

4/12/2021

Edcgov.us Mail - Public Comment from APAC---4/13/21 Meeting, Agenda Item #20



Public Comment #20

County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS RCVD 4/12/21

Public Comment from APAC---4/13/21 Meeting, Agenda Item #20

1 message

John Richard <us.jrichard@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 8:00 AM

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Please see the attached PDF submitted for public comment regarding Agenda Item #20 of the 4/13/21 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Thank you,

John Richard



EDHAPAC Public Comment - BOS 04-13-2021 Agenda Item 20 _Green Zone_.pdf

138K

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee



APAC 2021 Board

John Davey, Chair jdavey@daveygroup.net
John Raslear, Vice Chair jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net
Timothy White, Vice Chair tjwhitejd@gmail.com
Brooke Washburn, Secretary washburn_bew@yahoo.com

1021 Harvard Way, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
<https://cdhapac.org>

April 11, 2021

To: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
John Hidahl, District 1
George Turnboo, District 2
Wendy Thomas, District 3
Lori Parlin, District 4
Sue Novasel, District 5

From: John Richard
El Dorado Hills Planning Advisory Committee (APAC)

**RE: 4/13/21 Meeting of the Board of Supervisors, El Dorado County
Agenda Item #20, "Department of Transportation recommending the Board adopt and
authorize the Chair to sign Resolution 027-2021 to designate three Green Zones as a part
of
the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Green Means Go pilot program"
Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:**

APAC respectfully requests that Agenda Item #20, referenced above, be rejected by the Board of Supervisors. In the alternate, APAC requests that Agenda Item #20 be rescheduled to a later date in order to allow adequate time for public review and comment.

At this time, the primary concern APAC has with respect to Agenda Item #20 is the inclusion of land also incorporated in the proposed Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan (CEDHSP).

Specifically, Agenda Item #20 calls for the old Executive Golf Course and the Pedregal Planning Area to be designated as a "Green Zone."

As the Board of Supervisors is aware, the CEDHSP is controversial and overwhelmingly opposed by the residents of El Dorado Hills as evidenced by the November 3, 2015 vote on CSD Measure E. At that time, 91% of voters opposed the rezoning of the Executive Course to allow residential and commercial development on the property. Given the consistent public opposition to the project across multiple Planning Commission meetings in 2019 and 2020, there is no evidence to suggest there is now public support for the CEDHSP.

Designating the CEDHSP land as a "Green Zone" means it is an area which, per the SACOG "Green Means Go" website, is set aside for "accelerat[ed] infill development..." This is

something that needs to be very carefully considered given community opposition and the area's current General Plan and zoning designations.

It appears, however, inclusion of the CEDHSP area as a Green Zone has not been carefully considered. In the supporting document for Agenda Item #20, Exhibit A "Green Zone Narratives 1, 2, and 3", the section labeled "Brief description of Area Nominated" does not mention the CEDHSP area at all. It describes only the El Dorado Hills Business Park.

In the section labeled "Details on what policies, programs, or actions are in place, or are currently in progress, that demonstrates support for growth in this area," only the El Dorado Hills Business Park is detailed. No support for growth in the CEDHSP Area is demonstrated in the document. Nevertheless, the CEDHSP Area is included as part the El Dorado Hills Green Zone in Exhibit B, "El Dorado County Green Zone Proposal Map."

The obvious concern is that the designation of the CEDHSP Area as a Green Zone will be used to rationalize development of the Executive Golf Course and Pedregal Planning Area as proposed in the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. In 2019, APAC recommended against such development because the project, as proposed, does not provide adequate benefits to El Dorado Hills nor El Dorado County.

This is clearly an issue on which the Board of Supervisors should encourage public comment. If it does not, then it gives the appearance of undermining community input on a very unpopular proposal while moving forward through a back channel.

Therefore, and consistent with its earlier findings regarding the CEDHSP, APAC recommends against adopting Item #20 designating the CEDHSP area as a Green Zone.

In the event Item #20 is rescheduled for future consideration, I would like to discuss with the relevant members of the Board of Supervisors and El Dorado County staff the genesis of the proposed resolution designating the CEDHSP land as a Green Zone.

Sincerely,

John Richard
Chair, Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Subcommittee
El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

I Oppose Green Zone designation of CEDHSP

1 message

Shirley Richard <shirleyedh@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 11:26 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

I am writing to express my opposition to designating the proposed CEDHSP area as a SACOG Green Zone and to tell you I am disappointed that this item appears before the Board of Supervisors in an apparent attempt to move forward with the development of the old Executive Golf Course without adequate notice or public comment.

Please vote in a way that reflects the desires of the residents of El Dorado Hills and reject Agenda Item #20 at the 4/13/2021 meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,

Shirely Richard



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Opposition to the resolution naming the CEDHSP area as a Green Zone!!!

1 message

Rebecca Eno <rebecca.isbell@ymail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 10:55 AM

Reply-To: Rebecca Eno <rebecca.isbell@ymail.com>

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, BOS Two <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, BOS Four <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Laura Patane <laurapatane05@gmail.com>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear BOS,

I urge you to vote NO on this resolution! Last year our community spoke. Over 500 people showed up against this rezoning. And yet here we are again with the developer trying to get his way through the back door. Please VOTE NO on this resolution naming the CEDHSP as a green zone!

If our community voices don't matter to you, than what does??? VOTE NO!!!!

Rebecca Eno



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Comment for File 21-0369

Eric Fechter <ejfechter@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 1:08 PM

To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>

Supervisor Hidahl,

Resolution 027-2021 on the Board of Supervisors Agenda of April 13, 2021, designating "Green Zones" for segments of open space (such as the former Executive Golf Course) is entirely inappropriate. Please do not vote to approve it.

Long-range planning should be guided by the principles in county's General Plan, NOT by an under-the-radar resolution cooked up by our Department of Transportation together with local developers, and then approved by three members of the Board. This resolution is nothing short of a back-door mechanism to fast-track housing development on county-designated open space while circumventing our traditional development process. I urge you to vote "no" and uphold your credibility as an open-space advocate for District 1.

Respectfully,

Eric Fechter

EDH resident

PS. I have continually raised concerns to your Board for more than a year about Serrano Associates tactically delaying the application process of the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. Those concerns fell on deaf ears-- the Planning Department, DOT, and Planning commissioners all capitulated to the Applicant's demands. This resolution is yet another gift to Serrano Associates on behalf of the county at the expense of residents. I implore you to finally take a stand on this matter.



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Golf Course Green Zone Designation

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:01 PM

For item # 21-0369

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530) 621-5650
[CLICK HERE to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook](#)
[CLICK HERE to visit Supervisor Hidahl's web page](#)

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

From: <keneller@aol.com>
Date: Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 10:23 AM
Subject: Golf Course Green Zone Designation
To: bosone@edcgov.us <bosone@edcgov.us>

Supervisor,

Please stay consistent with your campaign promises concerning golf course development and oppose the Department of Transportation designation of the golf course area for "Green Zone" in-fill development. There are myriad other locations in our vast county that can satisfy any affordable housing mandate or intra-county agreement.

Thank you. David Keneller, [6109 Western Sierra Way, El Dorado Hills.](#)



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Agenda #20 Green Zone Resolution for the Executive Golf Course

1 message

Mark Baumgardner <mb112m@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:14 PM

To: "John Hidahl:" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "George Turnboo:" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "Karen Feathers:" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "Lori Parlin:" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "Sue Novasel:" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "General Public Comments:" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
Cc: baumers12@yahoo.com

Hello all,

I am writing to advise that I oppose Agenda #20- The Green Zone Resolution to the old Executive Golf Course.

The last thing we need in EDH is more high density homes, apartments or shopping centers.

While I have this opportunity, I live off Bass Lake Rd and cannot begin to tell you how disgusted I am with the construction that is taking place right now.

All the money spent on the Bass Lake Rd recently without widening the road to 4 lanes is simply horrendous and poor planning.

Mark my words, there will be increased traffic accidents and fatalities with the huge increase in cars on the road from all the new homes and shopping center. Especially with all of the new intersections (the Safeway gas station one with the wall blocking sight to cars traveling NE is really bad)

While I know you all have difficult jobs, please do your best to keep El Dorado Hills from turning into an overcrowded traffic mess!

Sincerely,

Mark and Shelley Baumgardner



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Oppose Designating CEDHSP as Green Zone

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:10 PM

For item #21-0369.

Cindy MuntAssistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado
Phone: (530) 621-5650
[CLICK HERE](#) to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook
[CLICK HERE](#) to visit Supervisor Hidahl's web page

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

From: **Michelle Petro** <petrostrut@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 10:40 AM
Subject: Oppose Designating CEDHSP as Green Zone
To: <bosone@edcgov.us>

Dear Mr. Hidahl,

It was brought to my attention today that the El Dorado County Department of Transportation submitted a resolution to the Board of Supervisors that designates the CEDHSP area as Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) "Green Zone."

I understand the Board of Supervisors is meeting tomorrow, 4/13/21, to vote on this issue.

I urge you and the Board of Supervisors NOT to designate the old Executive Golf Course as an area set aside for infill development. (Agenda Item #20 of the 4/13/2021 Meeting of the Board of Supervisors)

If I understand this correctly, SACOG Green Zones are areas set aside for accelerated infill development. Such a designation sets the stage for the development of the CEDHSP while flying below the radar.

I was informed that the supporting documents provided by the Department of Transportation do not identify the CEDHSP area once....only the El Dorado Hills Business Park is mentioned. Without any supporting documentation or other mention of developing the old golf course, the CEDHSP is designated a Green Zone via a map that is part of the resolution.

I am concerned that designating the CEDHSP as a SACOG Green Zone sets the stage to rationalize development of the old Executive Golf Course as a "green" measure consistent with area-wide government mandates. It seems more likely that this is a back-door push forward for a project facing stiff community opposition. Further, a Green Zone designation is inconsistent with the General Plan and current zoning. (The General Plan designates the old golf course as "open space" and current zoning allows recreational facilities.)

If the CEDHSP is designated a Green Zone by the Board of Supervisors, stopping development of the old golf course will be very difficult. We must not set that stage!

The EDH community has made it abundantly clear that we oppose development of this area. Please oppose any efforts that seek to directly or indirectly work against that vision.

Thank you for your support,

Michelle & Peter Petro
3196 Melrose Way

4/12/2021

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Oppose Designating CEDHSP as Green Zone

El Dorado Hills CA 95762
916-605-6932

Sent from my iPhone



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Opposition to Resolution 027-2021 regarding SACOG Green Means Go Pilot Program

1 message

Bob.Hendricks@zoho.com <bob.hendricks@zoho.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 1:19 PM

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

El Dorado County Board Members:

I have written you previously to oppose the Creekside Villages and the Carson Creek Villages development. In that correspondence, I shared with you a petition against those developments with (now) more than 2,000 El Dorado Hills resident's signatures.

Now I see that you are considering Resolution 027-2021 from the Department of Transportation, to designate three "Green Zones", one of which directly covers those areas along Latrobe Rd.

Our concerns for Creekside Village and Carson Creek Villages development where challenging enough, but to even consider turning over control to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments is even far more egregious, as it removes our communities influence in what may be developed in those areas.

Although we don't always agree with or appreciate the development decisions of the County, at least we know we have a voice and that our representatives listen to our concerns before making decisions.

But with this Resolution, you will be turning over control to SACOG, and turning your backs on your constituents.

I urge you to REJECT this Resolution and leave the development decisions of our community areas with the County and the County's residents.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bob Hendricks

President, Blackstone Homeowners Association

El Dorado Hills Resident



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Infill development

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:15 PM

To: County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

For item #21-0369

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1

Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado

Phone: (530) 621-5650

[CLICK HERE](#) to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook[CLICK HERE](#) to visit Supervisor Hidahl's web page

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

From: **Lisa Plummer** <lisa.m.plummer@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 11:40 AM

Subject: Infill development

To: <bosone@edcgov.us>

Hi John- just one of your constituents. I saw a next door post about expressing our opinion and confusion on the switch from Pedregal plan to county designated green infill development. Sounds like a bait and switch. Please stand up on this issue and request clarification or vote no for now. Thanks!

Lisa M. Plummer

Sent from my iPhone



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Maintaining Open Space Per Public Sentiment

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:16 PM

For item #21-0369

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1

Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado

Phone: (530) 621-5650

[CLICK HERE](#) to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook[CLICK HERE](#) to visit Supervisor Hidahl's web page

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

From: **Scott Schumm** <scott@premierfoodservice.com>

Date: Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 12:43 PM

Subject: Maintaining Open Space Per Public Sentiment

To: bosone@edcgov.us <bosone@edcgov.us>

John,

As a 30 year resident of EDH, I'm optimistic that you and your co-board members will represent the overwhelming majority of your fellow citizens and represent us in this issue of irresponsible growth plans.....

There is a better way.

Scott Schumm

[2111 Moonstone Circle](#)[El Dorado Hills, CA](#)



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: CEDHSP

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:20 PM

For item #21-0369

Cindy Munt

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, District 1

Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado

Phone: (530) 621-5650

[CLICK HERE to follow Supervisor Hidahl on Facebook](#)[CLICK HERE to visit Supervisor Hidahl's web page](#)

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

From: **Paul Hegarty** <eldohills37@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 12:43 PM

Subject: CEDHSP

To: <bosone@edcgov.us>

Read a disturbing note in the nextdoor app about a possible "Green Zone" designation for the old El Dorado Hills Executive golf course. If the article is correct and this is a "work around" to make it easier to develop the property I would like to register my negative vote. As a long time (28 years) resident of El Dorado Hills I would like this property to continue to be designated as it is in the general plan

thank you
Paul Hegarty
Fairchild Village



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS AGENDA ITEM 21-0369 RESOLUTION# 027-2021 Re: GREEN ZONES

Joel Wiley <joel-wiley@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 3:22 PM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Cc: "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@EDCgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "joel-wiley@sbcglobal.net" <joel-wiley@sbcglobal.net>

Item 21-0369 requests the Board approve Resolution # 27-2021 approving three areas to be designated as Green Zones supporting the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Green means Go program to accelerate infill housing. There appears to be a significant discrepancy between the map of the El Dorado Hills area and the associated narrative. The narrative describes the Business Park, South of US 50. The map includes the footprint of the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan but makes no mention of inclusion.

I am requesting the Board return this agenda item to the Department of Transportation to resolve this discrepancy prior to the Board taking a vote.

Sincerely,

Joel Wiley

El Dorado Hills, CA

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Old Executive golf course/Pedregal Planning Area - Vote NO on SACOG Green Zone

1 message

Wendy Jones <wendyandalexjones@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 3:24 PM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, BOS Four <bosfour@edcgov.us>, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Please vote no on designating the CEDHSP as a SACOG Green Zone.

As you know the community has voiced overwhelming opposition to the CEDHSP at every Planning Commission meeting.

Supporting documents on the SACOG Green Zones designation provided by the Department of Transportation do not identify the CEDHSP areaonly the El Dorado Hills Business Park is mentioned. Nevertheless, without any supporting documentation or other mention of developing the old golf course, the CEDHSP is designated a Green Zone via a map that is part of the resolution.

Designating the CEDHSP as a SACOG Green Zone sets the stage to rationalize development of the old Executive Golf Course as a "green" measure consistent with area-wide government mandates. The reality is **this is a back-door push forward for a project facing stiff community opposition**. Further, **such a Green Zone designation is inconsistent with the General Plan and current zoning**. (The General Plan designates the old golf course as "open space" and current zoning allows recreational facilities.) If the CEDHSP is designated a Green Zone, stopping development of the old golf course will be very difficult.

Please do not designate the old Executive Golf Course as an area set aside for infill development.

Thank you.

Wendy Jones



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors April 13, 2021 Agenda Item 20

John Davey <jdavey@daveygroup.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 3:25 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us, The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>, bosthree@edcgov.us, BOS Four <bosfour@edcgov.us>, bosfive@edcgov.us

Supervisors,

In regards to Agenda item #20 scheduled for your Board on April 13, 2021, I would like to offer the following public comment:

My major concern with the entire effort is that while I understand that the County Transportation Department is making a good effort at pursuing whatever alternate funding sources may be available for infrastructure improvements, that this promotion of infill development is crafted to precisely benefit currently proposed projects - so that when they are presented to the Board of Supervisors or the Planning Commission for review and approvals, that it puts the County in a position where they have additional motivation to support approval of these discretionary projects, because it would "meet the County's identified and desired needs and policies" for these infill projects.

But I also have a concern about labeling these projects as "infill". From the Adopted General Plan:

Policy 2.4.1.5 The County shall implement a program to promote infill development in existing communities.

B. Project sites may not be more than five acres in size and must demonstrate substantially development has occurred on 2 or more sides of the site.

D. Approval of a project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

The smallest of the current crop of projects proposed south of US50 along Latrobe Rd is 97 acres, which is about 92 acres larger than what the County General Plan Policy 2.4.1.5 defines as infill development.

Respectfully,
John Davey