

**COUNTY OF EL DORADO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT**



**Agenda of:** December 10, 2015

**Staff:** Lillian MacLeod

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT/REZONE/PLANNED  
DEVELOPMENT/TENTATIVE MAP/DEVELOPMENT  
AGREEMENT**

**FILE NUMBERS:** A11-0006/Z11-0008/PD11-0006/TM11-1505/DA14-0001/Dixon Ranch

**APPLICANT:** Dixon Ranch Ventures, LLC

**AGENT:** Joel Korotkin

**REQUEST:**

- 1) Certification of Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearing House No. 2012062023) for the Dixon Ranch Residential Project and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- 2) General Plan Amendment amending the land use designations from Low Density Residential (LDR)-278.99 acres and Open Space (OS)-1.28 acres to High Density Residential (HDR)-186.26 acres, Medium Density Residential (MDR)-21.40 acres, Low Density Residential (LDR)-5.02 acres, and Open Space (OS)-67.59 acres;
- 3) Zone Amendments amending the existing zones from Exclusive Agriculture (AE)-279.95 acres and Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5)-0.32 acre to an overall Planned Development Zone District (-PD) combined with six base zone districts as follows:

One-Family Residential (R1-PD)-177.04 acres;  
One-Acre Residential (R1A-PD)-5.52 acres;  
Single-Family Three-Acre Residential (R3A-PD)-15.88 acres;  
Estate-Residential Five-Acre (RE-5-PD)-5.02 acres;  
Recreation Facility (RF-PD)-9.22 acres; and  
Open Space (OS-PD)-67.59 acres;

- 4) Development Plan for Phase 1 of the project to allow efficient use of the land and flexibility of development under the proposed tentative subdivision map, subject to revised development standards, e.g.: lot size, height limit, and setbacks, for the proposed zones and to include gated private roads to serve the development; and Conceptual Development Plan for Phase 2 of the project, which will require a subsequent tentative map and development plan after County adopts an Oak Woodland Management Plan and in-lieu fee program consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, Option B;
- 5) Tentative Subdivision Map on the 280.27 acre property consisting of:
  - A) Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Phase 0) creating 33 large lots for financing and phasing purposes, ranging in size from 0.27 acre to 62.25 acres;
  - B) Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map for Phase 1 of the project creating a total of 411 single family residential lots ranging in size from 4,725 square feet to 5 acres on 193.15 acres of the project site; one public park lot; one clubhouse lot; eight open space lots; 10 landscape lots; six road lots; and one sewer lift station lot; and
  - C) Conceptual approval of the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map for Phase 2 of the project creating the remaining 194 single family residential lots ranging in size from approximately 4,725 square feet to 3.01 acres on the remaining 87.12 acres of the project site; one neighborhood park; and the remaining open space, landscape, and road lots necessary to serve the subdivision; and
- 6) Design waivers are requested from Standard Plan 101B, or as indicated, to allow the following:
  - A) Reduced right-of-way (ROW) and roadway width for 'A' Drive and 'B' Circle to a 50 foot ROW with a 36 foot paved width from curb face to curb face, with reduced paved width of 26 feet curb face to curb face on 'B' Circle near the intersection of 'A' Drive and 'B' Circle only;
  - B) Reduced roadway width for 'C' Drive to 24 feet from curb face to curb face in the vicinity of the Green Springs Creek crossing;

- C) Reduced ROW and roadway width for 'D' Drive through 'N' Drive and 'P' Drive through 'Y' Drive to a 40 foot ROW with a 30 foot paved width from curb face to curb face;
- D) Reduced roadway width for dead-end roads in excess of 500 feet to 30 feet from curb face to curb face;
- E) Modify Standard Plan 103A-1 to:
  - (1) Allow driveway to be within 25 feet from a radius return;
  - (2) Reduce minimum driveway widths from 16 feet to 10 feet wide for secondary single car garages where a larger driveway for the same property is also proposed; and
  - (3) Eliminate 4 foot taper to back of curb;
- F) Reduced sidewalk width to 5 feet (4.5 feet from back of curb to back of walk);
- G) Reduced gutter pan width for both vertical and rolled curb and gutter to 10 inches and 8 inches, respectively;
- H) Sidewalks on one side of roads that serve the Age-Restricted, Small Lot Village, and Large Lot Village units, only;
- I) Reverse horizontal curves without a 100 foot tangent;
- J) Reduced ROW and roadway width for hammerhead and Wye turnarounds;
- K) Maximum centerline grade for 'A' Drive to be 12 percent; and
- L) Reduced intersection spacing to less than 300 feet between the intersections of 'B' Drive/'A' Drive and 'B' Circle/'E' Drive.

**LOCATION:** On the south side of Green Valley Road, approximately 150 feet east of the intersection with Malcolm Dixon Road in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills, Supervisorial District 1. (Exhibits A and D)

**APNs:** 126-020-01, 126-020-02, 126-020-03, 126-020-04, and 126-150-23. (Exhibits B1 and B2)

**ACREAGE:** 280.27 acres

**GENERAL PLAN:** Low Density Residential (LDR) Open Space (OS) (Exhibit C)

**ZONING:** Exclusive Agriculture (AE), Estate Residential-5 acres (RE-5) (Exhibit E)

**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:** Environmental Impact Report

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission make the following recommendation to the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt Resolution 2016-xxx certifying the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH No. 2012062023) for the proposed Dixon Ranch Residential Project, subject to CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations;
2. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP), in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(a), (Exhibit F);
3. Adopt Resolution 2016-xxx amending the General Plan from Low Density Residential (LDR, 278.99 acres) and Open Space (OS, 1.28 acres) to High Density Residential (HDR, 186.26 acres), Medium Density Residential (MDR, 21.40 acres), LDR (5.02 acres), and OS (67.59 acres) (General Plan Amendment A11-0006), based on the Findings;
4. Adopt Ordinance No. XXX rezoning property from Exclusive Agriculture (AE, 279.95 acres) and Estate Residential Five-acres (RE-5, 0.32 acres) to One-family Residential (R1-PD, 177.04 acres); One-acre Residential (R1A-PD, 5.52 acres); Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A-PD, 15.88 acres); Estate-residential Five-acre (RE-5-PD, 5.02 acres); Recreation Facility (RF-PD, 9.22 acres); and Open Space (OS-PD, 67.59 acres) (Zoning Ordinance Amendment Z11-0008), based on the Findings;
5. Approve the Phase 1 Development Plan containing several residential lot types, including age-restricted units. Residences will be served by gated private roads. The development will provide a public park, open space, and landscape areas totaling 62.84 acres; internal pedestrian/bicycle circulation consisting of sidewalks, pedestrian pathways, open space trails, and multi-use trails; and a public Class 2 bike lane from Green Valley Road to the on-site public park. (Exhibits G1-2) (Development Plan PD11-0006), based on the Findings and Conditions of Approval;
6. Approve the Large-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map creating 33 large lots for financing and phasing purposes (TM11-1505) (Exhibit H1);
7. Approve the Phase 1 Tentative Map consisting of 411 residential lots, one public park lot, eight open space lots, 10 landscape lots, six road lots, and one public utility lot (TM11-1505) (Exhibits H1,2,and 3), based on the Findings and subject to the MMRP and Conditions of Approval;
8. Approve Design Waivers 1 through 12, based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval;
9. Conceptually approve Phase 2 of Development Plan PD11-0006 in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 130.040.010.A (Exhibit I); and

10. Adopt Ordinance No. XXX approving the Dixon Ranch Development Agreement (DA14-0001). (Exhibit J)

**SITE DESCRIPTION:** The project site is 280 acres of rolling grassland with oak trees situated south of Green Valley Road in the El Dorado Hills Community Region. The project site currently has two residential structures and several outbuildings located in the northcentral portion of the property that gain access directly from the terminus of Verde Valle Lane and Green Valley Road. No other structures exist on the site except those that are ancillary to the seasonal grazing operations, such as cattle gates, fences, and feed troughs.

**Existing Ponds:** Two man-made ponds (Upper and Lower Ponds) exist within the on-site corridor of Green Spring Creek separated by an earthen embankment that provides access to the site. Both ponds have a combined area of approximately 3.8 acres. Another embankment with a spillway exists on the west end of the Lower Pond (Exhibit K). Both embankments have been in place for over 50 years. Ongoing pond maintenance efforts are expected to improve drainage flow capacity and reduce the potential for downstream flooding and maintain the health of the ponds, regardless of whether the Dixon Ranch project is approved or not. Any improvements to the ponds in the course of the maintenance procedures will be subject to separate permitting requirements and CEQA analysis.

**Existing AE Zoning:** The project parcels have historically been used for a commercial grazing operation under a previous Williamson Act contract (WAC) designated as Agricultural Preserve No. 2. The Williamson Act contract provided the property owner with a reduction in property taxes for a 10-year commitment to maintain the land for agricultural use. The contract is unique in that the 10 year term is automatically extended annually unless the property owner files a Notice of Non-renewal, which starts a 9 year roll out. As part of the enrollment process, the property owners were required by the County to amend their zone to the Exclusive Agriculture (AE) Zone District to meet the state requirement that lands encumbered under a WAC be distinguished from non-contracted land. Subsequent roll-out of the WAC occurred in two stages, so that complete roll-out was effective February 1999. The County does not require the property owners to rezone to a compatible non-encumbered zone district when rolling out, so the project parcels still remain designated by the AE zone. The property currently is being used for seasonal grazing, with a small portion at the northwest boundary for strawberry cultivation.

**SMUD Easement:** At the southeast corner of the project site, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) was granted right-of-way in 1960 on the easement now described as APN 126-020-04 by Malcolm and Maude Dixon, the property owners at that time. The Grant of Right of Way was recorded by the County in Book 500 Page 333. Ownership of the parcel is currently under the *Fay Louie Trust, et al.* The parcel is being assessed as right-of-way and not fee title; therefore, SMUD is subject to taxation as the right-of-way holder. Limitations on the development of the parcel by the property owners are addressed in the Grant of Right of Way and consist primarily of a non-building restriction.

## **I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The Dixon Ranch project would subdivide approximately 280 acres into 605 residential lots (Exhibit L). However, since the entire project cannot meet the oak canopy retention standards of General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4, the project is proposed in two Phases. Phase 1 consists of 411 dwelling units on 193 acres and is described in further detail in Section V of this staff report. Phase 2 is a conceptual design only, and consists of 194 lots on 87 acres (Exhibit I). The entire project, including both Phase 1 and 2, are fully analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report and this staff report, but the recommendation is to approve only the Phase 1 tentative map and development plan. The Phase 2 tentative map and development plan would be subject to future action, as described in further detail in the Phasing Section of the staff report.

The Dixon Ranch project proposes 604 new single-family detached residential lots with one 5-acre lot created to include the existing Dixon Residence. Approximately 160 of the lots would be age-restricted to at least one qualified permanent resident 55 years of age and older. A clubhouse would be constructed to accommodate these residents. The remaining 444 lots may be developed as both production and custom homes. The 604 lots would range in size from 4,725 square feet to over three acres.

The General Plan Amendments (A11-0006) are being requested to allow the proposed increase to 2.16 dwelling units per acre in overall residential density. Zone amendments and a development plan (Z11-0008, PD11-0006) have been requested to accommodate each lot size and type. Design Guidelines have been prepared detailing the architectural and landscape standards proposed within the subdivision, as well as the design review process that would be required to ensure compatibility and compliance with these standards.

The project would include approximately 84 acres of open space areas constituting 30 percent of the project site, in the form of parks, trails, landscape lots, and natural open spaces. The natural water features of intermittent and ephemeral channels, seasonal wetlands, and seeps would be preserved on-site within the proposed open space lots. The largest park, known as Village Park (Exhibit M - Lot A) would comprise 9.2 acres and be accessed off the main 'A Drive' entrance by both residents of the subdivision and the public. A second smaller park, known as Neighborhood Park, would comprise 1.9 acres and would be available for residents of the subdivision, only (Exhibit N).

The project requires on-site and off-site road and utility improvements to serve the development. Access would be provided to the site from the two proposed entrance roads, 'A' and 'C' Drives, that would directly connect to Green Valley Road. Due to the close proximity of these two access roads, three emergency vehicle access easements (EVAs) are required by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department and would be created at the south, west, and east boundaries of the project. Public sewer and water would be provided on all but the 5-acre lot, which would continue to be served from existing well and septic systems. Annexations into the El Dorado Irrigation District; the El Dorado Hills Community Service District; and the El Dorado Hills County Water District (El Dorado Hills Fire Department) would be required.

**Phasing:** The project is proposed to be developed in two phases to comply with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4. The County may approve the proposed General Plan and zone amendments over the entire project 280 acres, but can only approve a tentative map and development plan that is consistent with the oak tree canopy retention and replacement standards under General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 Option A. The proposed Phase 1 tentative map and development plan would involve 193.15 acres of the project site and create 411 single-family residential lots, including the 5 acre existing Dixon Residence. The Village Park would be developed at this time, as would the clubhouse within the age-restricted development area. Open space serving this phase would exceed the 30 percent requirement of 58 acres by creating approximately 63 acres comprising the Village Park and specific open space and landscaped lots. All infrastructures necessary to serve the 411 lots and provide the backbone for the Phase 2 lots would be developed during Phase 1. Internal circulation roads delineated as Lots R1 through R5 would be stubbed out and emergency vehicle accesses (EVAs) reconfigured until such time as Phase 2 could be developed.

Phase 2 would consist of a future tentative map and development plan for the remaining 194 lots, the remaining portions of the road, utility, and trail systems to serve these lots, as well as the remaining open space to meet overall requirements, including the Neighborhood Park (Exhibit I). The Neighborhood Park would be designated with the R1-PD zone that allows public parks by right in the base R1 zone and the ability to modify that requirement to restrict its use to subdivision residents with the –PD combining zone. The Neighborhood park is 1.9 acres in size and would provide passive recreational uses with some limited areas for active uses within open turf and half-court basketball areas.

The Phase 2 future tentative map and development plan could only move forward under one of two scenarios: 1) submittal of tentative map and development plan applications that would comply with the General Plan oak canopy retention standards; or 2) submittal of tentative map and development plan applications when General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4 Option B (in lieu fee program) becomes available under an adopted Oak Resource Mitigation Plan and subject to further environmental review. The County is in the process of updating the Biological Resources Policies of the General Plan, including implementation of an Oak Resource Management Plan and the Option B in-lieu fee program. That project is planned to be completed later in 2016.

**Land Use Distribution:** Table 1 summarizes the land use designation and residential development types proposed for the project and delineated on the Proposed General Plan and Zoning Designations and Conceptual Site Plans (Exhibits O and L, respectively), as follows:

The Non-age Restricted Hillside Custom and the Medium Density Estate and Estate Large Lots are intended to be developed with custom home construction. All other lot types with the exception of the LDR lot will be constructed as production units.

**TABLE 1 – Residential Development Summary**

<b>Lot Type</b>	<b>Approximate Lot Size in Square Feet (Acres)</b>	<b>Average Lot Size in Square Feet</b>	<b>Number of Lots</b>
<b>High-Density Residential (HDR) Lots</b>			
R1-PD Lot Type			
<i>Age-Restricted Village Units</i>			
Small Lot	4,725 to 9,989	6,080	80
Large Lot	5,775 to 12,685	7,360	80
<i>Non Age-Restricted Units</i>			
Village Small Lot	5,775 to 11,751	7,290	149
Village Large Lot	6,825 to 18,017	9,410	173
Hillside	10,740 to 47,922	14,230	54
Hillside Custom	12,135 to 39,422	20,410	58
<b>Total HDR Lots</b>			<b>594</b>
<b>Medium Density Residential (MDR) Lots</b>			
R1A-PD Estate	43,800 to 52,141 (1.0 – 1.2 acres)	48,051	5
R3A-PD Estate Large Lot	131,046 to 144,526 (3.0 – 3.2 acres)	136,016	5
<b>Total MDR Lots</b>			<b>10</b>
<b>Existing Low Density Residential (LDR) Lots</b>			
RE-5-PD	218,276 (5 acres)		1
<b>Total LDR Lots</b>			<b>1</b>
<b>TOTAL LOTS</b>			<b>605</b>

**Access and Circulation:** Access to the site would be provided by two direct connections to Green Valley Road: A Drive and C Drive. A Drive is located approximately 0.5 mile east of the Malcolm Dixon Road intersection. C Drive is located 1,000 feet east of the Malcolm Dixon Road intersection. The Dixon Residence (Lot 1) would continue to be accessed from Verde Valle Lane, which connects to Green Valley Road by way of West Green Springs Road. Lots 2 and 3 may take direct access from Green Valley Road through a shared easement as a result of Lot 2’s frontage on this road. Lot Z containing the proposed lift station would also have direct access from Green Valley Road for maintenance purposes.

A Drive and C Drive pass through easements on adjoining property fronting Green Valley Road before reaching the project site: A Drive by a distance of 630 feet and C Drive by 150 feet. A Drive would be constructed within an existing 90-foot easement to provide the main entrance to the site as well as public access to the Village Park. A Drive would be controlled by a signal installed at its intersection with Green Valley Road that would provide full turning movements. One lane would be provided for inbound traffic and two lanes provided for outbound traffic to allow both left and right turning movements onto Green Valley Road. Class II bike lanes will be constructed on both sides of this road (see EIR Figure III-10b). C Drive will be constructed approximately 1,400 feet west of A Drive, but would provide only limited right-in/right-out turning movements within an existing 60-foot easement. The right-out turning movement would be controlled by a stop sign installed as part of the project (see EIR Figure III-10a).



Several improvements to Green Valley Road, to include but not be limited to shoulder widening, relocation of utility poles, and realignment of some existing driveways are being proposed as part of access road construction. Based on EIR Figures III-10a and b, off-site grading may be required as a part of constructing these road improvements to Green Valley Road as well as both access drives. Additional right-of-way or slope easements may be necessary for those off-site areas on private property. The project will be required to acquire any necessary off-site property or easements. If the property or easements cannot be obtained by the developer, then the developer will initially propose alternative engineering designs to limit grading or other construction activities to within the right-of-ways. If off-site property is required for Green Valley Road improvements, then the County may invoke its eminent domain authority to acquire private property for public purposes. A standard condition has been applied to the project addressing the process, timing, and agreements necessary to acquire private property pursuant to State Government Code Section 66462.5.

**Pedestrian Circulation:** Sidewalks and trails would be provided throughout the subdivision as shown on the Conceptual Site Plan (Exhibit O). All internal roads would generally have sidewalks on one side, with the exception of the roads within the Hillside, Hillside Custom, and Estate Residential lot areas.

A multi-use trail system would surround the Age-Restricted development within landscape lots P, Q, and S and open space lot N. Pedestrian pathways would be created to meander through open space lots L and M, with those in Lot L providing connection to and from the clubhouse. Interconnections would link the internal sidewalks within the Age-Restricted development with these two trail and pathway systems.

To the northernmost portion of the project, a system of sidewalks, pedestrian pathways, and multi-use trails would provide public access to the Village Park. Open space and multi-use trails within landscape and open space lots E, X, and Y would provide park access and connections to its trails for the residents of the subdivision.

**Emergency Vehicle Access:** Three emergency vehicle access easements (EVAs) are being proposed to meet the intent of fire codes and County standards pursuant to the *Dixon Ranch Wildland Fire Safety Plan* (CDS Fire Prevention Planning, revised 7/13) (Exhibit P). The proposed EVAs are located at the west boundary to connect with the stub-out at Lima Way, a public road within the Highland View subdivision; at the east boundary to connect with Marden Drive, a private road within the Green Springs Ranch subdivision; and at the south boundary to connect with East Green Springs Road also a private road within the Green Springs Ranch subdivision. It shall be noted that the EVAs would also allow reciprocal access through the project site for the adjoining Highland View and Green Springs Ranch subdivision residents should an emergency require it.

**Grading and Earthwork:** Approximately 570,000 cubic yards of grading is being proposed for both phases of the project and in a manner that will allow cut and fill to be balanced on site. Phase 1 will comprise 440,000 cubic yards of the total grading, as shown in the preliminary grading and drainage plan for that phase (Exhibit Q1-2). The majority of the earthwork involves the construction of the road circulation network and site preparation for residential construction. Mass pad grading is proposed for the production units on the Age-Restricted, Village and Hillside lots. With the

exception of Lots 402 through 407, all Hillside Custom and Estate Residential lots will be custom graded.

Site preparation would include mass pad grading to establish individual residential pads where indicated, construct site drainage infrastructure, driveways, and retaining walls, and construct underground trenches for dry (e.g. electric, gas, cable, phone) and wet utilities (e.g. sewer, drainage, water). Subdivision road improvements would be constructed in accordance with the standards of the County Design and Improvement Standards Manual, Grading and Drainage Ordinances, and applicable fire codes. These improvements include construction of access and internal roads according to County standards, subject to approval of the requested design waivers, on- and off-site EVAs, service roads, creek crossings, and placement of ancillary drainage facilities and utilities. Grading for the Village Park would be included in the Phase 1 cubic yard total. Grading permits and improvement plans would be required by the County prior to commencement of any construction.

**Drainage:** The site generally drains to the north/northeast into Green Spring Creek that runs along the northern boundary of the site parallel to Green Valley Road. Green Spring Creek flows east to west into New York Creek before draining into Folsom Reservoir. In the southwestern portion of the site, natural channels conduct drainage to the south/southwest into Allegheny Creek and ultimately Folsom Reservoir by way of Green Spring and New York Creeks. As shown in the preliminary grading and drainage plans for Phase 1, development of the site includes design and construction of storm drainage facilities. Conveyance of drainage generally follows the topography of the site. Lot drainage is conveyed via a storm drain network of underground lines, drainage inlets, ditches, and gutters along subdivision roads that drain into man-made detention ponds in the southwest portion of the project or pass through rock dissipaters before being released into natural on-site streams, channels, and wetlands to flow off-site. A final detailed drainage report is required prior to construction to design the infrastructure necessary to achieve pre- and post-development peak flow balance consistent with the Grading Ordinance, Grading Design Manual, and Drainage Manual.

#### **Utilities:**

**Water:** Currently, three domestic wells are on site to serve the existing residential uses and grazing operations. Two are located in the northern portion of the site adjacent to the current and former Dixon Residences and the third is located in the southeast portion of the site. Of the three wells, two would be abandoned with one remaining to provide water to the Dixon Residence. On-site public water would serve the remaining development through connections to one or all of the existing water lines nearest the project site: the 12-inch water line in Green Valley Road, the 10-inch water line at the intersection of Clarksville Road and Greenview Drive, and/or the 8-inch water line located in Lima Way at the west boundary of the site (Exhibit R). It is likely that one pressure reducing station would be required to accommodate the Lima Way connection. All off-site water lines and infrastructure would be located within existing and proposed road and EVA easements. Water availability and adequate pressure to serve the project would be ensured under Mitigation Measures UTL-1 and 2.

**Recycled Water:** In 2004, the EID Board of Directors mandated the use of recycled water for all new subdivisions in the recycled water service area. While the availability of recycled water is currently limited to El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park, the project is not within the recycled water service area pursuant to the *Wastewater Facilities Master Plan, El Dorado Irrigation District* (2013). As a result, no recycled water is being proposed to serve the project.

**Sewer:** All proposed lots and facilities will connect to a public sewer system, except for the Dixon residence, which will continue to use its private septic system. The on-site sewer system infrastructure would include a lift station constructed at the northernmost point of the project site on Lot Z, with gravity lines, force mains, and individual pump systems installed throughout the subdivision (Exhibit R). Three off-site alternatives have been identified that would all require, in part, connecting to the existing gravity sewer line in Lima Way; improvements to split the sewer flows near the intersection of Lima Way and Aberdeen Way; and use of the existing sewer system in the Highland View subdivision to direct flows to the existing Highland Hills Lift Station. Once the sewer flows are split, the existing gravity lines running through the road easements of Highland View can adequately serve the project. Off-site improvements associated with the alternatives could involve up-sizing existing wastewater lines, improving existing wastewater lines, or construction of a lift station subject to El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) requirements. The potential alternatives are shown in the EIR Section IV.L – Utilities, as Figures IV.L-1, 2, and 3. While most of the off-site improvements would occur in existing road easements, all three alternatives would require installation of a new sewer line within the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) corridor, outside of a road easement. Environmental impacts from construction within this corridor were analyzed in the EIR with specific mitigation warranted to reduce potential impacts to an on-site swale and special status plant species within the corridor (UTL-3).

The Facility Plan Report would address the expansion of the water and sewer facilities to meet service demands and specific fire flow requirements for each phase of the project. Off-site sewer and water infrastructure would be constructed during Phase 1 to accommodate both phases of the project with internal connections completed as needed for each unit of development. Mitigation measures AIR 1, 2, 3; CULT-1, 2, 3; GEO-1; and NOI-1 would generally apply to the construction and installation of the sewer and water systems.

**Dry Utilities:** Overhead electrical connections would be made approximately two miles east and continuing to the northernmost point of the project site from existing utility lines running parallel to Green Valley Road (Exhibit S). Improvements would consist of the addition or replacement of poles, wires, overhead switches or fusing, as well as ancillary tree trimming and perfection of the existing right of way. Underground electrical connections would be made from the existing utility easements located southwest of the site beginning in Sangiovese Drive and continuing north and east to Lima Way where a gas stub-out is located that would also serve the project. With the possible exception of the overhead utility lines through the northeast portion of the project, new on-site utilities will be provided through underground connections within the internal roadway easements. Existing connections to the Dixon residence (Lot 1) would remain the same.

## II. ADJACENT LAND USES:

To supplement the discussion below, Exhibit T delineates the Community Region boundaries and the existing residential development densities that have been currently approved surrounding the project site.

**West:** The Highland View subdivision immediately west of the project was designated as an “Urban Area” under the Long Range Plan in effect at the time. The original map that was submitted in 1986 proposed 300 residential lots, but was withdrawn due to the requirement for an EIR. Shortly after in 1987 the Dixon family filed for roll-out of their Williamson Act contract (WAC). The subdivision application was then resubmitted reducing the number of residential lots to 245 and rezoning the site from Estate residential -10 acres (RE-10) to Residential – One-half acre (R20K). As the subdivision would directly adjoin the Dixon property, staff conferred with the Agricultural Commissioner, who determined that due to the roll-out of the WAC and the AE-zoned property’s location within the Community Region, it could no longer be seen as useful for agriculture, so no agricultural setbacks, parcel size limitations, or agricultural fencing requirements would apply to the Highland View subdivision map. The resubmitted subdivision application was approved under a Negative Declaration in 1989 when the Dixon WAC was still active with eight years remaining before complete roll-out.

The approved map created a buffer area of approximately 100 feet between the nearest residential lot and the Dixon property. The buffer area was designated Lot 241/Phase 6, but it was also designated for “future development”. A revision to the map on April 24, 1990 delineated a “future road” running through the buffer and connecting Highland View to the Dixon property. The roadway was designated as ‘A Drive’. In December 2001, a final map was recorded developing Phase 6, now re-designated as Unit 7, with 14 residential lots and one utility lot. ‘A Drive’ was recorded as ‘Lima Way’ and delineated as a 50 foot right-of-way with 36 feet of paved width to Standard Plan 101-B standards. It is listed as a public, County-maintained road.

**East:** Green Springs Ranch subdivision map and rezone were approved on July 13, 1976 creating a total of 99 lots on approximately 629 acres. The existing zoning was amended from Exclusive Agriculture (AE) to Estate Residential (RE-5), Agricultural (A), and Residential-agricultural – 20 acres (RA-20). The approved lots ranged in size from 5 acres to approximately 16 acres. Four parcel maps were later approved further subdividing the largest four lots into 10 approximately five acre lots. In November 1976, the overall zoning for the subdivision was amended to Residential-agriculture, five acre minimums (RE-5) as part of the adopted Rescue Area Plan.

The Green Springs Ranch subdivision is surrounded on the east by the Cameron Park Community Region and on the west and south by the El Dorado Hills Community Region. North of the subdivision boundary, two 10-acre undeveloped parcels separate the subdivision from Green Valley Road. Both the Green Springs Ranch subdivision and these two parcels lie within the Rural Region.

Condition 7 of the Green Springs Ranch tentative map was amended at hearing by the Board of Supervisors to require an EVA easement from the southerly portion of the property to connect to

Bass Lake Road “if legally possible” and if not, that an EVA easement be provided through the “adjoining portions of the subdivision connecting the subdivision to Green Valley Road”. The approved site plan delineated two potential connections to Green Valley Road; one by extending Marden Drive through the Dixon property to the west and the other by extending Green Springs Road through the Dixon property to the north. These EVA connections were never made and it was not until the development of Serrano Villages K1/K2 in 2002 did Green Springs Ranch have a secondary access from Clarksville Road. With approval of the Dixon Ranch project, the two connections from Marden Drive and Green Springs Road can finally be completed ensuring the Green Springs Ranch subdivision has emergency access to Green Valley Road as originally planned.

Condition 5 of the original approval required the internal roads and easements to be dedicated for the public and public utilities’ use. On January 24, 2002, a hearing was held before the Planning Commission for a finding of consistency to abandon the internal roads and offers of dedication at the request of the property owners association. On February 25, 2003, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Resolution of Vacation for roads within the Green Springs Ranch subdivision that reserved and excepted from vacation all public utility, non-vehicular trails, vehicular and non-vehicular ingress and egress, and emergency vehicle access easements to adjoining property under General Vacation #2002-01

**North:** To the north and northwest of the project boundaries is a group of lots ranging in size from 0.78 acres to 10 acres, with the majority of lots measuring five acres each. The lots have been subdivided and in a few instances, resubdivided over the years from 1973 to 1990. The largest 10 acre lot has an active parcel map approved in 2007 creating two five-acre lots. To date, it has not been recorded. While located in the Rural Region, this group of lots is surrounded on three sides by the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

**South:** El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Village M is located along the northern border of the Specific Plan where it is characterized by rolling-to-steep topography. This village was reserved for large residential lots ranging from 4 to 7 acres in size and was anticipated to accommodate approximately 37 dwelling units.

Prior to its expiration in 2009, the Development Agreement (DA) for the Specific Plan allowed the Planning Director to modify the zoning under Section 1.8, providing the modification did not “substantially alter the term, permitted uses, density or intensity of use, provisions for reservation and dedication of land . . . and is otherwise consistent with the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, the El Dorado Hills/Salmon Falls Area Plan and the County General Plan.” Section 2.1.1 of the Development Agreement further acknowledged that the number of dwelling units in any of the residential neighborhoods or any of the villages may vary within the Specific Plan, and that a density transfer between villages may occur provided that the Specific Plan densities and total units were not exceeded. Consistent with the provisions in the Development Agreement, subsequent revisions to the Village M tentative map approved between 2001 through 2007 have increased the total residential lots in Village M from 37 to 168.

### III. SPECIFIC ISSUES:

**Water Supply Assessment:** As a result of enactment of Senate Bill 610 in 2001, Public Resources Code Section 21151.9 was added requiring residential developments proposing more than 500 dwelling units to prepare a water supply assessment that would analyze the sufficiency of the supply to meet the existing and planned water demands over a 20-year projection. Based on the *Water Supply Assessment for the Dixon Ranch Residential Project, August 2013* (WSA), prepared for and approved by EID Board of Directors on August 26, 2013, the project's completion schedule was estimated at being well within the 20-year projection. To determine the specific water demand for the project, EID gathered water use data from the surrounding Serrano and El Dorado Hills developments for the years 2008 through 2012, as that time period best represented the greatest number of constructed homes with established landscaping over a range of climatic conditions. This data was then used to derive the average annual water use expected for the indoor and outdoor uses of each proposed dwelling unit, based on lot size. The resulting size classifications ranged from approximately 5,000 square feet to three acre lots, consistent with the project's range of new development. A 'baseline unit water demand factor' was then established for each classification, as expressed in a value of acre feet per dwelling unit (af/du). The method and basis for determining each baseline factor are detailed within the WSA (EIR Appendix F, pgs. 2-1 to 2-9). Table 2-1 of the WSA summarizes the project's residential water demand, with a 10 percent reduction applied to each classification based on current water efficiency building codes and landscape ordinances.

Non-residential baseline water demand factors were also established for the indoor and outdoor uses of the following project classifications: Village and Community Parks, Community Center (clubhouse), and miscellaneous uses, such as street medians, environmental mitigation, sewer lift stations, and natural ponds. Data gathering and methodology are detailed in the WSA (pgs. 2-6 to 2-9), with the resulting baseline unit expressed in a value of acre-feet per acre (af/ac). Table 2-2 of the WSA summarizes the non-residential demand factors by classification. Conservation reductions were not applied, due to the inconstancy of climatic conditions on water usage for what are mostly landscape features.

As analyzed and reflected in Table 2-3 of the WSA, the residential and non-residential components of the Dixon Ranch project would require a total of 427 acre feet of water per year (af/year) at buildout. Further added to this amount is 'non-revenue demand', represented as water delivered but not billed to the customer as a result of system leaks and inaccuracies in meter readings, and unmetered uses such as fire protection and hydrant flushing. EID calculates non-revenue demand at a fixed rate of 13 percent for an additional 55 af/year, bringing the year-2035 project total at build-out of both phases to 482 acre feet per year.

To assess the increase in county-wide water demand from the project, a baseline was established from the current water demands of customers and uses in the EID service area. Based on the 2012 *Water Diversion Report*, which best represents current baseline demand by factoring in conservation efforts, new rate structures, and other variables, 38,984 acre-feet was diverted into the potable water and recycled water systems to meet customer demands. Included in that amount was non-revenue water and 1,269 acre-feet that was sold to the City of Placerville for that year. Table 3-1 of the WSA

estimated demand from that baseline in five year increments thereafter to 2035 (WSA pg. 3-7). Ongoing implementation of water conservation measures were factored in to reduce year-2020 estimates by two percent and year-2035 by another one percent. The categories used for Table 3-1, in addition to the Current Customers and Uses baseline, include:

- Other Currently Proposed Projects: Includes demands for three projects for which EID concurrently prepared WSAs – Central El Dorado Hills, Lime Rock Valley, and the Village of Marble Valley Specific Plans.
- Adjusted General Plan Land Use: Includes demand projections from EID's 2013 *Integrated Water Resources Master Plan (IWRMP)*, adjusted to remove the project and the three proposed specific plans' demands (included in a separate category), and adjusted based on project applications with Facility Improvement Letters (FILs) issued by EID;
- Standard 13 percent non-revenue water demand.

The Adjusted General Plan Land Use category eliminated double counting from the baseline estimated demand in the 2013 *IWRMP* by removing the current underlying land use designation(s) of the project parcels, the three proposed specific plans, and those FIL-issued projects that included General Plan amendments. Excluding Dixon Ranch, the total water demand in year-2035 is estimated at 66,813 acre feet per year at build-out for all existing and planned future uses. The totals in Table 3-1 are conservative as they assume full build-out in 2035 of all proposed projects, which is not often the case due to market conditions and other factors.

Table 3-2 uses the estimated five-year water demands from Table 3-1 to calculate the impact of the Dixon Ranch project on total water demands through year-2035 (WSA pg. 3-8). With inclusion of the Dixon Ranch project demand of 482 acre feet per year at build-out, the estimated water demand of the project plus all existing and future uses totals 67,295 acre feet in year-2035. The estimated water demand from the project comprises 0.7 percent of this total.

Water delivery to the project site will be either from the El Dorado Hills Water System consisting primarily of Folsom Reservoir, or the Western/Eastern System, consisting primarily of upstream American River and Cosumnes River watershed diversions. EID will serve the project in both normal and dry water years using not only these water sources, but those sources obtained from planned water rights, entitlements, and supplies. As shown in Table 4-1 (WSA pg. 4-3), with the inclusion of these planned water sources plus recycled water supplies into the existing water sources, the planned water supply availability would range from 77,885 acre-feet in a single dry year to a maximum of 130,690 acre-feet in normal years. The WSA also evaluated supply and demand in a multiple dry year scenario (Table 5-1). The analysis concludes that EID will have sufficient water under all hydrologic conditions in each of the 5-year increments through 2035.

### **Roadway Impacts and Necessary Improvements:**

An extensive traffic analysis was conducted for the Dixon Ranch EIR that identified effects upon and improvements for the local roadway system of arterials, streets, and controlling intersections serving El Dorado Hills. While the EIR provides a detailed impact analysis and list of required

improvements, a summary of those improvements that the applicant would be required to construct is as follows:

1. Intersection #2, Green Valley Road/El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Salmon Falls Road:

- Modify lane configuration on the southbound approach to result in one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.
- Install an additional through lane in each direction along Green Valley Road.
- Extend the westbound left-turn pocket from Green Valley Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard to 250 feet (from 105 feet) to accommodate future traffic projections. This would require widening Green Valley Road between El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway.
- To accommodate the westbound through queue, an additional westbound through lane shall be provided on Green Valley Road between El Dorado Hills Boulevard and Silva Valley Parkway that is long enough to accommodate the anticipated queuing and other operational considerations.
- The northbound through queue extends beyond the next intersection to the south, Timberline Ridge Drive. To prevent blocking of traffic entering and exiting Timberline Ridge Drive, “Keep Clear” markings shall be added to northbound El Dorado Hills Boulevard lanes in front of the Timberline Ridge Drive intersection.

2. Intersection #12, El Dorado Hills Boulevard/Francisco Drive:

- The southbound through queue extends beyond the next intersection to the north, Telegraph Hill Road. To prevent blocking of traffic entering and exiting Telegraph Hill Road, “Keep Clear” markings shall be added to southbound El Dorado Hills Boulevard lanes in front of the Telegraph Hill Road intersection.

3. Intersection #4, Green Valley Road/Loch Way:

- Addition of a two-way left-turn lane along Green Valley Road in the immediate vicinity of the intersection with Loch Way.

4. Intersection #7, Green Valley Road/Deer Valley Road:

- To ensure proper timing for the installation of the traffic signal control, the applicant shall be required to perform traffic signal warrants and LOS analysis at this intersection with each final map.

5. Intersection #24, Silva Valley Parkway/Appian Way:

- To ensure proper timing for the installation of the traffic signal control, the applicant shall be responsible to perform traffic signal warrants and LOS analysis at this intersection with each final map.

Those improvements within the EIR that are not listed here are already included in the 10-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). In those cases, the applicant would be required to pay TIM fees as their proportionate fair share towards the costs of the improvements. Should the applicant choose to



construct the improvements instead, they could enter into a reimbursement agreement with the County to recoup the costs incurred in excess of their proportionate fair share.

**Noise:**

Off-site operational noise, or off-site noise generated by the increase in traffic projected from the project, was analyzed for impacts on outdoor residential use areas along Green Valley Road at 12 roadway segments from Cameron Park Drive to Francisco Drive, inclusively. All roadway segments currently have traffic noise levels in excess of the weighted average measured over a 24-hour period (65dBA L<sub>dn</sub>). At this level, an increase of 1.5 dB would be considered a significant impact. Based on the study, and as analyzed in Section IV-F of the EIR, the project would not exceed 1.5 dB in either of the ‘existing + project’ or the ‘existing + approved projects + project’ scenarios.

On-site operational noise, specifically as a result of traffic-generated noise from Green Valley Road, was analyzed for impacts on proposed residential development. It was found that the 60dBA L<sub>dn</sub> threshold for outdoor residential use areas was attained at a distance of 294 feet or more from the centerline of Green Valley Road. Therefore, Lots 2, 3, and 4 could potentially be impacted by excessive noise levels due to their location along this road. Without knowing where the residential development on these custom lots would be sited, mitigation measure NOI-2 would ensure that if development was to occur within 294 feet from Green Valley Road, a site specific noise analysis would be required prior to grading permit approval demonstrating that the addition of either a berm, soundwall, or combination of both would attenuate the noise levels on the outdoor use area to meet the acceptable threshold.

**IV. GENERAL PLAN AND ZONE AMENDMENTS (A11-0006 and Z11-0008):**

The project is located entirely within the General Plan Community Region of El Dorado Hills. The objective of establishing the community region boundaries was to create an urban limit line where growth will be directed and facilitated (2004 General Plan, Plan Concepts).

The project is currently designated for Low Density Residential (LDR) land use, with the exception of the 1.28 acre parcel at the southeast corner of the property that is designated as Open Space (OS). The project includes a request to amend these General Plan land use designations to add High Density Residential (HDR) allowing a density range of 1 to 5 dwelling units per acre (du’s/acre); Medium Density Residential (MDR) allowing a maximum of 1 du/acre; and to expand the Open Space (OS) designation from the existing 1.28 acres to approximately 68 acres. The project would retain a portion of the existing Low Density Residential (LDR) land use designation for the five-acre lot containing the existing Dixon Residence. The project would comply with the densities required within each proposed land use designation at 3.2 du’s/acre in the HDR portion, 1 du/1 to 3.2 acres in the MDR portion, and 1 du/5 acres in the LDR portion of the site. The overall density of the project would average 2.16 du’s/acre. As shown on Table 2-1 of the Land Use Element, the project’s proposed HDR, MDR, OS, and remaining LDR designations are consistent with the General Plan’s planning concept for the Community Region.

Existing zoning includes a combination of 0.32 acres of Estate Residential-Five acre (RE-5) with the remaining 279.95 acres zoned Exclusive Agriculture (AE). The existing AE zone is inconsistent with the General Plan objectives for the Community Region, both in its 20 acre minimum parcel size requirements and its land capability for rangeland and grazing operations. The AE zone is also archaic, as it no longer serves the purpose of denoting an active, contracted agricultural use of the land under the Williamson Act.

Policy 8.1.4.1 requires the Agricultural Commission to review all discretionary projects that are either agriculturally zoned or adjacent to agriculturally zoned parcels. At their hearing on November 9, 2011, the Agricultural Commissioners' reviewed the project in order to advise the reviewing authority in their decision. In narrowing their scope of deliberations to the rezone request, the Agricultural Commission determined that as the project is 1) located within the Community Region, 2) designated for residential use under the General Plan, and 3) surrounded by non-agricultural land. As such, it could not be protected as historic grazing land regardless of the criteria they use to evaluate capability, such as soils. The Agricultural Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezone from AE to residential zones.

The project proposes to amend the existing zones and add the Planned Development combining zone to each, resulting in the following proposed zones: R1-PD, R1A-PD, R3A-PD, RE5-PD, RF-PD and OS-PD. As previously discussed in Section I (Project Description), 84 acres of open space would be provided within the subdivision to meet the 30 percent requirements under the General Plan. Phase 1 compliance with open space requirements is discussed in Section V below.

As the request to amend the base zones also includes a –PD zone amendment, General Plan Policy 2.2.3.3 requires an analysis on whether the project site could support the proposed density and intensity of use based on available infrastructure and the lack of physical constraints or, if present, the ability to surmount them. The General Plan guides this analysis through Policy 2.2.5.3 that provides criteria for the County to evaluate zone amendments based on minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density, and to assess whether changes in conditions would support a higher density or intensity zone district. The specific criteria to be considered are analyzed in the attached Project Findings.

General Plan Policy 2.2.5.4 requires the Planned Development combining zone to be applied to applications creating 50 or more lots. The project complies with this requirement as well as the zone amendment requirements under Chapter 130.04 of the Zoning Ordinance with submittal of PD11-0006. The specific details of the proposed development plan are discussed in Section V below and analyzed in the attached Project Findings.

Chapter 130.68 of the Zoning Ordinance regulates the Open Space District (OS). Its standards provide a minimum 10 acre lot size unless used as an easement for pedestrian trails or paths, links between recreation or scenic areas and populations centers, or areas adjacent to water bodies or streams for scenic or recreation uses. The proposed zone amendment to OS would serve to designate those predominant woodland and water feature areas throughout the subdivision that would be maintained in their natural state (Lots D-H and J-N). These features would provide a total of approximately 68 acres to be used as pathways, multi-use trails, and scenic areas for the residents of

the subdivision. As such, all but two of the open space lots would be smaller than the 10 acre minimum (Lots F and H). However, the smaller lots would qualify for the size standard waiver due to the uses proposed for them, as well as by the flexibility allowed under the development plan.

Chapter 130.48 of the Zoning Ordinance regulates the Recreational Facilities Zone (RF). The applicant proposes a zone amendment to RF-PD for Lot A containing the Village Park. At 9.2 acres, Lot A complies with the five-acre minimum size requirement for the zone. Any variations in development standards and uses would be allowed under the required development plan. The applicant would develop and improve this park to meet the requirements of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District (EDH CSD), who will subsequently annex and maintain it for public use. Objective 2.2.4 implemented under Policy 2.2.4.1 allows a density bonus incentive to encourage the inclusion of lands that provide a public benefit as part of development. However, the applicant does not wish to request a density bonus for the 9.2 acres of dedicated public parkland, so the overall project density remains at 2.16 dwelling units per acre.

Conclusion: As determined in the Project Findings, the proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments are consistent with the provisions within these two regulatory documents and are therefore appropriate and in keeping with the County's vision for the Community Regions, as set forth in the General Plan.

## **V. PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT:**

### **1. Planned Development (PD11-0006):**

The –PD Combining Zone would allow flexibility in the development standards of all proposed zones, as detailed on pages 73 to 74 of the EIR and summarized as follows:

As defined in Section I, Table 1 of this staff report and as delineated in Exhibit G1, some of the proposed R1-PD zoned lots would be less than the standard 6,000 square foot minimum within the age-restricted core with the exception of the clubhouse (Lot C). The minimum size reduction would also include some of those lots designated as Village Small Lot that lie furthest south and southeast within the project. Buffer areas are provided between these lots and the project boundaries. In turn, those R1-PD lots to the north and southwest boundaries of the project site, designated as Hillside and Hillside Custom, would exceed the standard lot size by establishing a 10,000 square foot minimum. Lot width standards, building coverage requirements, certain setbacks, and building height requirements would be modified as shown in Exhibit G2, as well.

The proposed R1A-PD and R3A-PD lots located along the north, east, and southeast perimeters would have minimum parcel width measurements and maximum building height requirements modified to adjust for their access and topographic limitations. Lots 564-565 and 580-581 would not be developed in Phase 1. If the applicant decides to pad grade these lots in the Phase 2 tentative map and development plan, one or both of these modifications may not be required.

The proposed RE-5-PD lot would have a reduced lot width only if, at some point in the future, the property owners choose to take access from the internal R Drive. Otherwise, with access from Verde Valley Lane, this lot will be compliant with RE-5 development standards.

The proposed RF-PD lot containing the Village Park (Exhibit M) would be modified to remove minimum parcel width requirements, along with the required setback adjoining open space lots. The proposed OS-PD lots would be modified to remove minimum parcel area requirements.

**Open Space:** Open space within Phase 1 would exceed the 30 percent requirement of 58 acres by creating approximately 63 acres comprising the Village Park and specific open space and landscaped lots. The majority of neighboring lots that abut the project site would be buffered by Open Space Lots D, F, J, and K, or the Village Park. Of the 411 single-family residential lots included in the proposed Phase 1 tentative map, only 11 lots comprising less than three percent of the total residential lots would immediately border neighboring properties. These 11 lots would consist of the following development types: one lot would be 5-acres containing the existing Dixon Family Residence; three lots would be Estate Large Lots between 3.0 and 3.2 acres; one lot would be a 1.0 acre Estate lot, and six lots would be Hillside Lots between approximately one-quarter to half an acre in size.

The open space lots would be a combination of commonly owned and publicly dedicated land. With the exception of the Village Park, all open space areas will be designated with the OS-PD zone that will serve to preserve natural features, such as water courses and oak woodland, and provide passive recreational uses of scenic areas and walking and bike trails for the residents' enjoyment. The Village Park would be designated with the RF-PD zone and would provide active recreational uses for both the residents and the public.

**Landscaping:** The applicant would form a Landscape and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD) for financing purposes to maintain the open space areas delineated as Lots D, a portion of E, Lots F, G, J through L, and N, and landscape areas delineated as Lots O through Q and S through Y. A homeowners' association would be formed to maintain these lots. The El Dorado Hills Community Service District would maintain the Lot A Village Park and the remaining portion of the Lot E open space.

**Lighting:** The Landscape and Lighting Assessment District would finance the cost of operating and maintaining street lighting in public areas of the project. Street lighting would be provided at major intersections, mid-block pedestrian crossings, and along sag vertical curves where needed to establish adequate sight distance and as appropriate for public safety. Limited safety and security lighting would be provided in parking areas, play areas, and walkways at the park site, entry gate locations, and the clubhouse, where appropriate. Lighted ball fields or other light intensive uses at the park site are not being proposed and would not be allowed in the future without further discretionary review. Lighting would be consistent with the requirements under Section 130.14.170 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Gates:** Entrance gates would be located at A and C Drives, ensuring public access to the Village Park is adequately provided. Gating of smaller village areas off of the loop road or other internal roads are not being proposed in compliance with Fire Department requirements. Emergency vehicle accesses are proposed to be gated in accordance with the requirements of the final Dixon Ranch Wildland Fire Safe Plan (Exhibit P).

**Signage:** No signage is being proposed at this time. If signs are being proposed in the future, they will have to comply with the County Sign Ordinance and be presented as a revision to the development plan, potentially requiring a public hearing for approval depending on the scope of the sign plan.

**Design Guidelines:** The applicant has prepared a comprehensive set of design standards and guidelines that lay out: 1) their vision for a multi-generational community, 2) the features offered to implement their vision, and 3) the design principles that will serve to “create a visually engaging and cohesive streetscape.” Master home plan series have been developed to provide variations in building placement and massing. Architectural styles and standards would ensure diversity and cohesion within the subdivision. Landscape and irrigation guidelines would conform to the State Water Conservation Act, with additional methods offered or encouraged to further reduce water use and stormwater runoff. The composition of the Dixon Ranch Design Review Committee and the process for development review are established in the Design Guidelines (Exhibit U).

## **2. Tentative Map (TM11-1505):**

Exhibits H-1, 2, and 3 illustrate the proposed Phase 1 Dixon Ranch Tentative Subdivision Map that is being recommended for approval at this time. The proposed Phase 1 tentative map would create 411 lots on 193.15 acres of the project site for a density of 2.13 dwelling units per acre. The lots will range from 4,725 square feet to five acres in size. Generally, the size and arrangement of the lots are strategically designed to preserve existing vegetative and riparian resources and be compatible with topography, with the smaller lots clustered in the middle of the site while the larger lots are situated along the project’s perimeter.

Village Park, identified as Lot A, would be dedicated to, designed and developed in accordance with, and maintained by the El Dorado Hills Community Services District. At 9.2 acres, the park satisfies the Subdivision Ordinance parkland dedication requirement of 6.8 acres for the Phase 1 tentative map, calculated at the standard of 3.3 persons per dwelling unit and 5 acres/1,000 population for 411 dwelling units. Eight open space lots totaling 48 acres would be created for the purposes of preserving areas constrained by topography, protecting biological and cultural resources, and providing natural buffers from adjoining larger rural residential lots.

Ancillary lots that would be created to further serve the subdivision consist of the following:

1. A total of 10 lots for landscaping, located primarily along portions of the C Drive access road, the B Circle hub road, and at the two entrances into the age-restricted development, designated as Lots O through Q and S through Y;
2. All internal roads on the Phase 1 tentative map, designated as Lots R, and R1 through R5;
3. One utility lot that would house a lift station, designated Lot Z; and
4. The clubhouse in the age-restricted area, designated Lot C.

A Phasing Plan for the subdivision would create 33 large lots. Exhibit H-1 delineates the phasing in an inset on the map. A large lot Final Map would be required for the creation of these lots.

### **3. Design Waiver(s):**

In accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance, Design Waivers are required in order to modify subdivision improvement standards required by the El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standards Manual (DISM). These modified road improvements include, but are not limited to reductions in intersection spacing, right-of-way and roadway widths, sidewalk widths, and driveway standards. As further discussed in the *Design Waiver Findings*, these modified improvements would provide flexibility from the typical design and construction standards in order to reduce earthwork associated with the improvements and minimize anticipated impacts to resources.

### **VI. Development Agreement (DA):**

Development agreements are authorized by Government Code Sections 65864 through 65869.5 and County Ordinance 130.85. A development agreement is adopted by ordinance. The purpose of a development agreement “is to provide assurance to an applicant for a development project that upon approval of the project the applicant may proceed in accordance with existing policies, rules and regulations, and subject to conditions of approval, will strengthen the public planning process, encourage private participation in comprehensive planning and reduce the economic costs of development.” (County Ordinance 130.85.005.)

The proposed Dixon Ranch Development Agreement (DA) is attached as an exhibit to the staff report (Exhibit J) and is proposed for approval by the Board of Supervisors along with the Environmental Impact Report, General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Tentative Map, and Development Plan of the Dixon Ranch project. The DA has been prepared through negotiations between the applicant and County staff from the Community Development Agency, County Counsel, and the Chief Administrators Office. The final terms are subject to Board of Supervisors approval.

In general, the proposed DA would extend the term of the approved tentative subdivision map for up to 20 years, the maximum allowed by County Ordinance (130.85.016). The DA provides vested rights to the developer to develop the project as approved by the County, in conformance with the County rules, regulations, policies, standards, specifications, and ordinances in effect on the date of adoption of the ordinance for the DA.

In consideration, the developer will pay a “County/Community benefit” fee. The fee is intended to be used by the County for any purpose that benefits the County, such as facilities improvement, maintenance, or new construction. Potential use of the fees could include contributions for additional water rights, park land, economic development, or other community/social services, to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

As required by General Plan Policy 10.2.1.5, a plan for public facilities and services is incorporated into the project and is implemented through the DA and the accompanying Public Facilities and Financing Plan (PFFP) (Exhibit V). The DA and PFFP demonstrate that public facilities and infrastructure will be available for the project prior to or concurrently with the construction of the project. The DA and PFFP ensures that there will be no term adverse impact on the service levels currently provided to existing residents of the El Dorado Hills Community Region. Funding for the facilities and infrastructure is primarily through public financing districts, such as community facilities districts and assessment districts, and through fees paid prior to final map approval or at the building permit stage, and through direct developer financing.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. The Dixon Ranch Residential Project EIR consisting of the Draft EIR (DEIR) and Final EIR (FEIR) identified significant impacts associated with project approval. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires lead agencies to make one or more of the following written findings:

1. Changes or alterations have been required for the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the findings. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
3. Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternative identified in the final EIR.

As a result of the environmental analysis for the project, the County determined that impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, geology, soils and seismicity, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, transportation and circulation, and utilities were projected to have potentially significant impacts, but implementation of mitigation measures would

reduce the impact to less-than significant levels. Air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and construction noise, were projected to be significant impacts even with implementation of recommended mitigation measures, and would remain significant and unavoidable. Certain transportation and circulation impacts were conservatively projected to be significant but temporarily unavoidable until such time as implementation measures in the form of CIP projects were completed, at which time they would become less than significant. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit F) has been prepared and agreed to by the applicant. As such, CEQA Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations have been prepared, as required by the Board of Supervisors to certify the EIR.

This project is located within or adjacent to an area which has wildlife resources (riparian lands, wetlands, watercourses, native plant life, threatened and endangered plants or animals, etc.), and was referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. In accordance with State Legislation (California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4), the project is subject to their current fee after approval, but prior to the County filing the Notice of Determination on the project. This fee, less a \$50.<sup>00</sup> processing fee, is forwarded to the State Department of Fish and Wildlife and is used to help defray the cost of managing and protecting the State's fish and wildlife resources.



## **SUPPORT INFORMATION**

### **Attachments to Staff Report:**

Findings	
Conditions of Approval	
EIR CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations	
Exhibit A.....	Location Map
Exhibits B1-B2.....	Assessor's Parcel Maps
Exhibit C.....	General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit D.....	Community Region Map
Exhibit E.....	Zoning Map
Exhibit F.....	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Exhibit G1.....	Phase 1 Development Plan; April 2014
Exhibit G2.....	Phase 1 Development Plan Standards Table
Exhibits H1-H3.....	Phase 1 Tentative Subdivision Map; April 2014
Exhibit I.....	Phase 2 Conceptual Development Plan; November 2015
Exhibit J.....	Development Agreement
Exhibit K.....	Green Spring Creek Ponds Map
Exhibit L.....	Overall Conceptual Land Use; March 2013
Exhibit M.....	Village Park Site Plan; March 2013
Exhibit N.....	Neighborhood Park Site Plan; March 2013
Exhibit O.....	Proposed General Plan and Zone Designations; September 2013
Exhibit P.....	Wildland Fire Safe Plan; July 22, 2013
Exhibits Q1-Q2.....	Phase 1 Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan; April 2014
Exhibit R.....	Onsite Sewer and Water Plan; April 2014
Exhibit S.....	Offsite Electric and Gas Plan; March 2013
Exhibit T.....	Community Regions/Surrounding Density Map
Exhibit U.....	Dixon Ranch Design Guidelines; August 2015
Exhibit V.....	Public Facilities Financing Plan; September 4, 2015
Exhibit W.....	Emergency Vehicle Access Alternatives for Green Springs Ranch; March 2015