

# STAFF MEMO-ATTACHMENT 5

## COMMENT LETTER (CITIZENS FOR SENSIBLE DEVELOPMENT)

Citizens for Sensible Development in El Dorado Hills

January 11, 2018

Planning Commission  
County of El Dorado  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: A16-0001/Z16-0004/SP86-0002-R-3/PD94-0004-R-3/El Dorado Hills Apartments

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission deny this project as proposed.

We represent residents nearby and throughout the County who have concerns about the proposed El Dorado Hills Apartments project. We are also concerned regarding the precedent this would set if this project were to be approved.

A number of objections have arisen regarding the proposed El Dorado Hills Apartments, leading to recommendations for denial from the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC) and others. APAC gave the proposed project a great deal of focused evaluation and public review in concluding to deny the project.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) should serve as a tool for the deciding agency and impacted residents to determine impacts of a project and then decide if there are mitigation measures that will remove those impacts, or reduce them to be insignificant. If the impacts cannot be mitigated to such a level then the deciding agency should make the determination to deny the project. This is the legal CEQA process, but there should also be a moral component for the deciding agency to primarily serve the public and to honor agreements that were made when the original entitlements were given for this property within the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan.

The process for this apartment project has been flawed. That this project continues to move forward as it has, with County Planning's recommendation for support, shows a disconnect between County Planning and the residents that should be served by the County. If residents cannot rely on zoning, a General plan, specific plans, mandatory design standards within a specific plan, then what can a resident rely on in the way of certainty for protection of property and therefore their expected quality of life.

Of major concern is the blatant disregard of the public's input by El Dorado County. The CEQA process in this case has been used by the County as merely a back and forth "process" of the public's comments without any true regard of the public's input. Not only are the responses to the comments avoiding discussion and deflecting the

1

comments, many are misleading and assumptive, which will be addressed in our formal "CEQA" comments.

Many of the County's responses expect the public information to not be based on personal observations but instead paid consultant studies. The public that has historical knowledge should be considered even more so than the information from an outside consultant that is usually not connected to the community. I ask that the Planning Commission and other agencies that will be considering entitlements for this project put a lot of weigh on the public's information and impacts that the public experiences living in this area day to day.

1

**I. The following are reasons the Planning Commission should not to approve the El Dorado Hills Apartments project.**

**First**, the proposed plan is inconsistent with the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan and zoning that was agreed to and established by Ordinance #3849 on July 18, 1988. This alone should cause a denial of this project as proposed.

2

**Second**, if the County does moves forward, specifically for this developer, to violate this agreement and amend the General Plan and El Dorado Hills Specific Plan by changing the zoning to Multi-Unit Residential (RM) as is being proposed, the amendment is unlawful and causes the El Dorado County General Plan to be inconsistent.

Increasing the maximum density is inconsistent with the current General Plan. The current General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2 states:

"Policy 2.2.1.2:

To provide for an appropriate range of land use types and densities within the County, the following General Plan land use designations are established and defined.

Multifamily Residential (MFR): This land use designation identifies those areas suitable for high-density, single family and multifamily design concepts such as apartments, single-family attached dwelling units (i.e., air-space condominiums, townhouses and multiplexes), and small-lot single-family detached dwellings subject to the standards set for in the Zoning Ordinance and which meet the minimum allowable density. Mobile home parks, as well as existing and proposed manufactured home parks, shall also be permitted under this designation. Lands identified as MFR shall be in locations with the highest degree of access to transportation facilities, shopping and services, employment, recreation, and other public facilities. Mixed use development within Community Regions and Rural Centers which combine commercial and residential uses shall be permitted. The minimum allowable density is five dwelling units per acre, with a maximum density of 24 dwelling units per acre. Except as provided in Policy 2.2.2.3, this designation is considered appropriate only within Community Regions and Rural Centers."

3

The proposed amendment states:



**"Policy 2.2.6.6:**

Within Village T as shown in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, the development and implementation of extensive commercial, residential and office development provides a unique opportunity to serve the needs of residential uses sited within a short enough distance to allow biking, walking and other alternative modes of transportation to avail themselves of goods and services. This Specific Policy designates the approximately ±4.565 acre site comprised of Parcels 1, 2 and 3 as shown on parcel map for Town Center East, Parcel 3.4 filed September 29, 2008 in Book 50 of Parcel Maps at page 44, Official Records of El Dorado County, California (APN Nos. 121-290-60, 61 and 62) as 'Urban Infill Residential Area'. This area, because of its proximity to extensive commercial, retail, office and similar development in the balance of the El Dorado Hills Town Center, is deemed to be appropriate for dense infill development. The density of development allowed in this area may exceed the density of development set forth in other sections of this General Plan or zoning regulations up to a density of 47 units per acre upon the approval of a PD Development Plan approval and findings that the requested level of development is appropriate. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this General Plan or the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan or the zoning ordinance, the development restrictions and standards to apply in the Urban Infill Residential Area, including height limits, shall be those out in the approved PD Development Plan."

The proposed Policy 2.2.6.6 is inconsistent with the 2004 voter approved General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2, which clearly states that maximum density allowed for Multi-Family residential is 24. It should be also noted that the residential and urban infill language in new policy 2.2.6.6 is also being added to the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan in order to justify the changes, otherwise this project as designed would not be allowed.

Under rules of the General Plan "USING THE PLAN" states: "In implementing the General Plan, it must be applied comprehensively. No single component (map, goal, objective, policy, or map) can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. Conversely, the absence of a specific policy enabling a particular aspect of a project (exclusive of basic density consistency) is not to be grounds for a finding of General Plan inconsistency. Projects inherently raise policy issues. It is the task of the decision makers, consistent with State law, to weigh project benefits and consequences up against the General Plan as a whole. The merits of a project should ultimately be determined by its consistency with goals, objectives, and policies of all the elements and the land use map. Development standards as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and other County policies must be consistent with the standards in this Plan. The Plan standards represent a careful balancing of competing economic, social, and environmental interests. Background information concerning the planning issues addressed in the Plan is contained in the Environmental Impact Report certified by the Board of Supervisors in connection with adopting the Plan. Exclusive of specific plans, community plans, and planned developments, these policies shall not be implemented in a manner that will effectively shift the balance further in the direction of any one set of interests, except where the applicant for a land use approval advocates more environmental protection than required by the General Plan policies."



Also if the applicant was expecting to use the Mixed Use concept as mentioned throughout their submittals, they would also be violating the density allowed for Mixed Use which is 20 dwelling units per acre, and 20 units is only if there is adequate infrastructure in which we contest that there is NOT appropriate infrastructure for the required levels of service expected in this area.

“Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. Within Community Regions, the mixed-uses may occur vertically and/or horizontally. In mixed use projects, the maximum residential density shall be 20 dwelling units per acre within Community Regions. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provided concurrent with development.”

4

The County's Findings state, *“If mixed-use development is being proposed, the development conforms to the standards in Section 130.40.180 (Mixed Use Development)”*. As stated above this is false since the project allows more than double the allowed density of 20 dwelling units per acre for mixed use.

Allowing this applicant to rewrite the density policies specifically for this specific project creates an inconsistency between existing policies 2.2.1.2, 2.1.1.3 and the new policy 2.2.6.6 within the General Plan and according to “Using the Plan” changing the density is an unlawful violation of the El Dorado County General Plan. This project must therefore be denied.

**Third**, the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan seems out of conformity with the El Dorado County General Plan. The documents must be brought into conformity before any further project approvals in the plan area.

5

**Fourth**, the rezoning of the property violates the El Dorado County General Plan, the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, and the 1995 Town Center East project. These impact analyses need to be updated prior to any approval of the El Dorado Hills Apartments, and any amendments to the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan.

6

**Fifth**, the Planning Department would have been wise to have directed Planning Staff to work collaboratively with the project proponent and concerned citizens to modify the proposed El Dorado Hills Apartments project to better address the concerns raised by the APAC and concerned citizens. This should take place prior to any entitlements are given to the applicant.

7

**Sixth**, in the last paragraph of General Plan Finding 2.1, the report states that the residential development has been designed to match and complement the existing architectural theme and features in the Town Center East. This statement is false. In fact, **new** design guidelines and development standards are being submitted with the

8



project since the project is not consistent with the **existing** Town Center East Development Plan and Design Standards. It is interesting to note that the Design Standards have been changed to Design Guidelines, which lack enforceability. The County's Findings for this project state, "*Implementation of the project requires revisions to existing TCE Development Standards including minimum building setbacks and maximum building height to accommodate the proposed residential density. The revised standards are justified by the design of the project.*" **THE REVISED STANDARDS ARE JUSTIFIED BY THE DESIGN OF THE PROJECT!** Please let that sink in. Why have any standards if desired projects will now be driving the standards?

8

**Seventh**, if the County deems that amending the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan follows the intent of the General Plan by allowing for residential development, this must be done prior to allowing this project rather than concurrently. There is no reason that the project applicant cannot conform to the El Dorado County's General Plan for residential density, or first seek a revised specific plan which would be consistent with the current General Plan, and the project applicant should and can conform to the **existing** Town Center East Development Plan and Design Standards. If the project applicant is not willing to conform to El Dorado County policies, rules and standards, then the project must be denied.

9

**II. The El Dorado Hills Specific Plan is not consistent with the 2004 General Plan.**

The 2004 General Plan sits atop the land use hierarchy as the constitution for local land use. Virtually all other County land use decisions must be consistent with the 2004 General Plan. (California Native Plant Society v. City of Rancho Cordova (App. 3 Dist. 2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 603.) These decisions include, specific plan amendments, rezones, and planned development amendments like the ones needed for the proposed project. (See for example, Government Code, Section 65454, regarding specific plans.) Because a specific plan holds a subsidiary position relative to a general plan, a specific plan must be reviewed and amended to make it consistent with any changes in a county general plan. (Government Code, Section 65359.)

After approval of the 1987 El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, El Dorado County completed three comprehensive general plan updates in 1996, 2004, and 2015. However, there is no evidence in the record to indicate that this specific plan was ever modified to conform to the 2004 General Plan. Similarly, there are no findings of fact that demonstrate that the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan conforms to the 2004 General Plan. To the contrary, the record does reflect inconsistencies between the two plans.

10

For example, the road system contemplated to serve the intense development in the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan is not the same as the road system contemplated by the 2004 General Plan. The El Dorado Hills Specific Plan calls for a road system in 2010 that includes a divided 6-lane portion of Green Valley Road, a divided 4 lane Bass Lake Road, and divided 6-lane White Rock Road west of the project. (Exhibit 1: El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Final EIR, Figure 7-21, page 2-2.) The Circulation Map for the 2004 General Plan reflects less road expansion for the specific plan area, and defers its development later in time. The 2004 General Plan, figure TC-1, depicts no portion of



Green Valley Road with 6 lanes, Bass Lake Road as undivided with 4-lanes, and the aforementioned section of White Rock Road as 4 lanes. It is now 2018, the roads in the plan area have still not expanded as called for in the specific plan, and as a result cannot provide free flowing and safe traffic for the existing level of development in the specific plan area. Thus, this lack of consistency between the specific plan and the general plan is a source of traffic impacts in the area. Since the traffic impacts associated with the proposed El Dorado Hills Apartments have been repeatedly voiced as a critical concern of neighbors and advisory bodies, there is a direct nexus between the proposed project and the lack of consistency between the plans.

We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission direct the Planning Department to compare each provision (maps and text) of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, its conditions of approval, its EIR, its mitigation measures, and any associated development agreements to the provisions of the 2004 General Plan, its EIR, and its mitigation measures. The Planning Department analysis should identify the areas of consistency and inconsistency. Where inconsistencies exist, the Planning Department should bring forth recommendations for resolving these inconsistencies. This analysis should be reviewed by the Area Planning Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission, prior to being acted on by the Board of Supervisors. The County critically needs this analysis and action to form the lawful planning foundation for future Board of Supervisor approvals of the El Dorado Hills Apartments.

10

### **III. Responses to the County's responses to our comments**

**The response 5-1 and 5-2** to our comments regarding consistency with the approved plans was partly deflected due to the misunderstanding of who compiled the historical information. We stand corrected that the document was prepared by the County who is the lead agency rather than the applicant. The point of the comment was to establish the past entitlements with conditions in which this project was initially approved and to show how this plan violates these past approvals within the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan and also violates the El Dorado County General Plan, the El Dorado Hills Town Center East Development plan and the El Dorado Hills Town Center East Design Guidelines. The County did not respond to these infractions but instead stated that it's up to the Board of Supervisors whether or not the El Dorado Hills Apartments are consistent with those plans:

11

*"The determination whether the proposed project is consistent with applicable local land use plans ultimately rests with the decision makers who have authority to approve the project. Here, the County Board of Supervisors will make that determination. Under state law (Court of Appeal decisional authority):"*

How are the decision makers going to determine if the El Dorado Hills Apartments are consistent with the County's plans if there is little if any information provided from the Planning staff that shows how the project is in conflict? It's inconceivable that a project this massive and this conflicting with existing plans has hardly any data showing impact or conflict. The County's analysis is short on real substance.



Also 5-1 stated that the project is in violation to the 2016 Voter Approve Measure E. The project creates LOS F at Town Center Boulevard and the Post Street Intersection, among other areas that are also impacted. The Traffic Study prepared for this project states that *“Although this section includes analysis of the private Town Center Boulevard/Post Street intersection for informational purposes, Policy TC-Xa(3) only applies to “highways, arterial roads and their intersections” and does not apply to private roads and their intersections. For this reason, the Town Center Boulevard/Post Street intersection is not subject to the requirements of this Measure E analysis.”*

Actually Policy TC-Xa(3) states: *“Developer paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building **all** necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon **any** highways, **arterial roads and their intersections** during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.”* Also Policy TC-Xa(1) requires *“Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods **on any** highway, road, interchange or **intersection** in the unincorporated areas of the county.”* There is nothing in the policies that exclude private roads, especially when they are open and heavily used by the general public.

Furthermore the county references two cases that exempts these policies from applying on private roads. After reading the two cases they really do not apply in the application of this project. In the first case the County states that, *“increased traffic contained within a private development is generally not considered an adverse impact on the environment under CEQA. (See, e.g., Walters v. City of Redondo Beach (2016) 1 Cal.App.5th 809 (“The Guidelines and case law clarify that traffic impacts for CEQA purposes relate to the flow of vehicles in public spaces.”);”* This case was due to the traffic within a parcel with a carwash, in which they were accused of violating the city’s traffic policies due to the cars lined up for the car wash. In this case the traffic in question was related to internal traffic confined to the actual parcel, not external traffic on the road way generated by the project. The second case *“(Parker Shattuck Neighbors v. Berkeley City Council (2013) 222 Cal.App.4th 768, 782 [“In general, CEQA does not regulate environmental changes that do not affect the public at large”].)”* has to do with one specific group of people that would live within the same housing project or specific school children impacted by a school project rather than the public in general being impacted. The intersection in question is not on a **confined** private parcel nor is access limited by a specific group of people, but instead the intersection is accessible to the general public. Therefore neither of these cases apply to this project.

Lastly the County states that, *“the County cannot approve such a condition at this private intersection without the project applicant’s consent.”* This is not true. The County has eminent domain powers that it repeatedly applies to conditions of approvals for developers to acquire private property due to conditions applied requiring them to make road improvements.

We contend that Comment 5-1 and 5-2 has not been adequately addressed.

12

13

14



**The response 5-3** to our comments regarding loss of inventory of commercial land use was deflected by stating that the residential use will benefit the surrounding commercial uses. This does not address the actual loss of commercial land use with is inconsistent with many of the General Plan goals previously discussed. It also does not address the increasing jobs to housing imbalance in the county. The County again mentions compliance with all the plans that have been revised so they therefore claim the project is consistent with the plans. In reality since the County is revising all of the Town Center's design standards this project will not be compatible with the existing architectural style of the existing structures that were built and designed based on different requirements. The project is a boiler plate apartment design commonly used by this developer and which the standards have been revised to conform to this commonly built project.

15

We contend that Comment 5-3 has not been adequately addressed.

**The response 5-4** to our comments regarding being inconsistent with the objectives of the Economic Element of the General Plan. The county states that this is not required by CEQA, yet the county also states that the project complies with the goals and objectives of the General Plan. These statements are in conflict. The County also makes numerous assumptions as to why the commercial use is not worth preserving. If the County took this stand on every designated use in the County then what use is a General Plan? They state that it's not likely that manufacturing would take place here, yet light manufacturing is currently allowed on this parcel. Even though capturing retail dollars has been one of the County's primary goals in which millions of dollars have been spent to accommodate, the County states that losing this opportunity here is not a substantial loss. The County also states that this property could not be used to promote tourism nor is there any existing tourist commercial operations located on or near the project site. Yet the California Welcome Center advertises the Town Center as a tourist destination.

16





# CALIFORNIA WELCOME CENTER

To grasp California's true gold, you can escape to the foothills for outdoor recreation! Experience the magic at Lake Tahoe, surrounded by world famous ski-resorts with legendary snow in winter, with arts, music, and festivals in summer. Hike to a swimming hole, four wheel on the Rubicon, or [shop in El Dorado Hills Town Center](#) - this region has everything to make your California visit unforgettable.

The California Welcome Center in El Dorado Hills is conveniently located right off of US Highway 50 in Town Center. The friendly staff can help you find local restaurants, book hotel rooms near and far and provide your furry friend a respite in our pet friendly location.

2085 Vine Street, Suite 105  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

[Site Map #14](#)

Website

(916) 358-3700

Mon-Fri: 9:30am-5pm  
Sat & Sun: 10am-4pm

← BACK TO TRAVEL & TOURISM



16

The County has gone beyond bending policies in order to accommodate this development. We contend that these responses to 5-4 in regards to the inconsistencies of the project to the Economic Element of the General Plan borders on deceptive behavior on the part of the County.

Re: **Response 5-5 and 5-6.** We disagree that the impact of converting the land use does not require the need for mitigation.

17

Re: **Response 5-8 and 5-9.** We agree that as revised TC-Xa3 does not require the improvements to be in place prior to approval of a discretionary project, but we disagree with the County analysis regarding Policy TC-Xf. As the policy has been revised the County has the option to (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure the construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 20-year CIP. In the way the response was written it does not seem the County has determined the action that is the greatest benefit for the County, but instead has chosen the best option for the developer. It is not certain that the voluntary action of the applicant to possibly install a signal at Town Center Blvd and Post Street at some unknown time will actually mitigation the cumulative traffic being generated by this project.

18

Re: **Response 5-11.** We disagree with the County's responses. We disagree with the understanding of the response from Caltrans since we have real time data that shows LOS F from Caltrans at Highway 50 in El Dorado Hills along with the letter from Caltrans to the County in 2015. Also the County is misinterpreting the letter that is referenced from October 2016. Caltrans was agreeing with the methodology but there were issues in the system. With all the additional projects that have been entitled since these

19



analysis were done, we are confident that the LOS has not improved. The county continues to disregard this impact.

**EXHIBIT F 8-30-16**

**Re: Project 14-1054 (5B 30 of 30)**

This analysis replicates Caltrans' original analysis precisely, including their volume number and assumed peak direction, using the HCS 2010 Release 6.5 (whereas Caltrans used Release 6.1). The results from the two Release versions are identical

HCS 2010: Basic Freeway Segments Release 6.50

Phone: Fax:

E-mail:

Operational

Analysis

Analyst: NKP replicating Jas

Agency or Company: CDA

Date Performed: 8/4/16

Analysis Time Period:

Freeway/Direction: US 50

From/To: SEG 8R

Jurisdiction: ED County

Analysis Year: 2012 Base

Description: CSMP/TCR 50

Flow Inputs and

Adjustments

Volume, V 4590 veh/h

Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.94

Peak 15-min volume, v15 1221 v

Trucks and buses 4 %

Recreational vehicles 0 %

Terrain type: Rolling

Grade - %

Segment length - mi

Trucks and buses PCE, ET 2.5

Recreational vehicle PCE, ER 2.0

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV 0.943

Driver population factor, fp 1.00

Flow rate, vp 2588 pc/h/ln

Speed Inputs and

Adjustments

Lane width - ft

Right-side lateral clearance - ft

Total ramp density, TRD - ramps/mi

Number of lanes, N 2

Free-flow speed: Measured

FFS or BFFS 70.0 mi/h

Lane width adjustment, fLW - mi/h

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC - mi/h

TRD adjustment - mi/h

Free-flow speed, FFS 70.0 mi/h



LOS and Performance

Measures

Flow rate, vp 2588 pc/h/ln  
Free-flow speed, FFS 70.0 mi/h  
Average passenger-car speed, S 47.7 mi/h  
Number of lanes, N 2  
Density, D 54.3 pc/mi/ln  
Level of service, LOS F

.From a 3-16-15 letter received from Caltrans to the County:

- Table 3.9-13 (pages 3.9-53-3.9-57) shows the current and future scenario LOS of ED County roadways. We reject many of the LOS values shown for US 50 for, specifically those segments that differ substantially from the values documented the 2014 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP)/Transportation Concept Report (TCR) (for base and future years) and California Performance Measurement System (PeMS) for existing values. The segment between the county line and El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road currently operates at LOS F according to both the US 50 CSMP/TCR and PeMS and will operate at LOS F in the future, without significant capacity increasing or operational improvements and/or reduction in demand. However, according to Table 3.9-13, this segment currently operates at LOS B and C and will operate at LOS D in the future. This LOS calculation implies that 2035 travel demand on this segment will reduce to lower levels than current demand even with the build-out of the general plan. Even with the parallel capacity increases, a 2035 projection LOS D for the US 50 segment between the county line and El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Latrobe Road is highly infeasible.

Considering the TGPA-ZOU build-out projections, the project will have a significant impact on multiple segments of US 50 between the county line and Missouri Flat Rd. Please note, while using the county's own TDM, Caltrans projects LOS F in 2035 for multiple segments on US 50. The PRDEIR should be revised to reflect the correct LOS calculations and any necessary mitigations included.

Re: **Response 5-12, 5-15 and 5-16.** This project will require an enormous amount of water resources which are limited in this area during a drought. As we have seen with the recent drought, Folsom Lake was reduced to a mud hole putting El Dorado Hills in jeopardy of being provided water service. If this project exasperates the need for El Dorado County Irrigation District to supply water to the residents of El Dorado Hills during a drought, they would be required to tap from the water source coming from the east part of the County and they would first cut off supplies to agriculture in order to accommodate these residential dwelling units. This impact to Agriculture needs to be studied prior to moving forward especially with this project that requires a large volume of water and sewer service and may be facing another drought year. Continuing to allow projects to move forward based on first come first serve in spite of existing ministerial enticements is irresponsible on the part of the County. There are numbers of so called units available, but there is reality when the water supply is reduce to a mud hole.

Re: **Response 5-13.** We disagree with the response. See Comment I(Second) beginning on page 2.

19

20

21



Re: **Response 5-14.** We disagree with the response. See Response 5-3. Also the existing standards require setbacks to be taken from the right of way 0 to 15 feet where the new standards go from the road 0 to 4 feet. The setback on the creek is 75 feet from the centerline of the creek and the new plans state 30 feet from the Central Creek Corridor Property Line. The existing max height is 50 feet. The new standards are allowing up to 75 feet. There were many other standards which will no longer apply and the new "guidelines" are merely suggestive and with that, many of the new policies conflict with the plan that has already been designed for approval.

22

This is the end of responding to the comments, but we reserve the right to add our comments on 5-7, 5-10, 5-17 through 5-42 should this project be approved by the Commission.

23

The County states that Alternative 2 to retain the existing zoning would not meet the project's objective, but it **would** meet the County's General Plan's goals and objectives. The report also state that this alternative "*would not integrate pedestrian, bicycle, transit, open space and outdoor uses to encourage active centers.*" This statement is assumptive. It is unknown, if the property was to retain its commercial zoning, whether or not these amenities would be provided.

24

We advise the Planning Commission to deny this project and suggest that the applicant work with the public to create a project more conducive to the surrounding Town Center development and community.

Sincerely,



for  
Citizens for Sensible Development in El Dorado Hills