

Paul J. Stanfel

April 5, 2015

El Dorado County
Board of Supervisors.
3030 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: Special Use Permit Number S08-0012R/Rancho Olivo Vineyards

Dear Supervisors and Staff

I have been a resident of El Dorado County for 34 years. I have served on the Cameron Estates Community Services District board. I am a former Marine and business owner. I value accuracy and fairness in business and the interest of the public trust. I believe much information about this matter has been inaccurately presented. It will be your opportunity to carefully digest the information and make a decision that is not influence by monetary returns or individual interests but rather, what's best for Cameron Estates and it's residence.

Perhaps your staff is not familiar with the background of this community. When this unique homeowner enclave of approximately 300 5+ acre parcels was established in the early 1960's each property deed extended to the middle of the road. As a point of reference you are welcome to research my deed at 5091 Highcrest Drive; Cameron Park, CA to verify that the deed has these parameters. Each property owner is assessed an annual fee (that was voted for by the majority of the community using the standard election process) for maintenance of the roadways within the boundaries of the Cameron Estates. The responsibility for maintenance of the roadways falls upon the Cameron Estates Community Services District (CECSD), a legal entity recognized by the State of California. The CECSD is entrusted with controlling the right of way and the right of passage over each property owner's land and the primary charter is to maintain the roadways using the summation of the funds from the annual assessment.

As such each property owner is liable for any accidents or injuries that occur on their property including to the center of the road in front of that property. This in itself makes it difficult because unlike El Dorado County (EDC) maintained roads or roads that are adopted by EDC , it is the responsibility of each property owner and the CECSD to minimize the risk to each other property owner that uses said roads for themselves and their guests. By introducing a commercial enterprise to such a

complex community dynamic it adds additional levels of responsibility to, not only the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, if they should choose to ignore this special circumstance, but also to the CECSD and each and every property owner in the community. Even the attorney advising the Planning Commission, when this matter was taken up, stated that these roads are private roads and fall under the jurisdiction of the Cameron Estates Community Services District. You have the letter from the CECSD expressing their opposition in this matter.

I personally believe, if forced to accept commercial traffic on these non-county roads in a private-road limited-access RE 5 zoned community, all individuals responsible for that decision should and would be held liable for any accidents, injuries or death that may result. With this prior knowledge I can not find any reasonable justification for enabling a vineyard operation to have commercial access as a winery in a residential area when the only access and egress to and from that vineyard is via private property on private roads. A limited amount of research would reveal that there is no significant wine production on the Olivo property. There are at least eight other properties in the Cameron Estates that also grow wine grapes. I know of at least one of the eight that has already hosted weddings and wine tasting and is currently planning to do more.

When the planning commission issued the first special use permit I believe they were led to believe that the Olivo property was not part of Cameron Estates and that it was zone agricultural and not RE, residential. By approving the Olivo Special Use Permit Number S08-0012R, you the Board of Supervisors are acknowledging and condoning the outcome. I can only respectfully request that you and your staff carefully research the motions that you set in place. I believe that given accurate factual information you will come to the obvious conclusion that a commercial enterprise is not acceptable on roads that do not meet county standards, that are not fully supported and regulated by EDC and where EDC does not hold the deed to said property that you intend to regulate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Stanfel