



---

## Public Forum/Public Comment: Planning Commission Meeting April 24, 2025 Agenda Item 25-0691

---

**From** George Steed <George.Steed@heritageEDH.com>

**Date** Tue 4/22/2025 10:13 PM

**To** Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

---

### This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Please include this forwarded email as a Public Comment for the April 24, 2025, Planning Commission meeting for Agenda item 25-0691 Public Forum/Public Comment

George Steed  
Vice President

---

**From:** George Steed <George.Steed@heritageEDH.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 22, 2025 17:19

**To:** bob.williams@edcgov.us <bob.williams@edcgov.us>; david.spaur@edcgov.us <david.spaur@edcgov.us>; jeff.hanson@edcgov.us <jeff.hanson@edcgov.us>; tim.costello@edcgov.us <tim.costello@edcgov.us>; patrick.frega@edcgove.us <patrick.frega@edcgove.us>

**Cc:** George Turnboo <George.Turnboo@edcgov.us>; Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>

**Subject:** Re: UPDATE: Verizon/Epic Wireless Cellular Mono-Pine Tower CUP23-0010 CLOSED 6/21/2024 | Building Permit 0378185 APPROVED 4/7/2025

Planning Commision Chair Bob Williams and Commissioners,

I am dismayed and frustrated by the lack of response from the Director of Planning and Building regarding this Conditional Use Permit and the related Condition of Approval required by this Commission. I had intended to be present and make comments regarding this subject at your scheduled April 10 meeting, but that meeting was abruptly cancelled a few hours prior to the scheduled time. Unfortunately, I have a conflict and cannot be present at the April 24 meeting so I am asking that the Commission consider my comments regarding this Conditional Use Permit and the Condition of Approval # 48.

The October 31, 2024 letter from Evan Mattes, EDC Planner, to the applicant states: "COA 48 requires that the applicant will use best efforts to consult with the property owner and property to the west about additional plantings to aid in masking the project. These efforts shall be supported by written documentation for staff to review which shall address feasibility of additional plantings and the consultation process. Please provide written documentation of compliance with this condition." I can find no documentation available to the public regarding compliance or status of this condition.

My concerns and issues:

1. The lack of response from Planning to inquires I have made regarding this matter is unacceptable as they directly relate to the applicant's compliance to the condition set by this Commission. These inquires were made via emails to the Planner, to the Supervising Manager, and both via the email sent by the Commission's Chair on April 7, 2025 to the Planning Director, and made in person outside the Board of Supervisor's meeting on March 4, 2025.
2. The applicant has not responded to me since January 13 when I stated in an email that our association would not accept responsibility for obtaining any reviews or approvals required for compliance with any ordinances or codes, nor any additional related expenses.
3. What are the full responsibilities of the applicant related to this condition? Since the property and proposed plantings are located with 100 feet of the cell tower, does the applicant have the responsibility for the landscape design including assessing or considering compliance with the EDC Defensible Space Ordinance and obtaining any necessary reviews or approvals from authorities?
4. What financial obligations are conferred by permit conditions to a third-party? Our association is related only by the location of the cell tower to our neighboring properties. We were willing assist the applicant with mitigating the negative impact of the project, however, we objected when the applicant expected our association to assume the expense and effort associated with assessing impacts of the EDC Defensible Space Ordinance.
5. When questions, issues, concerns, or conflicts arise with a Planning Commission's Condition of Approval, what is the responsibility of the Planning Director resolve the issues, or to report to the Commission for direction?
6. At what point in the permitting process must a Condition of Approval be satisfied? Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit? Prior to final approval of the Building Permit?
7. What constitutes "verification" that a Condition has been satisfied and how is that recorded? The October letter to the applicant from the planner clearly states the requirement for written documentation. This concern is not just unique to this project but extends to other types of projects in which a condition has been stated but not satisfied. In some instances, no documented verification exists other than a notation by County staff (several final maps associated with the Carson Creek Project have been approved with notes indicating verification, but a site inspection would reveal otherwise).

It would appear that the lack of detail related to oversight and verification of conditions established by a review authority requires definition. May I suggest the Commissioners include a discussion in a future meeting agenda to review these issues and concerns and determine whether that section of the Permit Planning Process pertaining to Conditions of Approval identified in Title 130 - Article 5 (130.51.060) requires amending, or if other documented instructions should be provided to the Planning staff to clarify responsibilities.

I appreciate the Commissioners' attention and look forward to further comments or discussions the Commissioners may have on this subject.

George Steed

---

**From:** Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>

**Sent:** Monday, April 7, 2025 7:21 PM

**To:** Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>

**Cc:** George Turnboo <George.Turnboo@edcgov.us>; George Steed <George.Steed@heritageEDH.com>

**Subject:** Fw: UPDATE: Verizon/Epic Wireless Cellular Mono-Pine Tower CUP23-0010 CLOSED 6/21/2024 | Building Permit 0378185 APPROVED 4/7/2025

Karen,

Please confirm the status of the fulfillment of the conditions of approval on this project to Mr. Steed and me.

I have asked that Mr. Steed temporarily refrain from taking further action pending your expeditious administrative review and response.

Thank you.

Regards,

Bob Williams  
Planning Commission Chair and District 2 Commissioner

---

**From:** George Steed  
**Sent:** Monday, April 7, 2025 5:43 PM  
**To:** Bob Williams  
**Subject:** UPDATE: Verizon/Epic Wireless Cellular Mono-Pine Tower CUP23-0010 CLOSED 6/21/2024 | Building Permit 0378185 APPROVED 4/7/2025

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization. Commissioner Williams,  
Planning Commission Chair;

[Report Suspicious](#)

Today, I found that the building permit for construction of the Verizon Cell Tower has been approved. Presumably, the EDC Planning Department has made the determination that "*best efforts*" were made by the applicant. I say presumably, because I have received no response from either the Planning Department or the applicant regarding the matter.

I have been in contact with Jasmine Leary from Epic Wireless since August of last when I was contacted by in accordance with the Condition of Approval by the Planning Commission identified in the Conditional Use Permit stating:

*48. Applicant will use best efforts to consult with the property owner and property to the west about additional plantings to aid in masking the project. These efforts shall be supported by written documentation for staff to review which shall address feasibility of additional plantings and the consultation process.*

Through a series of emails and telephone calls over a six-month period, our Association provided a quotation (attached) for plantings on our neighboring property. In response to quotation, we received questions from the applicant regarding the size, cost and location of the plantings. We offered to make adjustments and to work with a landscape designed or architect to execute a design, but were told that would not be necessary.

While this project was proceeding, our Association was learning of and responding to the Defensible Space Ordinance enacted in July of last year. In response to concerns we have regarding the requirement to address vegetation within 100' of neighboring structures as well as questions regarding the quotation,

I emailed to Ms. Leary in early January (including both Evan Mattes and Arron Mount). In this email, we and our contracted landscape firm agreed to extend the work quote through March 2025. We also explained the difference between 24" tall trees and 24' boxed tress and the relative pricing and explained the costs of planting, irrigation, and nurturing the trees, all subjects that a landscape designer or architect would know. I also re-emphasized that our Association would not assume any costs of this request, and that the Applicant would be responsible for addressing Defensible Space requirements including any reviews and approvals required from County or local agencies.

From the beginning of January to the middle of February, I was out of the country on an extended trip. On my return, having received no communication from Ms. Leary, Mr. Mattes, or Mr. Mount, I emailed Ms. Leary and Mr. Mattes on February 24, requesting a status for the project and received no response. On March 4, after attending a Board of Supervisors meeting at which Mr. Mattes was present, I approached him with my business card stating I needed to discuss the Verizon application. He responded that "the issue has been escalated above my head." As Karen Gardner was also present at the meeting, I approached her with the same request. She responded she would be in touch with me, and on March 6, I forwarded to her my last email to Ms. Leary and Mr. Mattes. She responded twice via email, the last on March 10, saying she had been busy, but would be in touch. That is the last communication I have received.

Now as I came to understand the requirements of the EDC Defensible Space Ordinance, (I am now also the Vice President of our El Dorado Hills South Fire Safe Council), I certainly understand that the EDC Office of Wildfire Protection and Resilience may well have determined the additional plantings would not be appropriate for the site. However, I do not understand, nor can I excuse, the lack of response from the EDC Planning Department to ANY emails, including informing the involved parties of the resolution. This goes well beyond impolite or rude behavior; it is a clear demonstration of the contempt this department has for the tax-paying constituents of El Dorado County. I and my Association spent time and effort on this project. We deserved better response and respect from our County employees.

Further, the failure to inform and include the Planning Commission, who added the Condition of Approval, in this resolution, demonstrates a lack of respect for the authority of the Commission and an affront to the Commissioners themselves who conscientiously tried to respond public objections and mitigate concerns with a reasonable response. I urge the Commission of review this project with the Planning Staff to identify corrective measures in their processes.

Sincerely,

George Steed

George Steed  
Vice President  
Heritage El Dorado Hills  
7000 Pismo Dr  
El Dorado Hills CA 95762

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.




---

## Fw: TIF Discrepancy-Alleged KHA Error-KHA make us whole?

---

**From** Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>  
**Date** Tue 4/22/2025 9:36 PM  
**To** Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>  
**Cc** Joe H. Harn <joe.harn@edcgov.us>

 1 attachment (105 KB)  
TIF Major Update\_March2025.pdf;

Please post this email as an April 24, 2025 public comment  
Bob Williams  
Chair Planning Commission/District 2 Commissioner

---

**From:** Joe H. Harn <joe.harn@edcgov.us>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 22, 2025 10:08 AM  
**To:** Rafael Martinez <Rafael.Martinez@edcgov.us>  
**Cc:** Greg P. Ferrero <Greg.Ferrero@edcgov.us>; George Turnboo <George.Turnboo@edcgov.us>; Brian K. Veerkamp <Brian.Veerkamp@edcgov.us>; Lori Parlin <lori.parlin@edcgov.us>; Brooke Laine <Brooke.Laine@edcgov.us>; Tiffany Schmid <Tiffany.Schmid@edcgov.us>; David A Livingston <david.livingston@edcgov.us>; Daniel Vandekoolwyk <Daniel.Vandekoolwyk@edcgov.us>; Kyle B. Zimbelman <Kyle.Zimbelman@edcgov.us>; Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>  
**Subject:** TIF Discrepancy-Alleged KHA Error-KHA make us whole?

Rafael,

We pay KHA out of the TIF program. When we pay KHA, we have less money available for road capacity enhancements.

The 2024 Major Update to the TIF program has been a bureaucratic and public relation disaster for the County. It may have been a financial disaster for a few landowners. It has certainly delayed economic activity. On December 3, 2024, the BOS approved the Major Update (large west end fee increase).

I made 2 reasonable requests on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. I asked that the large west end fee increase be delayed for 4 weeks so the computation could be reviewed. Further, I asked that Economic Development to opine on the effect of the large west end fee increase.  
Rafael, you didn't support my reasonable requests.

Since December 3<sup>rd</sup> we have wasted so much staff time (money) on the 2004 Major Update. This staff time will be charged to the TIF and we have less money available for road capacity enhancements. Various applicants have wasted their time. The Chamber of Commerce has wasted its time.

In your March 26, 2025, memo you state, "KHA confirmed the discrepancy in their analysis."

My questions, now are,

1. When will we publicly acknowledge this TIF discrepancy?

2. Has KHA offered to make us whole? If not, it appears that the BOS should direct the County Counsel to possibly seek civil remedies.

Joe Harn  
Auditor-Controller  
El Dorado County

---

**From:** Rafael Martinez

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 26, 2025 12:45 PM

**To:** Greg P. Ferrero <[Greg.Ferrero@edcgov.us](mailto:Greg.Ferrero@edcgov.us)>; George Turnboo <[George.Turnboo@edcgov.us](mailto:George.Turnboo@edcgov.us)>; Brian K. Veerkamp <[Brian.Veerkamp@edcgov.us](mailto:Brian.Veerkamp@edcgov.us)>; Lori Parlin <[lori.parlin@edcgov.us](mailto:lori.parlin@edcgov.us)>; Brooke Laine <[Brooke.Laine@edcgov.us](mailto:Brooke.Laine@edcgov.us)>; Tiffany Schmid <[Tiffany.Schmid@edcgov.us](mailto:Tiffany.Schmid@edcgov.us)>

**Cc:** Cindy Munt <[Cindy.Munt@edcgov.us](mailto:Cindy.Munt@edcgov.us)>; Mark Treat <[Mark.Treat@edcgov.us](mailto:Mark.Treat@edcgov.us)>; Kathy Witherow <[kathy.witherow@edcgov.us](mailto:kathy.witherow@edcgov.us)>; Shelley Wiley <[Shelley.Wiley@edcgov.us](mailto:Shelley.Wiley@edcgov.us)>; Lisa D. Watson <[Lisa.Watson@edcgov.us](mailto:Lisa.Watson@edcgov.us)>; Laura Schwartz <[laura.schwartz@edcgov.us](mailto:laura.schwartz@edcgov.us)>; Tara Stout <[Tara.Stout@edcgov.us](mailto:Tara.Stout@edcgov.us)>; David A Livingston <[david.livingston@edcgov.us](mailto:david.livingston@edcgov.us)>; Daniel Vandekoolwyk <[Daniel.Vandekoolwyk@edcgov.us](mailto:Daniel.Vandekoolwyk@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)>; John H. Kahling <[john.kahling@edcgov.us](mailto:john.kahling@edcgov.us)>

**Subject:** TIF Discrepancy

Honorable Board of Supervisors and CAO,

As a follow up to our in-person conversation about the major discrepancy found in the 2024 Traffic Impact Fee Program Major Update, attached is a memo with more details. Please contact me if you wish to discuss further. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
**Rafael Martinez**  
Director

**County of El Dorado**  
Department of Transportation  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-7533  
[rafael.martinez@edcgov.us](mailto:rafael.martinez@edcgov.us)



## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508

March 26, 2025

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Rafael Martinez, Director of Department of Transportation

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "RM", is written over the name "Rafael Martinez".

Subject: The 2024 Traffic Impact Fee Program Major Update

On December 3, 2024, the Board of Supervisors voted to approve the 2024 Major Update (Major Update) to the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program and, as a result, the new fee schedule went into effect on February 1, 2025.

Recently, while reviewing the latest building permit data and during preparation of the annual update to the TIF Program, DOT staff identified a discrepancy between the permit data and the baseline growth analysis prepared by the County's consultants for the Major Update. In short, the updated baseline for available housing units in the West Slope considers the number of units (building permits) constructed since the previous baseline analysis (2018 in this case) and the number of new/approved developable parcels and/or units created since the previous baseline analysis. While KHA did subtract out the number of units constructed between 2018 and 2023, it inadvertently further subtracted, instead of added, the number of new units. This resulted in the 2023 housing baseline being lower than it should have been. Upon discovery of this discrepancy, staff reached out to the consultant, Kimley-Horn and Associates (KHA), to confirm. Shortly thereafter, KHA confirmed the discrepancy in their analysis.

The lower housing baseline was used in the Nexus Study that accompanied our Major Update. This had an effect on the number of housing units available in the El Dorado Hills Community Region and resulted in the Nexus Study allocating a larger number of additional housing units to adjacent Community Regions further up the hill. Staff believes that, had this error not occurred, the Nexus Study would have likely concluded that more capacity exists in El Dorado Hills than what the Major Update considered in its subsequent analyses. The end result is that the total cost for the required improvement projects in the TIF Program was spread amongst fewer new housing units, which resulted in higher fees across all Zones.

To correct this situation, the County and its consultant team are in the process of re-analyzing the 2023 baseline numbers for residential and non-residential uses. This information will be used to re-allocate growth to the Community Regions, while maximizing the amount of growth in the El Dorado Hills Community Region given historical trends, before re-allocating remaining growth demand in adjacent Community



Regions to the east. This data will then be utilized to update and re-run the Travel Demand Model to prepare a revised Nexus Study and tables to produce an updated fee schedule. Staff anticipates that fees in Zone C will come down from their current levels and that fees in Zones A and B may see a slight adjustment.

Staff will bring a future item to the Board to present the results of these updated analyses and to seek direction on how to appropriately disperse fee offsets to the three TIF zones to account for these changes. Preliminary discussions with the consultant team indicate that we will be prepared for this discussion with the Board sometime around the end of June. Following this discussion, staff will incorporate Board input and return as quickly as possible thereafter for final adoption of a revised nexus study and fee schedule.

As your Board is aware, staff has been meeting with the BIA and other developers pursuant to the Tolling Agreement signed by your Board on January 28<sup>th</sup>. Staff will be next meeting with the BIA and other developers on Wednesday, April 2<sup>nd</sup>. We will be sharing this information with them in preparation for that meeting and will continue to collaboratively meet with them regularly throughout the next year to get their input and perspective on the TIF Program, including as we move through the steps outlined in this memorandum.

It is important to point out that steps are already being taken to prevent this situation from occurring again during subsequent updates. Specifically, going forward, consultant contracts and scopes of work will include language to allow for additional meetings with DOT staff to review these initial analyses upon which the remainder of the Major Update is predicated upon. Staff will include more information and detail related to updated baseline analysis in future public workshops to ensure the Board is able to make informed decisions.



**From:** [Sue Taylor](#)  
**To:** [Planning Department](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding Design Standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:15:18 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Please forward to the Planning Commissioners:  
To the Planning Commission:

The County Board of Supervisors just agreed to pay another \$400,000.00 for Design Standards and it was not made clear as to what the intent is for this action.

Historically the process of creating Design Standards was based on the General Plan to contribute to the communities quality of life:

GOAL 2.4: EXISTING COMMUNITY IDENTITY Maintain and enhance the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life, economic health, and community pride of County residents.

Policy 2.4.1.2 The County shall develop community design guidelines in concert with members of each community which will detail specific qualities and features unique to the community as Planning staff and funds are available. Each plan shall contain design guidelines to be used in project site review of all discretionary project permits. Such plans may be developed for Rural Centers to the extent possible. The guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, the following criteria:

- A. Historic preservation
- B. Streetscape elements and improvements
- C. Signage
- D. Maintenance of existing scenic road and riparian corridors
- E. Compatible architectural design
- F. Designs for landmark land uses
- G. Outdoor art

The effort to get these in place has been side-stepped by the County since 2006. In helping Shingle Springs to get this in place I assisted the community in getting the process started in 2013. The County decided to include it into future goals and set some funds aside. Then again it appeared to be put into a black hole until 2022. It has not been clear if this current action is to abide by the General Plan to create a better quality of life for communities within these districts, or according to the text in the agenda to streamline low income housing projects by right into these

communities. It's also not clear what properties will be allowed to build these low income high density projects after the design standards are in place.

Given this, I have a request I would like for the Commission to agendize at the next Commission meeting:

- 1). I would like to see an agenda item on the Planning Commission that can give the public a clear picture of the County's intent.
- 2). What is the baseline for a low income high density project by right on Residential, Multi-Family, Commercial or on a Commercial Corridor. Is there anything that would prevent such a project from being built on any parcel within the county once these design standards are adopted? Will lack of infrastructure, lack of space, lack of setbacks, etc. be a cause for denial?
- 3). If the public feels that the project does not qualify for any of the State Bills that allow such a low income high density project, what is the appeal process for that challenge?
- 4). How did the Mercy Housing Project on Pleasant Valley Road get approved without the required infrastructure in place?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sue Taylor  
530-391-2190