



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Planning Commission 4/24 public comment_Serrano Village J5&6

Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

Thu, Apr 24, 2014 at 12:50 AM

Reply-To: Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

To: Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>, Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>, Brian Shinault <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>, Dave Pratt <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>, Tom Heflin <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>, Walter Mathews <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>, Rich Stewart <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>

Cc: Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>, Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>, "bostthree@edcgov.us" <bostthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>

Dear Planning Commission:

I agree with the assessment very well detailed below in the Public comment submitted by Ellen Van Dyke. I request the County deny Village J5/6 rezone and Specific Plan amendment.

This area needs to be supported by an adequate commercial center. Distributed commercial centers that have adequate traffic infrastructure and are compatible locations with the proper buffers should be planned so that are dispersed to support the community and don't put the load on one or two commercial centers that have to increase vehicle trips per day on local streets and roads. Reducing the Commercial Property from 45 acres to 12 acres is a recipe for congestion throughout El Dorado Hills. People need to access services locally, this is suppose to be a priority in our community and this is a logical place for the commercial to support the growth in this area. This change alone would definitely require a full EIR be done.

Sound walls are a result of not having enough buffer and setback to adequately place infrastructure and make it aesthetically compatible with the surroundings. I've been seeing an imbalance in land use planning emphasizing the use of every postage stamp of land and using sound walls to mitigate noise and aesthetics. We need to use sound walls sparingly and require adequate setback and open space buffer for good land use planning. I'm afraid El Dorado Hills will become one big sound wall maze as it appears most proposed developments want to build right up to the edge of roadway right of way and put a sound wall for a barrier. This is not good long term planning.

I won't go over everything in entirely stated below only to say that every point made is accurate and this project should absolutely not be approved based on the 1988 EIR. There are too many identified impacts that were not mitigated in the 1988 EIR. Again I am seeing gross inconsistency in the transportation infrastructure needs and the project presented.

El Dorado Hills is loosing one of its most valued natural assets, its Oak Tree Canopy. Not enough is being done to retain the Oak Tree canopy throughout El Dorado Hills. How does this project allow for removal of 5.2 of the 7.3 acres of oak canopy and meet the County ordinance?

I urge you to deny the rezone and Specific Plan amendment and use this much needed opportunity to plan for the critical infrastructure, retain the much needed commercial center in this location to support the well managed growth that is needed in El Dorado Hills.

Thank You For Your Service,
Tara Mccann
El Dorado County Resident

Public Comment - Planning Commission 4/24/14_Agenda Item 5(14-0280)

Re: **Serrano Village J5 & 6** (SP13-0002/Z13-0002/TM13-1511)

Dear Commissioners:

I urge you to deny the proposed Village J5/6 rezone and Specific Plan amendment based on the following issues:

1. A new environmental analysis **MUST BE** required to determine the impact on Hwy50 of eliminating this neighborhood commercial center while simultaneously replacing it with high density housing. Residents who would have utilized this retail center will now use Hwy 50 or Green Valley Rd to access services.
2. The required sound wall is an aesthetic impact that **MUST** be evaluated under CEQA. It cannot be considered "unavoidable" because the housing development proposed is not "required", nor would a sound wall be required for the commercial development. (see soundwall 'Fig.2' below)
3. The rezone eliminates vital and anticipated commercial potential in our county.
 - a. The EDH Specific Plan specifies 45 acres of commercial property in Village J, which will be reduced to less than 12 acres with this proposal
 - b. The insinuation that the Raleys'/LaBorgata center has had difficulty maintaining occupancy is absolutely unvalidated and untrue; it is a successful and vibrant center with longterm tenants.
 - c. Preserving commercially zoned property in EDH is a General Plan update priority.
 - d. Traffic on Hwy50 will be less impacted if people can access services here.
4. The surrounding rural lands require a 4-ac minimum lot size buffer under Section 2.5.1 of the Specific Plan. This requirement is being avoided by claiming a 'future high density' entitlement, **BUT** as it stands, and until they are developed, *these lands require that buffer*.
5. **Documentation** of the open space and oak woodland status, must be required in the form of MAPS that clearly show the accounting of both, relative to the overall Specific Plan area.
 - a. 5.2 of the 7.3 acres of oak canopy is proposed to be removed, which does **NOT** meet county guidelines. Provide a full Specific Plan accounting showing areas 'retained' and 'replaced' and their acreages (as 'constantly updated since March of 2007' per the staff report p10/12)
 - b. Does the open space calculation include the golf course rezone that is currently under discussion? Provide a map for clear accounting.
6. Exhibit P shows lots for the proposed development right at the edge of Bass Lake. Where is the required setback?
7. Per the staff report, the realignment of Bass Lake Rd is stated to be projected out by more than 10 years before construction is anticipated, and "*therefore, the Transportation Division is not requiring complete construction of the frontage improvements at this time*". However, conditions have perhaps changed, as the construction of the Bass Lake realignment is **currently** underway. There is no way this project should be approved based on the 1988 EIR. Most **CERTAINLY** impacts have been identified that were not discussed and mitigated in the 1988 EIR. You are obligated to deny this proposal.

Ellen Van

From: Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

To: Char Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>; Brian Shinault <brian.shinault@edcgov.us>; Dave Pratt <dave.pratt@edcgov.us>; Tom Heflin <tom.heflin@edcgov.us>; Walter Mathews <walter.mathews@edcgov.us>; Rich Stewart <rich.stewart@edcgov.us>

Cc: Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>; Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>

Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 12:27 PM

Subject: Planning Commission 4/24 public comment_Serrano Village J5&6

4/24/2014

Edcgov.us Mail - Planning Commission 4/24 public comment_Serrano Village J5&6

Please include the attached comments in public record for Planning Commission 4/24/14, agenda item 5(14-0280)

thank you
Ellen Van Dyke