

PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH apartment project in Town Center

Ashley Blinn <ashleyblinn@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: Ashley Blinn <ashleyblinn@yahoo.com>
To: "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Mon, Sep 8, 2014 at 5:20 PM

I am opposed to the EDH apartment project in Town Center for the following reasons:

Unwise for our county to change major guidelines including the General Plan and Zoning Ordinances to meet the goals of the outside interests of developers.

Why offer to increase County population when those of us already here and other approved developments have water restrictions due to the severe drought?

The report by the Sheriff's Department indicates the need for 2 full time deputies, and vehicles that require maintenance. They suggest that this cost could be passed along to the residents of the new complex in the form of Mello-Roos fees.

Rents have been estimated to between \$1600 and \$2200 per month. Jobs in the Town Center area do not pay well enough to support that cost.

The occupants of these apartments will likely spend most of their money in Folsom or Sacramento which would not be of help to El Dorado County merchants.

I believe that if our Planning Commission, and eventually, the County BOS agree to waive the current 24 unit density per parcel to allow for the requested 55 occupants, we will open the flood gates for the same high density in other developments in the County. This could change the whole nature of our County.

Sincerely,

Sandi Blinn
Cameron Park, CA

PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Dave Hammond <davemh@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 11:06 AM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heffin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us,
brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.usI oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

This proposed project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the EDH community.

It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F).

It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed **water supply**, as current drought rationing makes clear.

It is incompatible with the zoning for this area.

The EDC Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project.

For all these reasons, the proposed project violates our General Plan.

Please reject this proposed urban-encroachment project, El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments

Dave Hammond
Shingle Springs, CA
916 801 9465

PC 9/11/14
#4

El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments

Mickey Sizemore <sizemore@hughes.net>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 11:29 AM

Reply-To: sizemore@hughes.net

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heffin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

Dear Commissioners,

We have some serious concerns about the El Dorado Hills town Center East Apartments. First of all, the roads in the area are already at capacity (Load Level F) and it would increase traffic burdens. It is in violation of county design standards, and the high rise would not fit in visually. In this time of serious drought conditions, these high density apartments would put an increased demand on our area water supply. The apartments are incompatible with the zoning for the area. Our county's sheriffs will need additional officers and staff because of this project. Because of all these reasons, the project violates our General Plan. We are asking you to please reject this proposed El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments project.

Thank You,

Michael Ann Sizemore

Jerry Melvin Sizemore

(35 year residents of El Dorado County)

1700 St. Garth Way

Shingle Springs, CA 95682



PC 9/11/14
#4
4 pages

PC Agenda 9/11/14, file no. 14-0769 (EDH Apts)

Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 11:30 AM

To: Brian Shinault <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, Dave Pratt <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, Tom Heflin <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, Walter Mathews <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>, Rich Stewart <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>
Cc: Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Please review the attached comments for Thursday's Planning Commission hearing of item 4 and submit into the public record.

Thank you – Ellen Van Dyke

 **PC comments VanDyke 9.11.14_TC Apts.pdf**
187K

Public Comment - Planning Commission 9/11/14, Item 14-0769 (EDH Apartments)

Dear Commissioners:

On June 26th the Planning Commission agreed that this project needed an EIR. The additional information provided for this meeting has not changed the project description or circumstances.

Please do NOT recommend this project for approval.

We strongly disagree with the response memo (agenda attachment 3B) and County staffs' continued advocacy for this project:

- 1) **Contrary to staff's assertion, this project most definitely sets a precedent for increased density elsewhere in the county.** Staff reasoning is that "the proposed General Plan amendment is limited to this specific site". A definition for 'precedent' is needed:

pre·c·e·dent / noun: an earlier event or action that is regarded as an example or guide to be considered in subsequent similar circumstances.

Note that the EDH executive golf course parcel is *also* part of the EDH Specific Plan, could *also* be considered infill, and is *also* currently being proposed for high density residential zoning. The significant potential for this density increase to set a precedence has been disregarded, and impact analysis must be provided via an EIR.

- 2) **The response memo includes a totally insufficient attempt to justify the project density, by stating:**

- a. This location would be convenient for the residents who would live there
- b. This location would minimize construction costs for the developer
- c. This density is needed to cover the cost of the parking structure
- d. The apartment residents would boost sales in the center (see 'e' below)

These are not benefits to either the county or existing residents. Additionally:

- e. according to the economic report, the potential resident boost in sales would *not* outweigh the revenue potential of the currently allowed hotel/commercial use.
- f. Page 8 of the June 26 staff report acknowledges the project would cause displacement of job opportunities and retail.
- g. there is no explanation as to how this project would improve the county jobs-to-housing balance, as is claimed on p32/61 of the MND (contrary to 'f' above).
- h. the applicant specializes in luxury apartments, and has made clear there will be no compromise reducing density in order to include lower floor retail.
- i. the number of locals who would be displaced as shoppers and discouraged by the additional 1600+ daily car trips on Town Center Blvd, has been dismissed.

- 3) **Current sewer capacity is adequate for existing conditions but will not accommodate this project. A pre-existing condition has NOT been shown to exist, as stated in the response memo.** From page 44 of the MND: "EID indicates that the sewer line has adequate capacity as of April 2014."

Concern was expressed in June, that existing residents would end up paying the cost of a sewer line upgrade that would not otherwise be required. Nothing in the response memo allays that concern, and GP policy 5.1.2.1 regarding capacity has not been adequately

addressed. Under an EIR, capacity questions must be answered and full environmental analysis provided PRIOR to approval. Timing and mitigation cannot be ignored.

4) Water supply concerns are *confirmed* and not eliminated in the response memo.

- a. The memo states: "*EID is currently at a Stage 2 Water Supply Warning and is seeking to reduce water demands by 30 percent in order to maintain supply if the drought continues into 2015. ... EID is not prohibiting water connections for new development in Stage 2*". This validates the frustration of existing residents who have let their lawns die, only to see new development proceed using *their* water.
- b. Per General Plan policy 5.2.1.7, "*In times of declared water shortages, the Board of Supervisors shall give priority within the affected water district to approving affordable housing and non-residential*" development. This project is NEITHER, and is thus inconsistent with General Plan policy 5.2.1.7. Note: watering restrictions have yet to be lifted in EDH.

5) Noise has still not been adequately addressed. The noise data does not confirm this location to be appropriate for a noise sensitive receptor such as a residential use.

- a. The project has not been shown to be consistent with GP Policy 6.5.1.8 regarding exterior noise.
 - i. measurements were not taken at locations of highest impact
 - ii. balconies were not considered (ie: 'stay indoors with windows closed' is NOT a mitigation for residential use)
 - iii. inconsistencies in the noise analysis are poorly explainedWith an EIR, answers and their corresponding analysis would be required.
- b. Existing community activities within Town Center such as concerts with amplified sound, would likely need to cease due to the impact of noise levels on apartment residents. This has not been addressed, nor has the likely changing of Town Center from a 'community' gathering place into a service center for on-site residents.
- c. The sheriff's report in attachment 4A confirms the noise related problems with this proposed change of use.

6) Aesthetics

The photo simulations provided in attachment 3E were exactly what was needed for visualization - thank you. Additionally:

- a. If the simulations are accurate, the height exception (60'/75') requested is excessive, and raises concerns about future intentions. Note that reducing the project density would reduce the needed height of the parking structure.
- b. To state that the building design is in accordance with the development standards is misleading when standards have been modified specifically to accommodate this project. Note that these revised standards do not even meet the standards of the newly proposed countywide Mixed Use Design guidelines:
 - i. Max height for mixed use buildings should be 50', exclusive of spires/chimneys.
 - ii. The maximum density for the residential use component shall be 20 dwelling units/acre in the Community Region.
 - iii. Stair housings, etc, may not exceed the maximum allowable height by more than 20%.
 - iv. New infill buildings shall reflect traditional design patterns of adjacent buildings.

- c. What is the difference between "no impact" and "no significant impact", in the context of 'public concerns that are not going to be addressed'?
- 7) **Staff memo (Attachment 3D) dismisses the concern for an increased need of police services.** The applicant repeatedly claims this was covered in the MND, but the extent of analysis in the MND is to say 'no analysis is needed' (MND page 35, item b). The Sheriff's department disagrees, saying (in attachment 4A, page 15/33) that more staff is needed, or this project will be in conflict with General Plan policy 5.7.3.1. (Sheriff's report starts on page 7 of 33). An EIR would not allow this to go unanswered.
- 8) **Traffic issues**
 Responses to the numerous concerns regarding the accuracy and completeness of the traffic impact analysis are wholly inadequate and unsatisfactory.
- The EDC Travel Demand Model used extensively in this analysis has not yet been adopted and cannot be utilized as a basis for the traffic impact analysis in this MND. The TDM is full of flaws and erroneous data, and has received substantial correction comments from Caltrans through the draft EIR.
 - Impact mitigation MM-TR3 includes payment into 20-year CIP project no. 66116 [the widening of Latrobe to 6-lanes]. While this may be consistent with policy TC-Xf, it amounts to you, Commissioners, approving an immediate impact on residents with the mitigation relief being decades away. (this was not the intention of TC-Xa(3))
 - Mitigations that may be acceptable to Caltrans are NOT necessarily consistent with EDC policy. Future improvements for Hwy 50 include auxiliary lanes, HOV lanes and mainline improvements, which Caltrans has already said will not relieve the LOS F on Hwy 50.
- 9) **Economic analysis shows the planned hotel to be of greater economic benefit to EDC.**
 Per staff's summary, the currently planned non-residential land uses for this site would generate more revenue at build out than the proposed residential project. While this is irrelevant in an EIR, it should NOT be irrelevant to an approval decision.
- An 'approval' only benefits the applicant and immediately adjacent businesses.
 - It is NOT beneficial to nearby impacted residents or the remainder of the county.
- 10) **EIR vs. MND**
 The staff memo concludes that there are no significant impacts, and that no commenters have provided technical analysis to counter the MND conclusions. Not only is this is blatantly false, but it is the responsibility of the applicant to prove the benefit of this project to the community and to show there will be no significant impact on the environment and the existing residents.
- 'Approval' will disregard, or actively conflict with, General Plan policies on noise, water, sewer, and public services, as well as allow the use of a not-yet-adopted traffic modeling program. Without an EIR, questions from the public, technical and otherwise, will have been ignored.
- Hold this project to General Plan requirements. There are many appropriate options for Town Center, but this project is not one of them. ***The project as presented needs an EIR - please vote to DENY.***

Ellen & Don Van Dyke



PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Jeannette Maynard <jeannettemaynard7@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 11:50 AM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us,
brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

Dear Commissioners:

I strongly oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

**Respectfully,
Jeannette Elaine Maynard
Shingle Springs**

PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Ellen Obradovic <ellenobradovic@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 12:13 PM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

Dear Commissioners:

Our area does not have the water resources to support high density housing such as the Town Center Apartments. If for no other reason, and there are many, the project must be rejected due to our limited and dwindling water supply. It is shortsighted to build something like this in light of the problems we already have with water resources, and these problems will not go away; in fact they are projected to get worse. Please accept only projects that conform to current zoning and the current General Plan.

Thank you for your time and your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Ellen Obradovic

Placerville



PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

David Pava <david@pava.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 12:17 PM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

Commissioners,

I oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

This proposed project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the EDH community.

It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F).

It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed water supply.

It is incompatible with the zoning for this area.

The EDC Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project.

For all these reasons, the proposed project violates our General Plan.

Please reject this proposed urban-encroachment project,

David Pava
Shingle Springs, CA

PC 9/11/14
#4

El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments

Leslie Freeman <ednles@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 12:24 PM

Reply-To: Leslie Freeman <ednles@sbcglobal.net>

To: "rich.stewart@edcgov.us" <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, "dave.pratt@edcgov.us" <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, "tom.heflin@edcgov.us" <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, "walter.mathews@edcgov.us" <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Dear Board,

This project would only benefit out of area developers in achieving their goal of highest and best use of the property while very negatively impacting OUR County services and infrastructure. At a minimum, this project violates the Specific Plan for Town Center, it violates the county design standards, it violates the traffic standards, it violates the zoning (24 units per acre), and it violates our General Plan.

Can't say it better than the following public comment so I straight on copied and agree 100%!

This proposed project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the EDH community.

It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F). It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed **water supply**, as current drought rationing makes clear. It is incompatible with the current zoning for this area. The EDC Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project. For all these reasons, the proposed project violates our General Plan. Please REJECT this proposed urban-encroachment project, El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments.

Thanks for your consideration,
Leslie Freeman
resident of Shingle Springs

PC 9/11/14
#4



EDH Town Center Apartment Complex

Marc Chaisson <mchais@comcast.net>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 12:50 PM

To: "rich.stewart@edcgov.us" <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, "dave.pratt@edcgov.us" <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, "tom.heflin@edcgov.us" <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, "walter.mathews@edcgov.us" <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Dear Commissioners:

I oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form for the following reasons:

1. This proposed project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the EDH community.
2. It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F).
3. It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed water supply, as current drought rationing makes clear.
4. It is incompatible with the zoning for this area.
5. The EDC Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project.

For all these reasons, the proposed project violates our General Plan.

Please reject this proposed urban-encroachment project, El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments

Marc Chaisson

Shingle Springs



PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Trish Gansberg <tgansberg@yahoo.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 1:12 PM

Reply-To: Trish Gansberg <tgansberg@yahoo.com>

To: "rich.stewart@edcgov.us" <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, "dave.pratt@edcgov.us" <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, "tom.heflin@edcgov.us" <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, "walter.mathews@edcgov.us" <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Dear Commissioners:

I oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

This proposed project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the EDH community.

It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F).

It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed **water supply**, as current drought rationing makes clear.

It is incompatible with the zoning for this area.

The EDC Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project.

For all these reasons, the proposed project violates our General Plan.

Please reject this proposed urban-encroachment project, El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments

Signed,
Trish Gansberg
Shingle Springs



PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Kevin Harrington <kevin.b.harrington@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 1:17 PM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us,
brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

Dear Commissioners:

I oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

Wells in our area are going dry as is.

Signed,
Kevin & Carol Harrington
Shingle Springs

PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Ellen Katz <ek4575@att.net>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 2:46 PM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

To El Dorado County Planning Commissioners

The above-referenced project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the El Dorado Hills community. I am writing to object to this proposal for the following reasons:

- It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F) especially at the EDH ramps.
- It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed **water supply**, as current drought rationing makes clear.
- It is incompatible with the zoning for this area.
- The El Dorado County Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project.
- The proposed project **violates our General Plan**

Please reject this proposed urban-encroachment project, El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments.

Ellen Katz
Shingle Springs, CA

PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments ib Town Center, Agenda 9/11914, item 4 file no. 14-0769

Sherry Duncan <crazy3horselady@live.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 3:34 PM

To: "rich.stewart@edcgov.us" <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>, "dave.pratt@edcgov.us" <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, "tom.heklin@edcgov.us" <tom.heklin@edcgov.us>, "walter.mathews@edcgov.us" <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>, "brian.shinault@edcgov.us" <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, "charlene.tim@edcgov.us" <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Dear Commissioners:

I oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

This proposed project violates county design standards, and would induce high-rise visual blight in the EDH community. It would induce increased traffic burdens on already at-capacity roads (Load Level F). It would put a major increase in demand on our already-fully-committed **water supply**, as current drought rationing makes clear. It is incompatible with the zoning for this area. The EDC Sheriff's Office submitted a report concluding that they will need additional officers and staff due to this project. For all these reasons, the proposed project violates our General Plan. Please reject this proposed urban-encroachment project, El Dorado Hills Town Center East Apartments.

Thank you,
Sherry Duncan
Shingle Springs



PC 9/11/14
#4

EDH Apartments in Town Center, Agenda 9/11/14, item 4 file no. 14-0769

steve clark <jsclark58@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 9, 2014 at 4:15 PM

To: rich.stewart@edcgov.us, dave.pratt@edcgov.us, tom.heflin@edcgov.us, walter.mathews@edcgov.us,
brian.shinault@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us

Dear Commissioners:

I oppose the Town Center Apartments project in its current form.

I Would like to hear your reasons for wanting to go through with it, when we have no extra water ,traffic at a standstill and Zoning that does not allow for this size project

Signed,

Steve Clark

Shingle Springs