

5/19/2017

Edcgov.us Mail - Pomerol Vineyard PA16-0007, Comments for May 23 hearing



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 5/19/17

BUS 5/23/17

32

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Pomerol Vineyard PA16-0007, Comments for May 23 hearing

1 message

K Frevert / H Levenson <kathyhoward85@yahoo.com>

Thu, May 18, 2017 at 9:26 PM

Reply-To: K Frevert / H Levenson <kathyhoward85@yahoo.com>

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Please see the attached letter for our comments regarding the Pomerol Vineyard Estates pre-application.

Sincerely,
Kathy and Howard Levenson
Kathyhoward85@yahoo.com



Pomerol Development,5-18-2017.docx

26K

May 18, 2017
Roger Trout, Division Director
El Dorado County Planning
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
edc.cob@edcgov.us

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Trout,

We would like to express our opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project, as proposed. We oppose the redesignation of the project site to increase the intensity of development in the area and the encroachment of the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary into Rescue. This project would increase traffic on rural Starbuck Road and require the expansion of utilities in the area, which could promote further growth in the area.

El Dorado General Plan Policy 2.1.1.2 states that Community Regions define areas appropriate for the highest intensity of self-sustaining compact urban-type development or suburban type development within the County based on the municipal spheres of influence, availability of infrastructure, public services, major transportation corridors and travel patterns. This project is inconsistent with this policy. The proposed Pomerol Vineyard project would encroach on the rural community of Rescue to intensify uses to high density levels where infrastructure cannot support the level of development. This fact is acknowledged by the applicant in their description of the project stating that wastewater from the project cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure in the area. In addition, the Sheriff's department is currently stretched such that additional demand from this project cannot be supported without additional staff and resources. Further, the encroachment into the rural Rescue area could induce new development or redevelopment in Rescue as the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary is amended. Leave development in Cameron Park to areas currently covered in the boundary.

While we oppose the redesignation of the project site to increase the intensity of development in the area and the encroachment of the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary into Rescue, we offer the following comments on the project as currently proposed.

1. It is very important that Hwy 50 traffic flows. It functions as our county's main street. All residents are negatively impacted with more traffic and there are some enormous projects being built in the region. What other projects in the county and just across the county line also are seeking higher density and what would be the cumulative impact of these projects on roads and highways?
2. The project description on the County's website describes 137 units. There are 145 residential lots shown on the map on the County's website, plus the lot for the clubhouse.
3. The project description refers to the current "zoning" for the site as RL-10 (1 residential unit per each 10 acres) as a function of the previous use as a golf course (it should be noted that it appears that the applicant refers to the General Plan designation rather than the zoning). However, golf courses are allowed in every residential zone, as well as the Rural Land zone, Community Commercial zone, and Rural Commercial zone. To imply that the site is only designated for rural development because of the golf course use is disingenuous. It is clearly designated RL-10 because the area is intended for rural development, to be consistent with the development in the adjacent area in rural Rescue. A redesignation to allow suburban-level development is inappropriate.

4. The project proposes only two access points for 145 new residences, with rural Starbuck Road as the main access point. What is the capacity on Starbuck and what level of traffic is assumed to be absorbed on this road? What about speeds on Starbuck and visibility at the proposed intersection for the 1,500 trips per day from the project? Will this require a signal at this intersection? The project description also notes adjacent roads as Deer Oaks Drive, Buckhorn Lane, and Whitetail Drive, all of which are private roads. Residents of this area are opposed to connections to this proposed development. *Starbuck is a curvy road without adequate space for vehicles and bikes and pedestrians, which are common on weekends. It is simply unsafe to add more traffic without road expansion and safe walking trails.*
5. The project proposes “secondary” access at Peridot Drive. How many trips are proposed to access Peridot Drive? What will the additional project trips do to level of service at the intersection of Green Valley and Peridot Drive?
6. In 2016, El Dorado County voters approved Measure E, which includes a number of requirements regarding traffic impacts from residential development projects. How does the County propose to implement Measure E for this site?
7. The project description mentions public access to open space areas in the project. Will these areas be restricted to project residents? Will public access be allowed and will this be included as a condition of approval for the project?
8. The project description notes the project preserves oak canopy, while the project will clearly remove a substantial amount of oak canopy on the site. What is the amount of oak canopy that exists on the site and how much will be preserved compared to that destroyed by the project? *When the golf course was built there were many oak trees removed that were not replaced, contrary to policy. What assurances do we have that there will be adequate county oversight and enforcement of any agreement that is reached?*
9. The project description states additional vineyards could be added on front and side yards after building envelopes have been determined. However, the project description also states the custom lots would only be graded at the time of house construction, which would occur after the easements for vineyards have been established. How will additional easements be granted for vineyards after the custom lots have been purchased?
10. The project description proposes well water for irrigation of open space areas. What kind of landscaping is proposed in the open space areas and is irrigation or landscaping even reasonable for open space? How much irrigation would the open space require and how would that affect neighboring wells on lots that do not have access to EID water? How will the vineyards be irrigated? How much water will irrigation require? If the vineyards are irrigated with groundwater, how will that affect neighboring wells? The groundwater in the project vicinity needs to be studied and characterized to determine available supply and effects on neighboring groundwater users both in terms of water quality and water quantity. Specifically, what is capacity of the groundwater supply from which the project would draw; how many users currently rely on that supply; and what will the effect be on existing users? What is the remaining capacity of the wastewater treatment plant and what effect will this project's demand have on existing and cumulative capacity? Do the septic systems proposed have enough space to protect groundwater and surface water? As an alternative, the project could be conditioned to include a package wastewater treatment plant that could recycle water from the site to allow irrigation of the open space areas with treated water, rather than groundwater.
11. The project description acknowledges that the sewer lines would need to be upgraded to accommodate the project. Specifically, where would lines need to be replaced? What level of upsizing would be required to accommodate project demand? Any upsizing beyond that needed for project demand would result in the potential for growth inducement and the conversion of the

rural Rescue area to more intense uses than currently exist or are planned.

12. The project description requests design waivers related to road length and width. The County must not allow waivers for such changes that have the potential to affect firefighting efforts, which could in turn increase fire hazards at other rural properties in the vicinity. The project must comply with road standards to ensure fire safety on the project site and the effects on other properties.
13. Regarding other County services, with the Sheriff's department currently understaffed, how will law enforcement be affected by additional high-density units in this area? Will additional patrols be established and will more deputies or other staff be needed to accommodate this level of development in the rural area of Rescue?
14. The project description states the project would provide moderate income housing. What rates does the developer propose for the medium density housing and how does this compare to the County's target for moderate income housing? Given the size of other existing housing in the Cameron Park area, 1/4-acre lots don't seem to be on the affordable end for the area. Will the housing on the 1/4-acre lots be subsidized?
15. The project description states the project enhances preservation of natural resources when at the same time the developer plans to develop 130 acres of residential property and associated infrastructure. What proportion of the site will be "preserved" when considering stripping of resources to accommodate building envelopes, vineyards, roads, and "open Space" areas that would include landscaping that requires irrigation?
16. The project description notes that the clubhouse could be used for winetasting and could generate sales tax revenue for the County. Does the developer propose to produce wine on site? How many acres of grapes are proposed for the property? Wine production and sales would be a commercial enterprise that is not included in the project application. What other approvals would be required for that component?
17. The vineyard portion of the project is shown as easements on the map, but there is no description of who would manage and maintain the vines. The project also includes the rosy prediction that the proceeds from the vines would offset HOA costs. Has the project developer had any experience with vineyards? How does the project propose to protect the vineyard from the common wildlife that occurs in the area (deer, rabbits, raccoons, fox) that would damage the vines and grapes? The distribution of the vineyards and small, irregular areas would make fencing difficult, if not infeasible. Has an economic analysis been prepared that assesses the cost of maintenance of this amount of vines distributed in an irregular fashion throughout the site as proposed for the project? Will homeowners be responsible for irrigation or is this the responsibility of the HOA (in either case water demand needs to be considered)? The project needs to include a management plan with economic analysis to demonstrate that the vineyard proposal is feasible and will not reduce the buffers provided in the plan. The management must also address the use of pesticides and fertilizers and the effects on neighboring properties and groundwater.
18. How is this project financed and are any EB-5 Visas being issued?

For the record, we would like to restate our opposition to the redesignation of the site for urban/suburban development. If the project moves forward, any proposal for development of this site should be accompanied by an EIR that fully analyzes the potential physical impacts that such a development would cause in the area and on County services. It appears that the alternative of less dense housing would have greatly reduced infrastructure costs and would be what residents expected in a rural community.

Please include us on all future correspondence for this project.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Howard Levenson
1590 Velvet Horn Lane, Rescue, CA 95672
email: kathyhoward85@yahoo.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

2017 MAY 19 AM 10:28

May 16, 2017
Roger Trout, Division Director
El Dorado County Planning
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

SENT TO ALL BOARD MEMBERS

edc.cob@edcgov.us

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

I think we should keep it simple and allow the zoning to change from 10 acres to 5 acre lots.

Or we need to address the multiple concerns below!

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. This project would increase traffic on rural Starbuck Road and require the expansion of utilities in the area, which could promote further growth in the area. El Dorado General Plan Policy 2.1.1.2 states that Community Regions define areas appropriate for the highest intensity of self-sustaining compact urban-type development or suburban type development within the County based on the municipal spheres of influence, availability of infrastructure, public services, major transportation corridors and travel patterns. This project is inconsistent with this policy. The proposed Pomerol Vineyard project would encroach on the rural community of Rescue to intensify uses to high density levels where infrastructure cannot support the level of development. This fact is acknowledged by the applicant in their description of the project stating that wastewater from the project cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure in the area. In addition, the Sheriff's department is currently stretched such that additional demand from this project cannot be supported without additional staff and resources. Further, the encroachment into the rural Rescue area could induce new

development or redevelopment in Rescue as the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary is amended. Leave development in Cameron Park to areas currently covered in the boundary.

While I oppose the redesignation of the project site to increase the intensity of development in the area and the encroachment of the Cameron Park Community Region Boundary into Rescue, I offer the following comments on the project as currently proposed.

The project description on the County's website describes 137 units. There are 145 residential lots shown on the map on the County's website, plus the lot for the clubhouse.

The project description refers to the current "zoning" for the site as RL-10 (1 residential unit per each 10 acres) as a function of the previous use as a golf course (it should be noted that it appears that the applicant refers to the General Plan designation rather than the zoning). However, golf courses are allowed in every residential zone, as well as the Rural Land zone, Community Commercial zone, and Rural Commercial zone. To imply that the site is only designated for rural development because of the golf course use is disingenuous. It is clearly designated RL-10 because the area is intended for rural development, to be consistent with the development in the adjacent area in rural Rescue. A redesignation to allow suburban-level development is inappropriate.

The project proposes only two access points for 145 new residences, with rural Starbuck Road as the main access point.

What is the capacity on Starbuck and what level of traffic is assumed to be absorbed on this road? What about speeds on Starbuck and visibility at the proposed intersection for the 1,500 trips per day from the project? Will this require a signal at this intersection? The project description also notes adjacent roads as Deer Oaks Drive, Buckhorn Lane, and Whitetail Drive, all of which are private roads. Residents of this area are opposed to connections to this proposed development.

The project proposes "secondary" access at Peridot Drive. How many trips are proposed to access Peridot Drive? What will the

additional project trips do to level of service at the intersection of Green Valley and Peridot Drive?

In 2016, El Dorado County voters approved Measure E, which includes a number of requirements regarding traffic impacts from residential development projects. How does the County propose to implement Measure E for this site?

The project description mentions public access to open space areas in the project. Will these areas be restricted to project residents?

Will public access be allowed and will this be included as a condition of approval for the project?

The project description notes the project preserves oak canopy, while the project will clearly remove a substantial amount of oak canopy on the site. What is the amount of oak canopy that exists on the site and how much will be preserved compared to that destroyed by the project?

The project description states additional vineyard could be added on front and side yards after building envelopes have been determined. However, the project description also states the custom lots would only be graded at the time of house construction, which would occur after the easements for vineyards have been established. How will additional easements be granted for vineyards after the custom lots have been purchased?

The project description proposes well water for irrigation of open space areas. What kind of landscaping is proposed in the open space areas and is irrigation or landscaping even reasonable for open space? How much irrigation would the open space require and how would that affect neighboring wells on lots that do not have access to EID water? How will the vineyards be irrigated? How much water will that require? If the vineyards are irrigated with groundwater, how will that affect neighboring wells? The groundwater in the project vicinity needs to be studied and characterized to determine available supply and effects on neighboring groundwater users. Specifically, what is capacity of the groundwater supply from which the project would draw; how

many users currently rely on that supply; and what will the effect be on existing users? What is the remaining capacity of the wastewater treatment plant and what effect will this project's demand have on existing and cumulative capacity? As an alternative, the project could be conditioned to include a package wastewater treatment plant that could recycle water from the site to allow irrigation of the open space areas with treated water, rather than groundwater.

The project description acknowledges that the sewer lines would need to be upgraded to accommodate the project. Specifically, where would lines need to be replaced? What level of upsizing would be required to accommodate project demand? Any upsizing beyond that needed for project demand would result in the potential for growth inducement and the conversion of the rural Rescue area to more intense uses than currently exist or are planned.

The project description requests design waivers related to road length and width. The County must not allow waivers for such changes that have the potential to affect firefighting efforts, which could in turn increase fire hazards at other rural properties in the vicinity. The project must comply with road standards to ensure fire safety on the project site and the effects on other properties. Regarding other County services, with the Sheriff's department currently understaffed, how will law enforcement be affected by additional high-density units in this area? Will additional patrols be established and will more deputies or other staff be needed to accommodate this level of development in the rural area of Rescue?

The project description states the project would provide moderate income housing. What rates does the developer propose for the medium density housing and how does this compare to the County's target for moderate income housing? Given the size of other existing housing in the Cameron Park area, 1/4-acre lots don't seem to be on the affordable end for the area. Will the housing on

the ¼-acre lots be subsidized?

The project description states the project enhances preservation of natural resources when at the same time the developer plans to develop 130 acres of residential property and associated infrastructure. What proportion of the site will be “preserved” when considering stripping of resources to accommodate building envelopes, vineyards, roads, and “open Space” areas that would include landscaping that requires irrigation?

The project description notes that the clubhouse could be used for winetasting and could generate sales tax revenue for the County. Does the developer propose to produce wine on site? How many acres of grapes are proposed for the property? Wine production and sales would be a commercial enterprise that is not included in the project application. What other approvals would be required for that component?

The vineyard portion of the project is shown as easements on the map, but there is no description of who would manage and maintain the vines. The project also includes the rosy prediction that the proceeds from the vines would offset HOA costs. Has the project developer had any experience with vineyards? How does the project propose to protect the vineyard from the common wildlife that occurs in the area (deer, rabbits, raccoons) that would damage the vines and grapes? The distribution of the vineyards and small, irregular areas would make fencing difficult, if not infeasible. Has an economic analysis been prepared that assesses the cost of maintenance of this amount of vines distributed in an irregular fashion throughout the site as proposed for the project? Will homeowners be responsible for irrigation or is this the responsibility of the HOA (in either case water demand needs to be considered)? The project needs to include a management plan with economic analysis to demonstrate that the vineyard proposal is feasible and will not reduce the buffers provided in the plan. The management must also address the use of pesticides and fertilizers and the effects on neighboring properties and groundwater.

For the record, I would like to restate my opposition to the redesignation of the site for urban/suburban development. If the project moves forward, any proposal for development of this site should be accompanied by an EIR that fully analyzes the potential physical impacts that such a development would cause in the area and on County services. Please include me on all future correspondence for this project.

Sincerely,



Don Rogers
2171 Buckhorn Lane
Rescue, CA 95672



Nancy Rogers

Buzzard3@sbcglobal.net

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Pomerol Vineyard Estates application

1 message

Gretchen Wilmer <gwilmer@signtechnology.com>

Fri, May 19, 2017 at 12:26 PM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Hello Mike Ranalli,

I moved to Deer Valley Road because of the rural environment. Currently Green Valley Road is a quiet country road. I feel that a medium/high density residential subdivision would negatively impact the area because of the excess traffic on Green Valley. If you must rezone, please keep with the 10 acre parcels that are common in this area to maintain the wonderful living environment we all enjoy. Thank you.

Gretchen Wilmer



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

AGAINST - Pomerol Vineyard Estates

1 message

Chris Palmer <c_j_palmer@yahoo.com>

Fri, May 19, 2017 at 12:52 PM

Reply-To: Chris Palmer <c_j_palmer@yahoo.com>

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Dear Sir/Madam:

My wife and I are life-long residents of El Dorado County, and currently reside off of Starbuck Road in Rescue. We are both against the proposed rezoning of the former Bass Lake Golf Course property to medium-and high-density housing. We need to keep the rural feel to our county, and the current residential 10 acre zoning is appropriate for the area.

Sincerely,

Chris J. Palmer and Kristi S. Palmer
3120 Winchester Dr.
Rescue, CA 95672
(530) 391-9879



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Pomerol Vineyard Estates

2 messages

murphy.pj45@yahoo.com <murphy.pj45@yahoo.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Fri, May 19, 2017 at 3:22 PM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message: When I was on Grand Jury 2005, complaint about the deplorable condition of Starbuck Road was received. El Dorado Dept of Transportation replied that Starbuck was a country road and a proper foundation was never built. A small portion of Starbuck was repaired eventually. This indicates that a tremendous increase in traffic on Starbuck may create many problems. Has the EDC transportation department been informed about the magnitude of this development.

PS Vineyards require 8 foot fences to keep deer from ravaging them.

Patricia Murphy

From: murphy.pj45@yahoo.com
Date: May 19, 2017 at 11:11:55 AM PDT
To: bosfour@edcgov.us
Cc: murphy.pj45@yahoo.com
Subject: Pomerol Vineyard Estates

Sent from my iPad

We are concerned about the major increase in traffic on Starbuck Road caused by this development. Was Starbuck Road built for major traffic? It is a narrow two lane road with little or no shoulder. There are blind curves before and after Winchester. Is there room for a left turn lane into "Road A". Bicyclists frequently use Starbuck. This would seem to be creating conditions for increased accidents. Tragedies waiting to happen.

It would seem far too many homes are proposed for this rural area. If no lot is less than one acre, it might work.

William Murphy & Patricia Murphy

murphy.pj45@yahoo.com <murphy.pj45@yahoo.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Fri, May 19, 2017 at 3:23 PM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: murphy.pj45@yahoo.com
Date: May 19, 2017 at 11:11:55 AM PDT
To: bosfour@edcgov.us
Cc: murphy.pj45@yahoo.com
Subject: Pomerol Vineyard Estates

Sent from my iPad

We are concerned about the major increase in traffic on Starbuck Road caused by this development. Was Starbuck Road built for major traffic? It is a narrow two lane road with little or no shoulder. There are blind curves before and after Winchester. Is there room for a left turn lane into "Road A". Bicyclists frequently use Starbuck. This would seem to be creating conditions for increased accidents. Tragedies waiting to happen.

It would seem far too many homes are proposed for this rural area. If no lot is less than one acre, it might work.

William Murphy & Patricia Murphy