of the local residents.

Yours truly,
Oliver Bohlman

Sent from my iPhone



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE OCT 24, 2017 #35

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Public Hearing

1 message

Clara Biegler <rcbieg@sbcglobal.net>
Reply-To: Clara Biegler <rcbieg@sbcglobal.net>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Tue, Oct 24, 2017 at 12:16 PM

Roger Trout. I am against the building Low-Density Residential to Medium and High Density residential housing. We have enough traffic here on Green Valley Road. I have a problem know making a left turn on Green Valley Road. Clara C Biegler