PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION

Placerville Office: 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
South Lake Tahoe Office: 924 B Emerald Bay Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
https://www.eldoradocounty.ca.gov/Home

Placerville Office:	Placerville Office:	Placerville Office:	South Lake Tahoe Office:
Building:	**Planning:**	**Code Enforcement:**	**All Services:**
(530) 621-5315	**(530) 621-5355**	**(530) 621-5999**	**(530) 573-3330**
bldgdept@edcgov.us	planning@edcgov.us	cdacode.enforcement@edcgov.us	plan-buildSLT@edcgov.us

Date: December 30, 2025

To: Board of Supervisors (Agenda Date: January 27, 2026)

From: Cameron Welch, Senior Planner, and Ande Flower, Planning Manager

Subject: Creekside Village Specific Plan – Reduced Impact Alternative (CVSP) (GPA20-0001, Z20-0005, SP20-0001, TM20-0002)

Planning Commission Recommended Actions for the Board of Supervisors (Board):

1) Planning Commission recommended (3-2) the Board deny the CVSP, including General Plan Amendment GPA20-0001, Rezone Z20-0005, Specific Plan SP20-0001, and Tentative Subdivision Map TM20-0002.

Staff Recommended Actions:

2) Should the Board wish to follow staff's original recommendation of approval of the CVSP as presented to the Planning Commission, the following actions are to be taken:

   a) Authorize the Chair to sign a Resolution (Attachment B) certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH#: 2020110052) (Attachment P, Exhibit P) and adopting the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment Q, Exhibit R) and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment Q, Exhibit Q);

   b) Authorize the Chair to sign the Ordinance (Attachment C) adopting the CVSP (SP20-0001) (Attachment N, Exhibit G) based on the Findings (Attachment K) and the Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) (Attachment R, Exhibit S);

   c) Authorize the Chair to sign the Rezoning Ordinance (Attachment D), approving Rezone Z20-0005 (Attachment M, Exhibit F) to apply zoning proposed with the CVSP, based on the Findings (Attachment K);

d) Authorize the Chair to sign a Resolution (Attachment E) adopting an amendment to the General Plan (GPA20-0001) (Attachment M, Exhibit D);

e) Authorize the Chair to sign a Resolution (Attachment F) approving Tentative Subdivision Map (TM20-0002) (Attachment N, Exhibit K) based on the Findings (Attachment K) and subject to the Conditions of Approval (Attachment L);

f) Authorize the Chair to sign a Resolution (Attachment G) approving the Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) (Attachment R, Exhibit S); and

g) Authorize the Chair to sign a Resolution (Attachment H) adopting the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) (Attachment R, Exhibit T).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The CVSP-RIA, consisting of a General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Specific Plan, and Tentative Subdivision Map would provide for the development of a maximum of 763 dwelling units, including 614 dwelling units ranging from 4 to 8 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) on approximately 117 acres, and 149 dwelling units on 21.3 acres with a density of 5-12 du/ac. The proposed General Plan Amendment would amend the County of El Dorado General Plan to change the project site general plan land use designation from Research & Development (R&D) to Adopted Plan (AP). The requested Rezone would change the zoning of the project site from R&D to Creekside Village Specific Plan (CV-SP). The Specific Plan would provide regulations for development of approximately 208 acres of land with a mix of residential, parks, optional neighborhood commercial, and open space land uses. The Tentative Subdivision Map would approve the creation of 763 single-family residential lots within the CVSP. Of the 763 single-family residential lots, a maximum of 150 units would be developed as conventional homes, with the remaining lots dedicated to Active Adult age-restricted units. The project proposes a 7.5-acre Village Park with 1.6 acres of the park containing a Planned Development (PD) overlay designation that could allow for neighborhood commercial uses to serve the plan area. These potential commercial uses would require future approval of a Conditional Use Permit and a PD. There would be two additional Neighborhood Parks, 4.4 and 2.2 acres in size. A total of 44.4 acres would be designated for Open Space Buffer and Open Space Preserve. The remainder of the project site would be dedicated to landscaping, public facilities, and roadway infrastructure.

The applicant initially submitted a request for a Development Agreement review process and subsequently withdrew that request. A Development Agreement is not required.

PROJECT HISTORY

Pursuant to BOS Policy J-6, the proposed project was initially considered with a Conceptual Review Process, which was brought to the BOS for review on November 5, 2019 (Legistar File No. 19-1556). The intent of this Conceptual Review Process is to determine if the proposed application: is consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan; if public infrastructure, facilities and services are available or can be feasibly provided to serve the proposed project without adverse impact to existing or approved development; and if the proposed amendment provides additional public benefit to the community as compared to the existing land use designation, density/intensity range, plan, or site design.

Staff's General Plan policy analysis of the proposed project during the 2019 Conceptual Review Process included the following tentative determinations:

> The BOS provided several comments regarding the conceptually proposed CVSP, most of which included the need for affordable and workforce housing. Another concern was the need for shopping opportunities for existing residents in the neighboring communities. The project evaluated during the J-6 meeting was estimated to include somewhere between 700 and 900 residential units.

Following the J-6 hearing, a formal project application was submitted to the County for processing. Subsequently, the CVSP project application was placed on hold from October 2021 through July 2023 when an unrelated R&D project application was processed by a different applicant on the same site for a fulfillment center/heavy distribution/parcel hub facility referred to as Project Frontier. When that unrelated application was withdrawn, the project resumed activity with minor updates that were made to the project description.

The 2023 initially proposed revision to the CVSP is referred to as the original CVSP. The original CVSP proposed to create up to 918 dwelling units, including 668 dwelling units ranging from 4 to 8 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) on approximately 116 acres, and 250 dwelling units on 21 acres with a density of 5-12 du/ac. There would have been an option for converting the 1.8 acres of neighborhood commercial to park uses, as well as an Active Adult Option to develop 768 age-restricted units, leaving a maximum of 150 units developed as conventional homes.

During the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document preparation, a Reduced Impact Alternative project (RIA) was developed that would reduce significant impacts of the proposed project while still meeting many of the applicant's objectives for the project. The EIR concludes, and County staff concurs, that the RIA is the environmentally superior alternative.
With the RIA, the only remaining significant and unavoidable impact to the environment is to Aesthetics. The analysis in the EIR would allow the Board to approve the RIA instead of the

original CVSP project, should that be the decision made. The materials considered by the Planning Commission as well as the resolutions, ordinance, and exhibits now presented to the Board are limited to the RIA.

Since the resumption of the Creekside Village project in 2023, it is noted that the applicant, in their public outreach activities, has conducted and/or participated in more than 30 meetings and gatherings to inform the public about the Creekside Village project. With the RIA, the applicant has also made significant revisions to the project in response to concerns from the local tribal governments, Latrobe School District, and community.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT

During the noticing period for the Planning Commission hearing, public comments were received from the Auditor-Controller, Latrobe School District, El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC), El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD), the applicant and applicant's consultants as well as individual members of the public.

Comments received from the Auditor-Controller and Latrobe School District expressed support for the project. The APAC considered the project and issued a letter of conditional support. The CSD provided written comments and testimony regarding different iterations of the project and that the CSD looks forward to providing future park and recreation opportunities as part of the project.

Written comments of both support and opposition were provided by members of the public. Supportive comments generally focused on how the proposed project was a better fit for the area (residential instead of R&D). Opposition comments generally centered around the environment, lack of water, lack of infrastructure, traffic, and the project's need for a General Plan amendment. During the public comment portion of the public hearing, verbal comments both in support and in opposition of the project were received, in general these comments reiterated written comments received prior to the hearing.

Wildfire, and evacuation should a wildfire in the immediate area occur, was mentioned as a concern by those speaking on the project. A Fire Safe Plan has been completed, reviewed, revised, and approved for the Creekside Village project by Cal Fire and the El Dorado Hills Fire Department (Attachment S, Exhibit U). The publication/signature date of the Fire Safe Plan is April 27, 2025. The project site is located within a State Responsibility Area for fire management. A majority of the project site is located within a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone and a small portion of the project site, 6.67 acres, is located within a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, an area which is wholly included within parcels designated for open space and parks. No proposed residences are located within the High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. There are five access points in

and out of the Creekside Village project that would assist in evacuation if necessary: three general public points of access are proposed to/from Latrobe Road to the east, one general public point of access is proposed to/from the Carson Creek community to the west, and one Emergency Vehicle Access point is proposed to/from the El Dorado Hills Business Park to the north.

Based on the multiple potential evacuation routes in different directions, road capacity, limited project size, and mitigation measures proposed, the risk and spread of wildfire within the project will be reduced and the project will not block, limit, alter, or impact routes utilized for evacuation. Representatives from El Dorado Hills Fire attended the Planning Commission hearing and confirmed their approval of the Fire Safe Plan and concurrence that all wildfire and fire issues were adequately addressed.

PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission recommended denial in a 3-2 vote with a motion to "deny the entitlements in favor of a more comprehensive plan better aligned with the existing general plan and zoning." In the motion to recommend denial, the Planning Commission did not identify any concerns with the analysis in the Draft and Final EIR.

While this section identifies questions and statements by various commissioners, these comments do not reflect the view of the entire Planning Commission. Moreover, staff have considered all the questions, comments, and concerns expressed by various Planning Commissioners and maintain the staff recommendation for project approval.

Comments from Planning Commissioners included the idea that a buffer would have been beneficial between the proposed residential and the El Dorado Hills Business Park as well as small business opportunities and flex space opportunities within the buffer so there is some job creation. One or more Planning Commissioners stated the CVSP takes away the job creation and therefore is inconsistent with the General Plan by the proposed findings of the project stating that the project will help with job creation by providing housing. Furthermore, one Planning Commissioner stated the project could appear to create "spot zoning" by having the new residential zoning next to the existing industrial zoning, thereby being another reason why the project proposal is inconsistent with the General Plan. Staff do not believe that project approval would create "spot zoning" due to the existing residential land uses adjacent to the east and west of the project site.

A question was received from a Planning Commissioner regarding the south adjacent property owner, the El Dorado Union High School District, about whether comments were ever received from that district. It was determined, during the DEIR Notice of Preparation/scoping public notice and review period, the DEIR Notice of Availability public review period, and the Planning Commission hearing notice for the CVSP project, that notification was timely and properly sent to

the El Dorado Union High School District as they are a neighboring property owner of the project site. However, it is noted that despite the notifications, no comments to date have been received by the County from the El Dorado Union High School District. While project notification was provided as required, a neighboring property owner would not be forced to comment on a project if they do not wish to. The applicant has also reached out to the El Dorado Union High School District since the Planning Commission hearing and has not received any comments.

Comments from a Planning Commissioner also included thoughts about the possibility for a community plan for the El Dorado Hills area. It was contemplated by this Commissioner about why a community plan for the larger area was not being considered rather than a Specific Plan exclusively for the Creekside Village project area. Typically, a community plan that encompasses a large area, such as El Dorado Hills, which would override or overrule several existing specific plans in the subject area, would be directed to be created by the highest decision-making authority of the jurisdiction, such as the Board of Supervisors. As no such direction has been given to staff to date by the Board of the Supervisors to create a Community Plan for the greater El Dorado Hills area, the proposed Specific Plan before the Board is the item up for consideration and discussion at this time.

Comments were also received from a Planning Commissioner asking, why not annex this project site into the Carson Creek Specific Plan and process an amendment to the Carson Creek Specific Plan to include the Creekside Village project area rather than do a stand-alone specific plan for the Creekside Village project area. The Carson Creek Specific Plan area is owned and managed by a separate property owner with vested rights on the property from the original specific plan adoption and is under no requirement to file for an amendment if not wanted or warranted, including if a potential future specific plan is proposed adjacent to the property. Furthermore, the project applicant is under no requirement to file to join an existing specific plan under any circumstances, and for a variety of reasons may determine a separate specific plan for their own property is the best route forward. As no application was filed, nor did the County nor Carson Creek property owner nor Creekside Village applicant see a need for the Creekside Village property to be included in the Carson Creek Specific Plan, there are no reasons nor merits to require that the Creekside Village project area be placed into the Carson Creek Specific Plan.

The Creekside Village Specific Plan has been submitted and processed by staff as allowed by County Code and State Law. Staff have confirmed that if approved the project is consistent with and systematically implements the General Plan with the change from R&D to Adopted Plan.

ALTERNATIVE ACTION

In addition to the above-listed actions to approve or deny the project, the Board may elect to guide revisions to the proposal and remand a revised project to be reviewed by the Planning Commission at a future date.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the public hearing held on November 12, 2025, the recommendation of the Planning Commission is that the Board deny the entitlements of this project in favor of a more comprehensive plan better aligned with the existing general plan and zoning. Staff have considered this recommendation and maintain the original staff recommendation of approval of the CVSP. Should the Board wish to approve the requested CVSP project, applicable ordinances, resolutions, findings, and conditions of approval have been provided by staff.