

FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JANUARY 14, 2016

Agenda Items

- 5. 14-1617** Hearing to consider the Dixon Ranch project [General Plan Amendment A11-0006/Rezone Z11-0008/Planned Development PD11-0006/Tentative Map TM11-1505/Development Agreement DA14-0001] for the following requests: 1) Certification of Environmental Impact Report and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; 2) General Plan Amendment amending the land use designations from Low Density Residential and Open Space to High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, and Open Space; 3) Zone Amendments amending the existing zones from Exclusive Agriculture and Estate Residential Five-Acre to an overall Planned Development Zone District combined with the following six base zone districts: One-Family Residential, One-Acre Residential, Single-Family Three-Acre Residential, Estate-Residential Five-Acre, Recreation Facility, and Open Space; 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 to include gated private roads, and a Conceptual Development Plan for Phase 2; 5) Tentative Subdivision Map consisting of: A) Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Phase 0) creating 33 large lots for financing and phasing purposes; B) Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map for Phase 1 creating a total of 411 single family residential lots, 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 creating the remaining 194 single family residential lots, one neighborhood park, and the remaining open space, landscape, and road lots, and 6) Design waivers from Standard Plan 101B on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 126-020-01, 126-020-02, 126-020-03, 126-020-04 and 126-150-23, consisting of 280.27 acres, located in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills, submitted by Dixon Ranch Ventures, LLC; and staff recommending 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 Subdivision, 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), Low Density Residential (LDR, 5.02 acres), and Open Space (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).
- (Supervisory District 1) (cont. 12/10/15, Item #4)

Prior to the start of the item, Chair Stewart recused himself and left the meeting.

Roger Trout provided a brief background on the General Plan and summarized the Development Agreement request.

Lillian MacLeod presented the item and provided clarification language that will be added to the request. She also referenced the two Staff Memos dated December 14, 2015 (HYD-1 revision) and January 12, 2016 (Revisions to Project Documents).

Joel Korotkin, applicant's agent, introduced his team members who each would provide a small presentation.

Matt Weir, Kimbly Horn & Associates, spoke on the traffic study.

Chelsea Richardson, applicant's agent, spoke on the following items:

- Demographics of the County;
- Creating a community to encompass all types of demographics;
- Multi-generational park being created in partnership with El Dorado Hills CSD;
- Community design guidelines; and
- Partnership with Eskaton's "Livable Design".

Sherry Pfeiffer, Eskaton, stated that the 55+ demographics is exploding and requires innovative solutions. She explained that Eskaton's concierge service would be expanded to include multi-generations.

Ellen Van Dyke distributed a handout and spoke on the concerns listed in it.

Tenley Martinez distributed a letter and spoke the concerns listed in it.

Glen Gillum, Executive Director of an assisted living in Cameron Park, urged approval for this innovative progressive project that would be a great value to the community.

Janna Buwalda, General Manager of Hickok Road CSD, read into the record a letter from their president, John O'Conner, and also made her own comments on traffic and water and requested a reduction of the project.

Terri Henning made the following comments:

- Long-time resident;
- Needs of her mother-in-law, a long-time County resident, have greatly changed;
- Supports the project because of the livable design; and
- Project would be a huge asset to the County.

Russell Mathis, resident of the Cottages of Eskaton, would not move from his current location to the proposed development.

Cheryl Langley distributed a handout and spoke on the items listed in it.

Dave Goldenberg, President of the Highland View HOA, made the following comments:

- There are 258 homes in the Highland View subdivision;
- Voiced concern on speeding issues, which had also been discussed with their residents, and have had discussions with the developers and Sterlingshire HOA to resolve concerns on traffic passing through their communities to the project;
- Has worked closely with the Fire Marshall on the emergency vehicle access road and are in support of that; and
- Developers met all of their concerns and also had ensured that there were multiple public meetings so many of the residents would be able to attend.

Cathy Keil, Green Springs Ranch resident, made the following comments:

- Requested clarification on the General Plan element of the project;
- Spoke on traffic on Green Valley Road during rush hour in the morning and afternoon, in addition to when accidents occur on that road;
- Rattlesnakes would start migrating away from the construction site area; and
- Welcomed projects, but wants a reduction.

Lenny Patini stated that although he doesn't live near the project, he doesn't like the request to amend the General Plan. He stated that the zoning is done for logic and order.

Carly Ambrose-Smith is a Recreation Therapist in Cameron Park and sees the benefits of multi-generations and supports the project.

Dave Guyer is a 20-year County resident and supports the project. He stated that the project would do road improvements on Green Valley Road and provide tax dollars.

Evelyn McGrath, Executive Director of an assisted living in Placerville and a County resident, supported the project with the livable design.

Kirsten Klinghammer made the following comments:

- An 18-year Green Springs Ranch resident;
- Description of project is appealing;
- Concerned on traffic;
- Spoke on bike lanes on Green Valley Road;
- Green Springs Ranch has 5 acre minimum parcel sizes;
- Parcels near their border need to be the larger parcels;
- Buffer is needed;
- If this moves forward, needs to be done in a sensible fashion; and
- Concerned on water availability.

Doug Wiele read his letter into the record.

Betty Peterson, Green Springs Ranch resident, stated that three-fourths of the project is surrounded by large parcels and recommended denial of the project as submitted.

Sarah Woldanski made the following comments:

- County resident but doesn't live in project area;
- General Plan gets manipulated time and time again;
- Green Springs Ranch residents would be impacted;
- Not enough water to support project; and
- Multi-generational community is good but not at this location.

Dave Comstock thanked everyone on the hard work on the Aberdeen Way emergency vehicle access and that it would be a great asset. He spoke on bike lanes and the need to change them to Class 1.

Jason Downey lives and works in El Dorado Hills and supported the project. He looked forward to growth in the community and applauded the efforts of the project's team.

Mary Williams made the following comments:

- Lives off of West Green Springs Road and there are 15 homes located there;
- 37-year resident;
- Voiced frustration that her rights to have a rural area surrounded by 5-acre parcels is being taken away from her;
- Nice project but doesn't belong smack in the middle of a 5-acre rural setting;
- Urged Commission to not approve the project as it stands;

- If approved, it needs to be changed to one acre minimum lots with larger lots on the outside of the development; and
- Spoke on senior citizens housing and safety concerns on Green Valley Road.

John Hidal, El Dorado Hills APAC member, made the following comments on behalf of the group:

- They reviewed project in 2012 and are pleased that the developer had made substantial compromises by modifying the project since then;
- Referenced letter submitted in February 2015; and
- Green Valley Road is a problem area.

John Hidal made the following personal comments:

- Development Agreement is somewhat nebulous and is undefined as to where the monies would be spent;
- Affordable housing is an oxymoron in El Dorado County; and
- There are some big “TBD” in this project.

Sue McClurg made the following comments:

- 5-year resident of Green Springs Ranch;
- Moved there for the 5-acre parcels;
- Project is too much for the area;
- Concerned on traffic and how Green Valley Road was significantly impacted by the fire on Hwy 50 a few years back; and
- Currently, Green Valley Road doesn't have the capacity to handle residents fleeing a fire.

Dale Gretzinger made the following comments:

- 20-year El Dorado Hills resident;
- Inquired how a project can be approved if the Development Agreement is not signed;
- His property butts up to Green Valley Road and the current noise level from traffic already significantly impacts him;
- Spoke on traffic concerns; and
- Density is beyond what the General Plan currently dictates and it needs to stay that way.

Mel Kowardy made the following comments:

- Green Springs Ranch resident;
- Concerned on water availability;
- Spoke on traffic concerns;
- Significant mitigation is needed to address all the concerns; and
- This is a nice development that needs to be relocated to an area that is a better fit.

Don Van Dyke distributed a handout and referenced the document. He stated that the project doesn't belong in the area.

Alison Bailey made the following comments:

- Property borders the project;
- Born and raised in El Dorado County;
- Schools will not provide bus service as they are too close and she won't allow her children to walk on Green Valley Road to the schools; and
- Well went dry.

Sue Taylor made the following comments:

- Huge issue is the transition;
- Inquired as to what was allowed for Low-Density Residential General Plan land use designation;
- Real information needs to be used and not people just voicing concern over drivers who are 55+ in age;
- Public is voicing concerns on health and safety;
- Project has intense density and we need to look past the "bling"; and
- "Age in place" is not for those living here but is a marketing scheme to bring others here.

Commissioner Pratt closed public comment.

Mr. Korotkin made the following rebuttal comments:

- Traffic:
 - Hired consultants that worked with County and did multiple studies and the project is conditioned for mitigation;
 - Green Valley Corridor Study was done by the County and it identified important problems;
 - Project is assisting in addressing those issues and even accelerating some of the identified improvements; and
 - Traffic would be enhanced by the project.
- Impact on water:
 - Project would be under EID and would be bringing EID into an area where it currently isn't available.
- Buffering and fitting in with community:
 - Project site is fairly unusual due to topography;
 - Addressing impacts to some of the neighboring parcels;
 - This is a different style of development that embraces the clustering effect; and
 - To a significant extent, oak canopy cover will remain.
- Spoke on General Plan designation;
- This type of project is needed in the El Dorado Hills area of the County;
- Has done what they needed to do to make the project fit in;
- Project would advance Trans-5 improvements (\$425,000) in order to solve the problems now; and
- Discussed in detail the Green Valley Corridor Study and identified the road improvements that the project would be willing to do.

At the request of the Commission, Mr. Weir discussed CEQA traffic mitigation.

Commissioner Pratt stated that he was not a big fan of bike lanes on fast track roads.

Commissioner Miller wanted everyone to keep in mind that people traveling on Green Valley Road would be impacted by the project due to the new traffic signals.

Dave Spiegelberg, Transportation, spoke on the Bikeway Master Plan.

In response to Commissioner Miller's comment that although the project centers around age-restricted homes, public transportation had not been addressed, Mrs. MacLeod stated that El Dorado Transit indicated that they had no plans to add bus stops to that area. Mr. Korotkin said that they have been in discussion with the CSD regarding using their vans for events and that there is also a Dial-A-Ride program in the County.

In response to Commissioner Pratt's inquiry on price points, Mr. Trout stated that on page 94 of Exhibit V, the financial analysis indicated \$488,000 for age-restricted and \$873,000 for estate-size lots.

Commissioner Miller was concerned about the length of time for construction noise, which is allowed on the weekends, if the project goes out to 20 years. He also didn't like approving sub-standard housing by granting design waivers. Brian Allen, CTA Engineering, spoke on the reasons for the Design Waiver requests. Mr. Korotkin disagreed with the term "sub-standard" and stated it was more of a "non-standard".

Mr. Trout responded to the noise concerns brought up by Commissioner Miller during the construction phase.

There was no further discussion.

Motion: Commissioner Heflin moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (3-1), to recommend the Board of Supervisors take the following actions: 1) Adopt Resolution 2016-xxx certifying the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH No. 2012062023) for the proposed Dixon Ranch Residential Subdivision, 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), Low Density Residential (LDR, 5.02 acres), and Open Space (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 as amended; 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 amended as follows: (a) Include recommended changes as identified in the Staff Memos dated December 14, 2015 and January 12, 2016; 8) Approve Design Waivers 1 through 12 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as amended; 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).

AYES: Shinault, Heflin, Pratt
NOES: Miller
RECUSED: Stewart