

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
9:26 am, Nov 09, 2010

LATE DISTRIBUTION
Date 9:26 am, Nov 09, 2010



To: Charlene M Tim/PV/EDC,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Fw: Comments on San Stino

Thank you Char. I will forward this to the Board Members.

Cindy Johnson
Senior Deputy Clerk,
Board of Supervisors
530-621-5393
cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us

Charlene M Tim CJ, I am forwarding a public comment that we ju... 11/09/2010 08:15:36 AM

From: Charlene M Tim/PV/EDC
To: Cynthia C Johnson/PV/EDC@TCP
Cc: Pierre Rivas/PV/EDC@TCP, Rommel Pabalinas/PV/EDC@TCP
Date: 11/09/2010 08:15 AM
Subject: Fw: Comments on San Stino

CJ,

I am forwarding a public comment that we just received on the San Stino Conceptual Review being heard by the BOS today at 2pm. Thank you.

Char Tim
Clerk of the Planning Commission
El Dorado County Development Services
(530) 621-5351

**Please note my new e-mail address: charlene.tim@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded by Charlene M Tim/PV/EDC on 11/09/2010 08:11 AM -----



Rommel Pabalinas/PV/EDC
11/09/2010 08:09 AM

To Charlene M Tim/PV/EDC@TCP
cc Pierre Rivas/PV/EDC@TCP
Subject Fw: Comments oin San Stino

fyi---please forward to BOS clerk. Thanks.

=====
Rommel (Mel) Pabalinas, Senior Planner
El Dorado County Development Services Department- Planning Division
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
Main Line 530-621-5355
Direct line 530-621-5363
Fax 530-642-0508

----- Forwarded by Rommel Pabalinas/PV/EDC on 11/09/2010 08:08 AM -----



"Brad Pearson"
<kitcarson@directcon.net>
11/08/2010 09:25 PM

To <rommel.pabalinas@edcgov.us>
cc "Bradley" <kitcarson@directcon.net>
Subject Comments oin San Stino

Mel:

Attached are comments on the San Stino project from Shingle Springs Neighbors for Quality Living.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Brad Pearson
President
SSNQL[attachment "San Stino - conceptual review letter 11-8-10.doc" deleted by Cynthia C Johnson/PV/EDC]

Shingle Springs Neighbors for Quality Living
P.O. Box 1156
Shingle springs, CA 95682

November 8, 2010

SENT VIA FACSIMILE, E MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

El Dorado County
Development Services Department
Planning Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Attn: Mel Pabalinas

RE: PA 10-0016 – SAN STINO pre-application for conceptual review of proposed development in the shingle springs area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Shingle Springs Neighbors for Quality Living (SSNQL) has commented extensively on development proposals for this property in 1998, 1999, 2007 and 2008.

We are happy to see that the Scheiber, Sawmill (Zweck) and White ranches are finally being planned comprehensively and with a transportation linkage to Hwy 50 that would lessen impact on existing neighborhoods.

This is, however, a substantial development proposal, probably one of the largest if not the single largest proposed residential developments east of Cambridge Road in the last 25 years.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project area is located just south of and partially bordering on – Mother Lode Drive and just east of and bordering on French Creek Road. It consists of 634 acres of ranch land with the following proposed land development:

- 919 single family detached housing units
- 386 multi-family housing units
- 88,000 sq. ft. of commercial space
- 222 acres of open space

- Proposed major roadway that traverses the project connecting from French Creek Rd. in the south to Shingle Springs Drive in the north at the rail road crossing.

PUBLIC AWARENESS

We sense that the public has very little awareness of this project, its magnitude or its impacts on traffic, school resources, public services and the inducement of growth in the area south of Mother Lode Drive. The developer has met with local CSD/HOA groups and this public conceptual review will help to bring public awareness to this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This project is large enough and comprehensive enough to require a full environmental impact report. Growth inducement in the surrounding areas because of the new north-south collector road will be an area of concern.

Traffic generated from the 1305 housing units will be 12,595 average daily trips.* While we only have 2007-08 traffic counts to work from, that represents a substantial loading to the local circulation system:

- French Creek Road at Mother Lode had a usage (2007-08) of 2,500 vehicles per day.
- Mother Lode at Holiday Lake Drive (major entry to Buckeye School) had a usage of 14,500 vehicles per day.
- Hwy 50 at Shingle Springs Drive had a usage of 58,000 vehicles per day.
- With a traffic generation from 1,305 housing units of 12,595 ADT, not counting new trips generated from the 88,000 sq. ft. of commercial development, the housing component alone will generate an additional 21.7% of the 2007 east/west traffic on the local freeway.

NORTH-SOUTH MAJOR CONNECTOR ROAD

The proposed north-south collector road is not part of the existing master road plan for the county. It will be traversing property not currently under the control of the county or possibly not under the control of the developer, and yet the project's viability depends on the construction of this road. The road should be studied apart from the project and its development assured prior to approval of the land use "entitlements" for this project. Since this project will be controlled by a 20 year development agreement, at what stage in the project's build-out will the road way be constructed? Is it possible that several hundred housing units could be built before the road way becomes operative?

* 11.1 ADT/unit for single family, 9.0 ADT/unit for multi-family.

PROJECT ENTITLEMENTS SOUGHT AND PHASING OF PROJECT BUILD OUT.

The project is seeking general plan changes and zoning changes to allow higher density development than currently allowed. The developer is seeking to concurrently subdivide the land. In addition the developer will have to enter into a 20 year development agreement to govern the construction of needed public works.

That development agreement needs to be a matter of public scrutiny and debate.

In addition, these entitlements need to be phased over time so that if the project does not develop according to public expectations, that development cannot be continued without coming back up for new review and approval. Giving all the approvals at year one leaves little recourse 10 years later if the project has been sold off in pieces and the master planned development is falling apart.

Right now with one developer proposing a master plan, it all looks rosy for the development of a cohesive project but once the project is subdivided there is no longer the guiding hand that was originally "sold" to the county and public. The county will be responsible for the maintenance of developing a phased and cohesive plan to build out and that overall "project management" is not going to be an easy role for the county to play. It is best that early on there be established a number of check points along the way at which certain performance standards must be met before proceeding along to the next phase of development.

This is the extent of our comments at this time. We look forward to detailed review of the project as the draft EIR is released for public scrutiny.

Please keep us informed in a timely manner for future hearings and CEQA review.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours truly

Bradley R. Pearson
President