

**LATE DISTRIBUTION****DATE**

5/22/17

BOS 5/23/17

#32

EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

**Pre-Application PA16-007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates**

1 message

**ROBIN NAGEL** <cheecha@sbcglobal.net>

Sat, May 20, 2017 at 1:52 PM

Reply-To: **ROBIN NAGEL** <cheecha@sbcglobal.net>

To: "robert.peters@edcgov.us" &lt;robert.peters@edcgov.us&gt;, "aaron.mount@edcgov.us" &lt;aaron.mount@edcgov.us&gt;, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;, "bosfour@edcgov.us" &lt;bosfour@edcgov.us&gt;

To whom it may concern,  
My name is Robin Dainty. I live at 2509 Starbuck Road in Rescue, Ca.

I am submitting this e-mail to you to voice my opposition to the construction of Pomerol Vineyard Estates, and to solicit you to carefully review this project and it's direct affect on the neighbors and community in and around Starbuck Road!

I arrived in Rescue an 1998 in search of a quite rural community to off-set my high stress job as an Emergency Room RN. I have found it here!

This proposal would re-zone and develop 130 acres into a residential "medium to high density" residential subdivision. One of my biggest concerns is that the main entrance would be on Starbuck Road across from Winchester Drive...very very close to where I live!

The traffic from this proposed venture, would make this rural road, Starbuck, into a heavily traveled, congested street. The noise volume would make my master bedroom facing Starbuck Road, sound like a front row seat to a drag race! The unsafe volume on Starbuck, again a small rural road, would markedly ruin this quiet, wonderful community that I searched for, for most of my life.

Please note my opposition at the May 23 planning hearing on the proposal.

Sincerely,

Robin Dainty  
2509 Starbuck Road  
Rescue, Ca. 95672

Cheecha@sbcglobal.net



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol Development

1 message

---

DVOOA <dvooa@sbcglobal.net>

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 1:39 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: bosfour@edcgov.us, robert.peters@edcgov.us

Please see attached letter regarding the proposed Pomerol Development and request to be included with any future correspondence regarding this development.

Respectfully,

Brad Archibald

Tanya Archibald



**Pomerol Project Opposition Letter.docx**

19K

May 21, 2017  
Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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. Further, the inclusion of a wine tasting room will increase the local occurrence of drivers under the influence.

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? If groundwater is depleted the established neighborhoods without access to EID property values will be drastically diminished. 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, ¼-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,

Brad Archibald  
Tanya Archibald  
2072 Buckhorn Lane  
Rescue, CA 95672  
[dvooa@sbcglobal.net](mailto:dvooa@sbcglobal.net)  
[tbnc@sbcglobal.net](mailto:tbnc@sbcglobal.net)

cc: Michael Ranalli ([bosfour@edcgov.us](mailto:bosfour@edcgov.us))



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

1 message

---

**Susanna Fong** <pslrafong@yahoo.com>  
Reply-To: Susanna Fong <pslrafong@yahoo.com>  
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>  
Cc: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 3:44 PM

Hi,

I'm unable to make the meeting on Tuesday afternoon but wanted to express my opposition to the proposed development of the Bass Lake Golf Course. You'll find my letter attached.

Thanks,  
Susanna Fong



**Bass Lake Development.docx**

19K

May, 20, 2017

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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 re-designation 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 re-designation 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 1/4-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 re-designation 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,  
Paul and Susanna Fong  
2830 Aquamarine Circle  
Rescue, CA 95672  
pslrafong@yahoo.com



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

---

## Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project Description.docx -- Roger Michael.docx

1 message

---

**MacGregor** <adh.macgregor@att.net>  
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us, bosfor@edcgov.us

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 4:50 PM



---

**Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project Description.docx -- Roger Michael.docx**  
16K

## Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project Description

To: Roger Trout and Michael Ranalli

From: Debra MacGregor

This project is not conducive to the rural Rescue Community or the General Plan. We are opposed to the project because:

The area is currently zoned RL10 and is proposing to have 95 lots at .25 acre, 4 lots at .50 acre; 16 lots at 2 acres, and 1 lot at 4.6 acres – how is this a transitional plan? How will the lot sizes proposed maintain a rural community? “We feel that this project would provide moderate income housing.” .25 acre lots are considered by whom to be moderate income housing? What square footage will the homes have on the .25 acre lots? What will the square footage of the houses on the .50, 1.0, 2.0, and 4.6 acre lots be? The plan -- pad graded for the 95 smaller .25 acre lots -- what would be the plan for the larger lots -- .50 to 4.6 acre lots?

Why is the project putting the entrance in an UNSAFE area across from Winchester Drive? Starbuck Road is a rural road – why not preserve the current entrance at Alexandrite Drive and keep the secondary entrance at Peridot Drive? Why is the project not proposing Alexandrite Drive to be the main entrance?

The project enhances the preservation of natural resources and promotes agricultural industries with the vineyard – can I have more details for this statement? Explain how many oak trees will be preserved? Explain how much water would be used to maintain the vines? Explain the amount of traffic that might occur to maintain and sell the grapes/wine? Explain the traffic for 137 lots – how does that preserve natural resources?

The developer wants to buffer the adjacent lots to the west and north with vineyard areas and other possible open space/oak preservation easement areas – why is the east not being buffered?

Creation of a vineyard – the concept sounds nice – when doing so what does that mean exactly for the current oak trees? Does the project have a detailed plan for the vineyard proposal? How many oak trees are currently in the area? What is the amount of oak trees that will be removed to make way for the vines? Water usage needed to maintain the vines is? Water usage in keeping the oak trees? How many vines would be planted? What is the plan for maintenance of the vines? EID water or well water usage for the vines? Who will harvest the vines? Who is responsible for the economic needs of the vineyard? How many oak trees would be removed if there was no vineyard? How will the vineyard concept affect neighbors – will pumping ground water be needed?

Parking areas to allow for public access to the large open spaces --What would the open spaces look like and provide? How much more traffic would be entering and exiting and how many parking spaces will there be? Will the open spaces need irrigation – if yes, then where would that come from and how much would be needed? How will the open spaces be maintained? Is there a study of the impact if well water is used? Will the residents in Rescue be informed of the results?

Capacity issues for the sewer system – if the area is kept with the current RL10 zoning – would upsizing off site sewer lines be needed? If the area is kept RL10 would there be a need to help pay for the sewer upgrades needed within the Cameron Park area?

There are standards for roads – if waivers are needed then what would the impact be for the Fire Department? What might be some safety concerns with waivers? Are the standards there for our safety?

A zoning RL10 project – keeps the area rural while preserving the natural resources. What is the difference between 10 acre lots and the proposed lots for traffic pollution? What is the difference between 10 acre lots and the proposed lots for noise pollution? What is the difference between 10 acre lots and the proposed lots for lighting pollution? What is the difference between 10 acre lots and the proposed lots for crime? What is the difference between 10 acre lots and the proposed lots for water usage?

Where will the water come from for the vineyards and open spaces?

How much water will be needed to complete the project?

Please explain how measure E would be followed by this project?

Who benefits from the community service boundary change?

Will Rescue lose tax dollars?

If the community service boundary does not change will the project be viable?

Is this project in compliance with CEQA?

There should be several people from Rescue at least 1 from Pine Hill Estates on the Design Review Committee. When will that committee be created?

The General Plan policy 2.1.1.2 – Community Regions – clearly shows that this project is not in live with the policy.

The project is for Cameron Park not Rescue – we as residents of Rescue do not want high density encroaching on our rural community. Keep high density in Cameron Park.

Allowing suburban development by rezoning is not consistent with the policy!

I anticipate needing:

A project that keeps the site zoned for RL10 -- keeping it in Rescue – the main and secondary entrances be Alexandrite Drive and Peridot Drive.

If the project moves forward – any proposal for development of this site should be accompanied by and EIR that fully analyzes the potential physical impacts that it would cause in the area and on county services -- fire protection and emergency response services.

Please include me on all future correspondence for the project.





EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol Vineyard Estates

1 message

---

**Andrew MacGregor** <macgregor.a.i@gmail.com>

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 6:23 PM

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

Cc: Andrew MacGregor <macgregor.ai@gmail.com>

Attached is a letter which described my opposition to the Pomerol Vineyard Estates.

Thanks for listening.

Andrew MacGregor



**pomerol vineyard.docx**

26K

May, 20 2017

Michael Ranalli, District Four Supervisor  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

I am writing you because I want to express my complete opposition to the Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. This project does not fit the rural characteristics of the current approved zoning and land use maps. This project would negatively affect the existing rural feeling that those in Rescue. I moved my family to Rescue for that rural environment. We moved out to this rural area for the quietness, the dark skys at night, the wildlife, fewer people and cars, and the open space. This project would destroy that! I made a choice to move to Rescue, not Cameron Park. I drive close to an hour to go to work, in the city. This project would bring the city to my front yard, defeating the entire reason why I moved out here. Why can't the parcel be developed as approved with 10 acre parcels? Why is there a need to change the community service district boundary? We would prefer the land stays Rescue and rural in nature and not incorporated into the service boundary.

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 project as described would need the county to rezone and moved into the community service district boundary. Why go to the trouble of having our elected officials approve a zoning map only for a developer come and change it? The developer is not looking out for our interests, only theirs. Our elected officials are elected to look out for our best interest, not the developers. Are our elected officials going to bend over for the developers?

The proposed project says that they have designed the lots as transitional from existing 0.25 acre lots in the south to the 5 acre lots in the North and West. There is no mention of the 5 acre lots to the East. Are they not important? The actual layouts of the lots do not represent this transition. The only large lot (1, 4.6 acre) is bounding the small lots to the south! A true transition would match the acreage of the bounding lots (0.25 acre to the south and 5 acre lots to the west, north, and east. As currently zoned, all of the bounding lots expect to have a 10 acre neighbor. If re-zoned, why can't the bounding parcels match the existing parcels which they would but up against?

The existing parcel and golf course have existing access through Alexandrite Drive. The intersection of Green Valley Road and Alexandrite Drive which is signalized with crosswalks and sidewalks just over 500 feet from the southern parcel line of the project. The project is proposing a new main entrance on Starbuck Road, forcing the traffic to drive north through the proposed development to the proposed entrance on Starbuck a half mile from Green Valley, almost a mile from the logical entrance from Alexandrite. Why would the project abandon this access to make a new one on a rural, winding, narrow road, which is outside of the community service boundary? The project would take its high traffic

load onto a less safe road, making it even less safe. This section (and much of) Starbuck road is not lighted, windy and undulating, creating very poor sight distance for drivers and unsafe driving conditions. It is already difficult to exit onto Starbuck Road from Winchester Drive. A four way intersection here would make it much more dangerous. This new access is also further away from Green Valley Road. The project as designed would needlessly increase the number of miles driving and increase the volume on a road that was not designed for it. What logic was used to create more traffic, more miles driven, and a less safe situation? Why can't the access stay on Alexandrite? There are only 3 houses and the cemetery on that section of Alexandrite. Why negatively impact all of the people on Starbuck when the existing access makes more sense (less driving, direct access (500') to a major road (Green Valley) at a signalized intersection? Has a traffic study been done to support the development? Did the traffic study recommend changing the access to Starbuck? Alexandrite is the most logical access. It is a direct and safe route to the closest major road, and all other major destinations (schools, shopping, and the highway).

This project is so large that the current sewer and water infrastructure would need to be improved. The current infrastructure was sized for the approved zoning and should be left alone. Current rate payers would almost certainly bear some of this improvement cost, one way or another. Existing roads would be negatively impacted with construction activities needed to upsize sewer and water. Increasing capacity of the infrastructure would be costly and would promote more growth.

The Sheriff's department is 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? Can the existing size of the fire and police (sheriff) staff support the additional area to cover? What crime impacts have been studied? Will the hiring of more fire and police staff be needed?

How much light pollution would this development create? How much light pollution difference is there between current zoning and proposed? We accept the current level of light pollution and do not want more!!

The change in zoning would increase the number of lots by a factor of 10, (10 times the existing approved zoning)!!! Where is all that water coming from? Has a groundwater study been done to determine the impacts to the surrounding wells? Would the county permit all of those extra wells beyond what is currently zoned? Septic systems would also increase by a large factor. Has the impact of all of the additional septic systems that this project would need been studied?

The project has been designed with non-standard roadway widths and lengths. Why would this be allowed? Road standards are designed to uphold safety and road life. Fire and emergency vehicles need the roads to meet those standards, in order to maintain a safe living environment. A fire problem in this development would not respect property lines! Using non-standard roads creates an un-safe environment for those who live on the road, emergency responders, and the surrounding neighborhoods! Would the county allow this development to not follow the standards approved by our elected officials, making our area less safe, so that the developer can have more land to profit on?

The project describes vineyards and wine tasting and sales, used as buffers and for HOA income. How will the vineyards be planted and maintained with the staged approach to the development? Will the vineyard be planted and functioning before the parcels are sold and homes built in a piecemeal fashion? In what order will the taking of easements, planting of vineyards, and building structures take place. Does the commercial nature of the development fit the general plan and land use and zoning? Where does the water come from for water the vines? Has the water needed for this been studied and accounted for?

How much noise, traffic and pollution will be created during the maintenance and harvesting of the vines? What happens if the vineyard loses money and is shut down or abandoned? How can it be assured that it will work and survive? How much traffic will winetasting and sales bring? Where do they park? How will the vineyards be protected from the wildlife? Will there be tall fencing? How are all of the small, separate areas with vines growing going to be protected?

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 notes the project preserves oak canopy, while the project will clearly remove a substantial amount of oak canopy with vineyard, roadway and lot grading. 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?

There is also a considerable amount creek habitat and wetlands. How much area of creek and wetlands will be destroyed? How will the existing surface drainage patterns be effected, changed, or eliminated?

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?

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 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, ¼-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 prosed 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?



May, 20 2017

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.

I would like to restate my opposition to the rezoning of the site for urban/suburban development. I would like it to be kept as 10 acre lots as a rural environment. 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,  
Andrew MacGregor  
3040 Winchester Drive  
Rescue, CA 95672

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**cameron park golf course**

1 message

**william sedgwick** <bill.s@dbintegration.biz>

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 7:29 PM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;, "bosfour@edcgov.us" &lt;bosfour@edcgov.us&gt;

Mr. Trout and Mr. Renalli,

Attached is my opposition the plan for the golf course development, I regret with such short notice I could not change my travel plans. It us my understanding you will not have much time to hear speakers so please accept this in my absence.

William Sedgwick

4636 Maries ct.

Rescue, Ca. 95672

(off Fremont's loop almost directly across from proposed main entrance)

**golf course letter.docx**

14K

William Sedgwick

4636 Marie's Ct.

Rescue, Ca. 95672

Dear Mr. Ranalli and Mr. Trout,

I strongly oppose the proposed development as it is outlined for the following reasons. It all sounds wonderful how they have described how they will come in and create a situation that adversely impacts every single household that lives in the area. The sewer lines are too small, the water is not really available in drought years and the traffic will multiply beyond what every last person that lives here was moving here for. This is a rural area with the vast majority of houses on 5 to 10 acre lots let's keep it that way.

Let's face it the wells went dry that's why the golf course closed, the golf course had zero impact on Starbuck rd. now you want to jeopardize lives on Starbuck by vastly increasing the traffic with people who will not be aware of the many deer that cross that road.

The "out of towners" who bought this property don't want much they just want to change the city people live in and cram as many houses possible into an area not designated for that density so we can have more traffic, longer sheriff response times more burden on the fire department so they can make as much as possible so they can have a great life with plenty of money and leave the country rubes holding the bag.

This is not why 98% of the people moved here ask yourselves if you lived off Starbuck or the next neighborhood over would you want this?

YOU ARE OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES, YOU ARE HERE FOR US, WE VOTED FOR YOU, PAY YOUR SALARIES AND SHOULD BE ABLE TO EXPECT YOU TO PROTECT US FROM THIS KIND OF DEVELOPMENT.

A house per 5-10 acres is what they knew they were getting when they bought the property and that's what they should get. It's fair and equitable to all sides, anything else the people of these neighborhoods including me are getting the short end of the stick.

Not to mention the fact that at rush hour traffic backs up to the freeway on Bass lake and green valley is already at capacity are they going to fix this? Don't buy the crap that we will build smaller lots first to let the larger ones be developed later most cases that never happens they come back for another variance then what?

It amazes me that the garbage company sent a post card that our rates may go up \$1.50 a month but this major impact..... I can only imagine if people were actually notified!

I would like to be on the e-mail or mailing list for any future information pertaining to this property as it will greatly impact my life.

Sincerely,

William Sedgwick ([William.sedgwick@sbcglobal.net](mailto:William.sedgwick@sbcglobal.net))



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

1 message

---

Team Outlook ©2017 <alterimatus@hotmail.com>

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 8:35 PM

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

Attached you will find our letter objecting to current proposal for the construction of Pomerol Vineyard Estates. We plan on attending the meeting on May 23.

Sincerely, James and Wanda Matus



**Pomerol Vineyards Proposal objections.docx**

15K



May 21, 2017

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning Department  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Michael Ranalli, District 4 Supervisor  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

We are writing this letter to voice our opposition to the construction of the Pomerol Vineyard Estates as currently proposed. Rescue is zoned as a rural community, and the residents of Rescue have purchased their properties in good faith that Rescue would remain a rural community. This project proposes changing the zoning to medium and high density housing and annexing a portion of Rescue into Cameron Park to be able to utilize some of the amenities available to the residents of Cameron Park. This violates the promises made to the residents of Rescue in the general plan.

The addition of over 135 residences will create a myriad of problems and concerns for the residents and tax payers of Rescue. First and foremost is the water issue. It is a known fact that when the golf course used ground water for irrigation more than 2 of their 4 wells failed as well as one of the wells located on a property in the Deer Valley Oaks Development adjacent to the golf course. That homeowner was burdened with the cost of having to dig a new well. Using ground water to irrigate the open space areas in the Pomerol Vineyard Estates proposal may very well effect the aquifer and impact an unknown number of Rescue residents, creating unforeseen burdens on those residents.

It would be much more compatible with Rescue's rural character to have full 5 acre lots abutting the Deer Valley Oaks development and as the lots get closer to the Emerald Meadows development to transition to 2 ½ acre lot size and closest to Emerald Meadows could be full one acre lots. The properties shown on the map as 2 acre lots are not full 2 acre lots since the vineyard areas encroach on these larger lots. None of the lots are actually the size listed as the homeowner would not have the use of the full lot size.

There are a number of other issues that come to mind regarding this proposed housing development. For example, the proposed intersection at Winchester and Starbuck is a particularly worrisome one. This intersection contains a nearly blind approach from both the north and south direction and several cars have already gone off the road in this area. Adding over 600 additional car approaches through this intersection a day is a disaster waiting to happen.

Considering the work, know how, equipment and manpower involved in raising grapes and marketing them into a money making enterprise exemplifies the fact that this is not a very well thought out plan.

This proposal also mentions proximity to adjacent streets, access to several of these roads would be prohibited since they are privately owned and privately maintained. The proposal states they are not considering access on these roads, but obviously they are considering access in the future since they mention these roads by name. This also has not been well thought out since they would not be allowed to access the private roads.

On top of all of that there are major infrastructure issues involved such as sewage system inadequacies issues which we feel have been only marginally addressed in this proposal.

We have owned our property since 1985, and it was the rural character and composition of the Rescue area that influenced our decision to purchase here rather than in Sacramento or Placer counties. We feel very strongly that this 130 acres should not be re-zoned into medium and high density housing and annexed into Cameron Park to fulfill the wishes of developers from the Bay Area.

Sincerely,  
James and Wanda Matus  
1921 Buckhorn Lane  
Rescue, CA 95672



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Pomerol Vineyard Development**

1 message

---

**JEFFREY and KRISTYN Beezley** <jeffandkristyn@yahoo.com>  
Reply-To: JEFFREY and KRISTYN Beezley <jeffandkristyn@yahoo.com>  
To: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>  
Cc: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Sun, May 21, 2017 at 9:28 PM

We strongly oppose the Pomerol Vineyard development project. Please see the attached letter.

Thank you,

Jeff and Kristyn Beezley  
3070 Whitetail Lane  
Rescue, Ca. 95672  
Hm: (530) 677-6698  
Cell: (916) 990-7836



---

**Pomerol Vineyard Development.docx**  
17K

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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, ¼-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 prosed 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,

Jeffrey and Kristyn Beezley  
3070 Whitetail Lane  
Rescue, Ca. 95672  
Home (530) 677-6698

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: Oppose EDC Planning proposal PA 16 0007 - POMEROL VINEYARD ESTATES**1 message

---

**Robert Peters** <robert.peters@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 8:17 AM

To: EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

Public comment received for PA16-0007. Please process is it for uploading to the legistar item.

Thank you.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ted** <black.dog@pacbell.net>

Date: Fri, May 19, 2017 at 2:19 PM

Subject: Oppose EDC Planning proposal PA 16 0007 - POMEROL VINEYARD ESTATES

To: robert.peters@edcgov.us

Cc: aaron.mount@edcgov.us

Sirs: I am submitting this e-mail to you to voice my opposition to the above referenced project, and to solicit your most careful project review, and opposition, as well.

My wife and I live on Fulam Court in Rescue just off rural 2-lane Starbuck Road. The project is in a preliminary review and discussion stage at EDC Planning. The proposal would re-zone and develop the 130 acre former golf course here to a 137 residence "medium to high density" subdivision, with its main entrance on Starbuck Road across from Winchester Drive. Starbuck is simply, and obviously, not designed for more traffic than it currently carries. The additional traffic related to 137 additional residences would create an distinctly unsafe traffic volume on Starbuck between Winchester and Green Valley Road, where we live. The same issues would be true of Starbuck between Winchester and Deer Valley Road, and continuing onto Deer Valley Road. It would also severely damage the quiet residential and rural environment along all of those roads.

Please note my opposition and its underlying issues in the context of the May 23 planning hearing on the proposal.

Any assistance you could provide opposing the project would be appreciated as a safety and environmental action.

Thank you.

Ted Starr

2921 Fulam Court

Rescue, CA, 95672

(H) 530-677-5566

(C) 916-765-0469



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

--

**Rob Peters**

Associate Planner

**County of El Dorado**

Community Development Agency

Development Services Division

Planning Services

2850 Fairlane Court

Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-6644 / FAX (530) 626-0387

Robert.Peters@edcgov.us





EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: vote no**

1 message

---

**Planning Department** <planning@edcgov.us>  
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 8:26 AM

Please upload to Legistar # 17-0488 PA16-0007 for BOS Agenda May 23, 2017

Thank you, Debbie

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Tallamy, Douglas W** <dtallamy@udel.edu>

Date: Sun, May 21, 2017 at 3:06 PM

Subject: vote no

To: "bosfour@dcgov.us" <bosfour@dcgov.us>, "planning@edcgov.us" <planning@edcgov.us>

City Supervisors and Planning Department

I am writing to urge you to NOT to rezone the low density (Re-10) area requested for high density development (PA 16-007) by Shore Springs Partners. I make this request for several reasons. The oak canopy on this property is a rare and extremely valuable ecological resource. My research (<http://canr.udel.edu/faculty/tallamy-doug/>) has shown that oaks have the highest ecological value of any tree genus in North America. They support larger and more complex food webs and thus more biodiversity, they sequester more above and below ground carbon, and they stabilize climate extremes and protect watersheds better than any other tree. In short, oaks contribute to rather than destroy local ecosystem function. And they are not easily replaced. It takes hundreds of years to develop the type of oak canopy you are considering eliminating for another housing development. Moreover, the property in question borders other ecologically valuable acreage and therefore is acting as a valuable biological corridor. Please do not further fragment such valuable habitat.

Respectfully,

Douglas W. Tallamy  
Professor, University of Delaware

May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

From: Emerald Meadows Subdivision , EL Dorado County Tax, Voter & Home owner, Rescue CA 95672

To be noted for evidence. The letter of notice from the Community development Agency Development Services- Planning office 2850 Fairlane Court Building C, Placerville, CA 95667 - regarding this proposal PA16-0007 was only received by myself by mail on May 7, 2017. The homeowners were not notified at anytime in writing before this date. To be entered on the record that the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors and planning Department withheld this information to those impacted most by this proposal.

County of El Dorado  
Community Development Agency  
Development Services Division  
Roger Trout, Division &  
Planning Director/ Robert Peters

[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Ref: Planning Pre-Application PA16-0007/ Pomerol Vinyard Estates submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC. ( Sabrina Investments Inc/ Shore Springs Partners LLC/Lebeck Young Engineering. ) Parcel # 102-210-08. ( Site of Old Bass Lake Golf Course located off Alexandrite Drive now referred to as " Green Valley Oaks Golf Course") located on the West side of Starbuck Road, GreenValley Road in the Cameron Park, Rescue area parcel number 102-210-08.

Dear: Roger Trout, Division Director, Robert Peters County Planner, El Dorado County Supervisors Districts, 1,2,3,4,

Thank you for the opportunity to give input regarding this pre application proposal PA 16-0007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates.

The proposal should be **DENIED** based on the location of Parcel # 102-210-08 to be Located NEAR or on **Federally** protected wetlands, flood plain, wildlife habitats, rare plants and Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetle insect, amphibians , rare toad & bird habitat among others, as protected under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)(ESA) for threatened or endangered under the Act. Which was renewed Federal Register.09/17/2014 79 FR 55879 55917. We object that the property will impede on the loss of a garden land or the open aspect of the neighborhood effect on the character of the neighborhood by building high density views that will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighboring owners. The proposed development will impact the residential

amenity of neighbors, by reason of (among) other factors noise, loss of privacy, overshadowing and adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

We **object** to the above planning application PA 16-0007/ Pomerol Vineyard Estates submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC for a Conceptual Review and Object to the final plan to build medium - to high density residential subdivision and or including Vineyard on said parcel. We object to the Proposed application that would amend the General plan land use and We object to the REZONE and object to the expansion of the Community Park Community boundary. We object to the future rezone, planned development, and tentative subdivision map that are requested for the identified by the Assessor's Parcel Number# 102-210-08 on the letter we received May 7, 2017. We object to the sale of wine to be sold on the premises, knowing there are schools nearby and the community has an issue with drunk driving as per public Eldorado County crime reports.

The Emerald Meadows homeowners and my self as individual party OBJECT to PA 16-0007 on the following grounds:

**1.Environmental Impact:**

The proposed HIGH density land use and over—development of the site, as well as, the adverse impact which the proposed development will have on the character of the neighborhood. We object to the design due to the fact that this parcel is surrounded by Federally Protected Pine Hill State Ecological Preserve, protected animal habitat & Emerald meadows wetlands and flood plain, that is home to Federally protected plants, insects and Birds. Under the ACT (16 U.S.C. 1531 ) (CFR)Code of Federal Regulations,50CFR17.11, 17.12

**2. Traffic and transport:**

Another large subdivision located off or near Green Valley Road, Cameron Park, Rescue Shingle Springs Area will drastically increase traffic, impact our local air quality, safety of pedestrians, particularly, local school children. The traffic data already shows Green Valley Road and surrounding two-lane streets located near the proposed site to be impacted by traffic from the new development subdivision still being built off Green Valley Road and the surrounding new homes off Bass Lake & Silva Parkway already impede traffic flow according to the (Environmental Impact Report.)The Cameron Glenn Estates plan, if completed (15 homes)is adjacent to Green Valley -Road near Starbucks Road, Hastings, Peridot drive, Alexandrite drive listed as the roads listed in the proposal, will impact traffic on all roads, and all roads located near this proposal will be impacted by noise and



traffic congestion. The transportation traffic data does not reassure us that there will not be a significant Negative impact on the health of Rescue, Cameron Park and Shingle Springs.

This will also impact commuters who take public transportation, as traffic increases so will the ability to get to their job . This proposal will cause a need for more public transportation which will impact the air quality of the citizens and animals in the area. Longer commute times will be created by this proposal.

We therefore request that the Planning department and Community Development Agency Supervisors carry out through, independent, and transparent assessment of the traffic and transport issues by an un-biased outside agency. How is the traffic planned to be kept off Tourmaline Way, Malachite Way, Hastings Drive and Dunbar road? TRAFFIC WILL IMPACT THE Surrounding streets which will cause harm to the Federally protected habitat.

We urge the county to consider the noise CNEL level and make sure it isn't beyond the 65 CNEL and 45 CNEL indoors , Set by the State of California . We refuse this proposal because the electricity to light up the subdivision will impact the birds that fly over the California belt way of migrating birds, who rely on the star constellations at night to get to their habitat and more light in the night sky will impede their ability to do so. (Many of these birds that fly over are Federally protected and listed on the National register of Endangered birds.)

### **3. Surface and Ground WATER pollution:**

We also oppose the fact that the zoning for Pomerol to have a vineyard on the property would go against the El Dorado County General Plan related to Oak Woodlands. As the use of the property for agriculture would allow the destruction of the OAK CANOPY needed for the endangered Federally protected habitats of birds and insect and amphibians that surround the parcel. *The Clean Streams Law* would be impacted and Federally protected

fish in the surrounding Lake and runoff streams from the flood plains drainage of small streams would cause contamination to community drinking water and or loss of endangered and protected wetland species. You mention nothing about organic certification for the grapes? So **pesticide** use would subject residents to air borne contaminants and soil contaminants from the pesticides used in Vineyards and grape production. Conventional wine growing can expose local waterways as well as farm workers to fungicides, fertilizers and pesticides which cause cancer, birth defects, nerve problems or allergy symptoms. According to the California Wine impact Assessment.(CWIA)



May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

Who pays for the crop insurance? Who pays for the inspection fees? Who pays for the additional water ?

**4. Airport issues.**

We object to the proposal because it conflicts with the FAA Code violations of Title 14 standards on Population Density restrictions for residential land use near airports. The proposed site for construction is at 1.9 miles to the Cameron Park Airpark (061.) This will affect noise sensitive lands uses and local communities. The location is not near a major freeway, not located near major employment facilities and would not be located near any major recreational area. No New construction or development should be undertaken California Administration Title Code, Title 24 must be maintained only after a detailed analysis of the noise insulation features included in the design.

This would create over development near the Cameron Air Park (061) which could lead to premature death and a change to the existing residential noise level amenity already known by residents. No changes to the existing residential zoning should be made.

The proposal mentions nothing about noise attenuation. The rural quiet nighttime we are used to is only 10-25 db(a) We object because The proposal would change that db(A). Possible hearing loss could result as well as loss of State protected animal , insect, plant habitats. California Administrative Code- Noise Standards-Title 21

5. More Schools, more Police, more Fire stations would be needed to accommodate this request and would impact the livelihood of the residents.

It is therefore determined that we as community & individuals in areas to be affected most by this proposal, object to the pre application of proposal PA 16-0007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates, submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC.

We as a community feel this will not maintain the Cameron Park , Rescue, Shingle Springs environment rich in rural Pioneer gold rush history and will pose traffic issues, noise , health, loss of view, loss of habitats, & the reasons stated above. It is our hope that you will deny this application. Please.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. & Mrs. Connie Rodgers, Audubon constituent  
cc

May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

Michael Ranelli- Supervisor Fourth District    bosfour@edcgov.us  
Shiva Frentzen- Supervisor Second District    bostwo@edcgov.us  
John Hidahl- Supervisor First District    bosone@edcgov.us  
Robert Peters- El Dorado County Planning    planning@edcgov.usgov.us  
FAA Environmental , Mr. D Tallamy, Phd, SFWO, AUDUBON, CEQ, S. Sanchez,EID,

May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

From: Emerald Meadows Subdivision , EL Dorado County Tax, Voter & Home owner, Rescue CA 95672

To be noted for evidence. The letter of notice from the Community development Agency Development Services- Planning office 2850 Fairlane Court Building C, Placerville, CA 95667 - regarding this proposal PA16-0007 was only received by myself by mail on May 7, 2017. The homeowners were not notified at anytime in writing before this date. To be entered on the record that the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors and planning Department withheld this information to those impacted most by this proposal.

County of El Dorado  
Community Development Agency  
Development Services Division  
Roger Trout, Division &  
Planning Director/ Robert Peters

[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Ref: Planning Pre-Application PA16-0007/ Pomerol Vinyard Estates submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC. ( Sabrina Investments Inc/ Shore Springs Partners LLC/ Lebeck Young Engineering. ) Parcel # 102-210-08. ( Site of Old Bass Lake Golf Course located off Alexandrite Drive now referred to as " Green Valley Oaks Golf Course") located on the West side of Starbuck Road, Green Valley Road in the Cameron Park, Rescue area parcel number 102-210-08.

Dear: Roger Trout, Division Director, Robert Peters County Planner, El Dorado County Supervisors Districts, 1,2,3,4,

Thank you for the opportunity to give input regarding this pre application proposal PA 16-0007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates.

The proposal should be **DENIED** based on the location of Parcel # 102-210-08 to be Located NEAR or on **Federally** protected wetlands, flood plain, wildlife habitats, rare plants and Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetle insect, amphibians , rare toad & bird habitat among others, as protected under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)(ESA) for threatened or endangered under the Act. Which was renewed Federal Register. 09/17/2014 79 FR 55879 55917. We object that the property will impede on the loss of a garden land or the open aspect of the neighborhood effect on the character of the neighborhood by building high density views that will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighboring owners. The proposed development will impact the residential

May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

amenity of neighbors, by reason of (among) other factors noise, loss of privacy, overshadowing and adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

We **object** to the above planning application PA 16-0007/ Pomerol Vinyard Estates submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC for a Conceptual Review and Object to the final plan to build medium - to high density residential subdivision and or including Vineyard on said parcel. We object to the Proposed application that would amend the General plan land use and We object to the REZONE and object to the expansion of the Community Park Community boundary. We object to the future rezone, planned development, and tentative subdivision map that are requested for the identified by the Assessor's Parcel Number# 102-210-08 on the letter we received May 7, 2017. We object to the sale of wine to be sold on the premises, knowing there are schools nearby and the community has an issue with drunk driving as per public Eldorado County crime reports.

The Emerald Meadows homeowners and my self as individual party OBJECT to PA 16-0007 on the following grounds:

### **1.Environmental Impact:**

The proposed HIGH density land use and over—development of the site, as well as, the adverse impact which the proposed development will have on the character of the neighborhood. We object to the design due to the fact that this parcel is surrounded by Federally Protected Pine Hill State Ecological Preserve, protected animal habitat & Emerald meadows wetlands and flood plain, that is home to Federally protected plants, insects and Birds. Under the ACT (16 U.S.C. 1531 ) (CFR)Code of Federal Regulations,50CFR17.11, 17.12

### **2. Traffic and transport:**

Another large subdivision located off or near Green Valley Road, Cameron Park, Rescue Shingle Springs Area will drastically increase traffic, impact our local air quality, safety of pedestrians, particularly, local school children. The traffic data already shows Green Valley Road and surrounding two-lane streets located near the proposed site to be impacted by traffic from the new development subdivision still being built off Green Valley Road and the surrounding new homes off Bass Lake & Silva Parkway already impede traffic flow according to the (Environmental Impact Report.)The Cameron Glenn Estates plan, if completed (15 homes)is adjacent to Green Valley -Road near Starbucks Road, Hastings, Peridot drive, Alexandrite drive listed as the roads listed in the proposal, will impact traffic on all roads, and all roads located near this proposal will be impacted by noise and



traffic congestion. The transportation traffic data does not reassure us that there will not be a significant Negative impact on the health of Rescue, Cameron Park and Shingle Springs.

This will also impact commuters who take public transportation, as traffic increases so will the ability to get to their job . This proposal will cause a need for more public transportation which will impact the air quality of the citizens and animals in the area. Longer commute times will be created by this proposal.

We therefore request that the Planning department and Community Development Agency Supervisors carry out through, independent, and transparent assessment of the traffic and transport issues by an un-biased outside agency. How is the traffic planned to be kept off Tourmaline Way, Malachite Way, Hastings Drive and Dunbar road? TRAFFIC WILL IMPACT THE Surrounding streets which will cause harm to the Federally protected habitat.

We urge the county to consider the noise CNEL level and make sure it isn't beyond the 65 CNEL and 45 CNEL indoors , Set by the State of California . We refuse this proposal because the electricity to light up the subdivision will impact the birds that fly over the California belt way of migrating birds, who rely on the star constellations at night to get to their habitat and more light in the night sky will impede their ability to do so. (Many of these birds that fly over are Federally protected and listed on the National register of Endangered birds.)

### 3. Surface and Ground WATER pollution:

We also oppose the fact that the zoning for Pomerol to have a vineyard on the property would go against the El Dorado County General Plan related to Oak Woodlands. As the use of the property for agriculture would allow the destruction of the OAK CANOPY needed for the endangered Federally protected habitats of birds and insect and amphibians that surround the parcel. *The Clean Streams Law* would be impacted and Federally protected

fish in the surrounding Lake and runoff streams from the flood plains drainage of small streams would cause contamination to community drinking water and or loss of endangered and protected wetland species. You mention nothing about organic certification for the grapes? So **pesticide** use would subject residents to air borne contaminants and soil contaminants from the pesticides used in Vineyards and grape production. Conventional wine growing can expose local waterways as well as farm workers to fungicides, fertilizers and pesticides which cause cancer, birth defects, nerve problems or allergy symptoms. According to the California Wine impact Assessment.(CWIA)

Who pays for the crop insurance? Who pays for the inspection fees? Who pays for the additional water ?

#### **4. Airport issues.**

We object to the proposal because it conflicts with the FAA Code violations of Title 14 standards on Population Density restrictions for residential land use near airports. The proposed site for construction is at 1.9 miles to the Cameron Park Airpark( 061.) This will affect noise sensitive lands uses and local communities. The location is not near a major freeway, not located near major employment facilities and would not be located near any major recreational area. No New construction or development should be undertaken California Administration Title Code, Title 24 must be maintained only after a detailed analysis of the noise insulation features included in the design.

This would create over development near the Cameron Air Park (061) which could lead to premature death and a change to the existing residential noise level amenity already known by residents. No changes to the existing residential zoning should be made.

The proposal mentions nothing about noise attenuation. The rural quiet nighttime we are used to is only 10-25 db(a) We object because The proposal would change that db(A). Possible hearing loss could result as well as loss of State protected animal , insect, plant habitats. California Administrative Code- Noise Standards-Title 21

5. More Schools, more Police, more Fire stations would be needed to accommodate this request and would impact the livelihood of the residents.

It is therefore determined that we as community & individuals in areas to be affected most by this proposal, object to the pre application of proposal PA 16-0007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates, submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC.

We as a community feel this will not maintain the Cameron Park , Rescue, Shingle Springs environment rich in rural Pioneer gold rush history and will pose traffic issues, noise , health, loss of view, loss of habitats, & the reasons stated above. It is our hope that you will deny this application. Please.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. & Mrs. Connie Rodgers, Audubon constituent  
cc

May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

Michael Ranelli- Supervisor Fourth District    bosfour@edcgov.us  
Shiva Frentzen- Supervisor Second District    bostwo@edcgov.us  
John Hidahl- Supervisor First District    bosone@edcgov.us  
Robert Peters- El Dorado County Planning    planning@edcgov.usgov.us  
FAA Environmental , Mr. D Tallamy, Phd, SFWO, AUDUBON, CEQ, S. Sanchez,EID,



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

1 message

---

Harmoning, Lynette M <lynette.m.harmoning@intel.com>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 9:09 AM

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

Cc: "Harmoning, Lynette M" <lynette.m.harmoning@intel.com>

May 22, 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. Ranalli,

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. As it appears this would create main access of Starbuck Road and Secondary access of Peridot Drive. We all know that Peridot drive is the most visible off Greenvalley road and would endure the brunt of traffic in and out of this proposed development. My main concern is with increased automobile traffic down a street that I have lived on for 20 years. I would like to see a better plan to manage traffic backing up in the neighborhood during commute hours, control of speed through our street with potential installation of undulations. I would also like to understand the plans for Alexandrite drive and why it is not being considered for access point into this proposed development.

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 re-designation 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 re-designation 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 1/4-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 re-designation 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,

Lynette Harmoning

2709 Peridot Drive

Rescue, CA 95672

(530) 676-7869

(916) 934-4213

lynette.m.harmoning@intel.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)

May 20, 2017

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

**Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project**

Dear Mr. Trout and Mr. Ranalli,

**I am writing this letter 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 UNWANTED growth in the area. Furthermore, I DO NOT SUPPORT ANNEXING ANY PART OR ENTIRETY OF THE RESCUE COMMUNITY INTO CAMERON PARK. Additionally, after living in this community for 30+ years, I am very familiar with the water issues such as wells going dry, LIKEWISE, I am TOTALLY AGAINST high density housing. The general area, including the golf course, is zoned for 5 and 10 acre parcels!!! Further development needs to continue developing 5 and 10 acre parcels!!!**

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, ¼-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. I've included my address and e-mail below.

Sincerely,



Jeannine K. Wheeler  
2081 Buckhorn Lane  
Rescue, California 95672  
Edm95672@yahoo.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)

May 20, 2017

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

**Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project**

Dear Mr. Trout and Mr. Ranalli,

**As a registered voter and graduate of Ponderosa High School who has lived his entire life in the Rescue community, I am writing this letter to express my OPPOSITION to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. I do not support the proposed high density housing. Keep Rescue rural and develop only the 5 and 10 acre parcels for which the area is zoned. I do not want Rescue to be annexed into Cameron Park.**

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, ¼-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 prosed 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 a 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. I've included my address below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John E. Wheeler, IV', written over a printed name.

John E. Wheeler, IV  
2081 Buckhorn Lane  
Rescue, California 95672

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



May 20, 2017

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

**Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project**

Dear Mr. Trout and Mr. Ranalli,

**I am writing this letter to express my OPPOSITION to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. As a resident of the Rescue community for 30+ years, I OBJECT to high density development. This area is zoned for 5 and 10 acre parcels, and needs to remain that way. I do not support annexing Rescue into Cameron Park, either. Furthermore, water is an issue in the Rescue area; wells go dry. EID cannot be relied upon to supply adequate water for the additional proposed development.**

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 1/4-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 prosed 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 a 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. I've included my address and e-mail below.

Sincerely,  
  
John E. Wheeler, III  
2081 Buckhorn Lane  
Rescue, California 95672  
Edm95672@yahoo.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



May 19, 2017

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
EL DORADO COUNTY

2017 MAY 22 AM 10:51

Michael Ranalli, District Four Supervisor  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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, ¼-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,  
  
William and Diane Palmer  
3026 Whitetail Drive  
Rescue, CA 95672

530-677-4449  
Cell 530-306-6128

cc: Roger Trout



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol subdivision plan

1 message

Gary Gorans <garygorans@sbcglobal.net>  
Reply-To: Gary Gorans <garygorans@sbcglobal.net>  
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 10:38 AM

May 21, 2017

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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 1/4-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,

Gary Gorans  
4565 Fremont's Loop  
Rescue, CA 95672  
530-676-7070  
garygorans@sbcglobal.net



cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: pomerol development**

1 message

**Char Tim** <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 11:26 AM

To: EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

Please upload this public comment for the Pomerol Vineyard Estates item (#17-0488). Thank you.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Roger Trout** <roger.trout@edcgov.us>

Date: Mon, May 22, 2017 at 11:24 AM

Subject: Fwd: pomerol development

To: Charlene Tim &lt;charlene.tim@edcgov.us&gt;, Robert Peters &lt;robert.peters@edcgov.us&gt;

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nancy** <nmertes@verizon.net>

Date: Sun, May 21, 2017 at 12:42 PM

Subject: Fwd: pomerol development

To: roger.trout@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:**pomerol development**Date:**Sun, 21 May 2017 12:36:29 -0700**From:**Nancy <nmertes@verizon.net>**To:**bosfour@edcgov.us, nmertes@verizon.net

I am adamantly opposed to this project. I am a homeowner in Deer Valley Oaks community, which is next to this project's boundary.

My community is totally well water dependent !! This project of 145 lots to use well water (ground water) is ludicrous. It is my understanding that the three wells to service the present golf course are as follows. One well is dry. A second well is only at about 50% capacity and the third well's condition is unknown. At any rate, to assume that this project will not impact my community is fantasy.

How many of the 145 proposed lots will be on sewer? How will this sewage be processed? Rescue has no sewage plant.

I have been a Resident of Rescue for thirty four years. My cows, chickens, sheep, dogs and horses have been very happy and contented here. Please do not let us lose our R designation.

I will look forward to further communication.

Stanley R. Mertes M.D.

---  
**Roger Trout**  
Development Services Division Director

**County of El Dorado**  
Community Development Agency  
Development Services Division  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5369 / FAX (530) 642-0508  
roger.trout@edcgov.us

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

---  
**Char Tim**  
Clerk of the Planning Commission

Assistant to Roger Trout  
Interim Director

**County of El Dorado**  
Planning and Building Department  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5351 / FAX (530) 642-0508  
charlene.tim@edcgov.us



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Opposition to the Pomerol Vineyard Estates Proposal

1 message

---

DENNIS BURTON <dennnis39@hotmail.com>  
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 12:08 PM

Mr. Trout,

I wish to express my opposition to the proposed development titled Pomerol Vineyard Estates.

My opposition is based on the following:

1. This development is inconsistent with the El Dorado County General Plan Policy 2.1.1.2.
2. The present access roads to the proposed development do not allow for the increased traffic that will result with the proposed number of lots.
3. The increase in noise, air pollution, crime and emergency support services will detract from the present acceptable level we enjoy at the present time.
4. Water and sewer concerns must be considered as the past drought conditions have shown that water is not always available to the proposed area of development.

I am in favor of development of the property involved with the project; but only if the proposed home sites are held to the existing five and ten acre zoning presently in place and are not incorporated into the Cameron Park boundary.

I do request you provide me any information on the development of the Pomerol Vineyard Estates project.



Respectfully,

Dennis and Sharon Burton

3041 Winchester Drive

Rescue, California 95672

(530) 672-7434

Dennnis39@hotmail.com

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

## The Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

1 message

Julie Gorans &lt;pered@sbcglobal.net&gt;

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 12:08 PM

Reply-To: Julie Gorans &lt;pered@sbcglobal.net&gt;

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

Dear Mr. Trout,

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 re-designation 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. Are you aware of the discrepancy? So which number of units is correct?

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 re-designation to allow suburban-level development is inappropriate and inconsistent.

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. How do you propose to account for this?

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 up-sizing would be required to accommodate project demand? Any up-sizing 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, ¼-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 wine tasting and could generate sales tax revenue for the County. Does the developer propose to produce wine on site? How many acres of grapes are planned 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. This is not an agricultural area and the use of pesticides and fertilizers may effect the current residents.

For the record, I would like to restate my opposition to the re-designation 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.

5/22/2017

Edcgov.us Mail - The Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Sincerely,

Julie Gorans  
4565 Fremonts Loop, Rescue, CA 95672  
pered@sbcglobal.net





EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

**Pomerol Vineyard Estates (Application No. PA160007...Parcel No. 102-210-08)**

1 message

Eileen Misrahi &lt;eileenm5591@gmail.com&gt;

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 12:13 PM

To: EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;, planning@edcgov.us

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

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

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Messrs, Trout and Ranalli:

We would like to express our continued opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. As it appears this would create main access of Starbuck Road and Secondary access of Peridot Drive. We all know that Peridot drive is the most visible off Greenvalley road and would endure the brunt of traffic in and out of this proposed development. This increased amount of traffic going in and out of the Pomerol area will cause major traffic blockages for those living in the Emerald Meadows area and more specifically, for those residents who live directly on Peridot Drive. This alone is only one issue, the homes that will be build directly behind the proposed Peridot entrance, will cause parking issues as well. Due to the high density building in the Pomerol area, cars will begin parking on Peridot and walking through when they are unable to find parking while visiting family, friends, etc. Now Peridot will not only be subject to an over excessive amount of traffic, but there will be parking issues as well and possible driveways blocked. The original entrance off of Alexandrite and the other proposed entrance off of Starbucks should be the designated entrances and Peridot should remain closed for the safety and well-being of the residents of Emerald Meadows.

We would also like to know if a wall will be put up behind the housing development behind Peridot and extending on both sides behind Aquamarine Circle. There is the issue of privacy that the residents would like to continue to have. Once the homes are built, they will look directly into the homes on Peridot and Aquamarine and that is a direct invasion of the residents' privacy. If this project continues and goes through, the issue of a wall needs to be addressed.

On another note, separate but yet inclusive with the property, during the high fire season there should be some kind of fire line made by the owner/proposed builder to avoid any possible fires reaching the homes on Aquamarine and Peridot. Last year there was a fire and everyone was on the watch to make sure that if it hit the golf course, that it did not get through to our homes. It would be nice if the owner/proposed builder would maintain the property so as to avoid any such problems with fires possibly jumping to our homes. Though it is not a property being used, there is no excuse for not maintaining it for safety reasons.

We would also like to join in with the community's letter from this point forward in objection to the Estates.

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 re-designation 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 re-designation 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 1/4-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 re-designation 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,

Ray and Eileen Misrahi

2703 Peridot Drive

Rescue, CA 95672

email: eileenm5591@gmail.com



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: PA 16-0007**

1 message

---

**The BOSTWO** <bostwo@edcgov.us>  
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 12:31 PM

***Elaine Gelber***

Assistant to Supervisor Shiva Frentzen  
Board of Supervisors, District II  
County of El Dorado  
530.621.5651

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Constance** <califgirlconnie@gmail.com>  
Date: Thu, May 18, 2017 at 1:52 PM  
Subject: RE:PA 16-0007  
To: bostwo@edcgov.us

Dear Shiva Frentzen Supervisor Second District,

I am am writing to ask for your help in a matter that affects our community.

It is our hope that you will deny this request PA 16-0007. Please read my reasons why in the letter enclosed . We aren't against the original land owner zoning of RE-10. We are against the proposal PA16-0007 and its impact on our rural community.

We like our rural community we have come to love. We like hearing only the sounds of wildlife such as song birds bumble bees, and children playing outside in the clean air. We moved to Rescue many many years ago and moved here because we wanted to get away from the Southern Californias "concrete jungle" & grid lock work commute. I like to tell people that" Rescue" really does Rescue people! We love it here because everyone is family . The rural atmosphere is why this community is so down to earth . Everyone in my neighborhood cares about the environment . We urge you to be the support we need to stop and Deny this proposal PA 16-0007.

Thank you for your time and consideration to this request.



**PA16-0007.pdf**  
68K



May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

From: Emerald Meadows Subdivision , EL Dorado County Tax, Voter & Home owner, Rescue CA 95672

To be noted for evidence. The letter of notice from the Community development Agency Development Services- Planning office 2850 Fairlane Court Building C, Placerville, CA 95667 - regarding this proposal PA16-0007 was only received by myself by mail on May 7, 2017. The homeowners were not notified at anytime in writing before this date. To be entered on the record that the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors and planning Department withheld this information to those impacted most by this proposal.

County of El Dorado  
Community Development Agency  
Development Services Division  
Roger Trout, Division &  
Planning Director/ Robert Peters

[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)  
[edc.cob@edcgov.us](mailto:edc.cob@edcgov.us)

Ref: Planning Pre-Application PA16-0007/ Pomerol Vinyard Estates submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC. ( Sabrina Investments Inc/ Shore Springs Partners LLC/ Lebeck Young Engineering. ) Parcel # 102-210-08. ( Site of Old Bass Lake Golf Course located off Alexandrite Drive now referred to as " Green Valley Oaks Golf Course") located on the West side of Starbuck Road, Green Valley Road in the Cameron Park, Rescue area parcel number 102-210-08.

Dear: Roger Trout, Division Director, Robert Peters County Planner, El Dorado County Supervisors Districts, 1,2,3,4,

Thank you for the opportunity to give input regarding this pre application proposal PA 16-0007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates.

The proposal should be **DENIED** based on the location of Parcel # 102-210-08 to be Located NEAR or on **Federally** protected wetlands, flood plain, wildlife habitats, rare plants and Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetle insect, amphibians , rare toad & bird habitat among others, as protected under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)(ESA) for threatened or endangered under the Act. Which was renewed Federal Register.09/17/2014 79 FR 55879 55917. We object that the property will impede on the loss of a garden land or the open aspect of the neighborhood effect on the character of the neighborhood by building high density views that will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighboring owners. The proposed development will impact the residential

amenity of neighbors, by reason of (among) other factors noise, loss of privacy, overshadowing and adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

We **object** to the above planning application PA 16-0007/ Pomerol Vineyard Estates submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC for a Conceptual Review and Object to the final plan to build medium - to high density residential subdivision and or including Vineyard on said parcel. We object to the Proposed application that would amend the General plan land use and We object to the REZONE and object to the expansion of the Community Park Community boundary. We object to the future rezone, planned development, and tentative subdivision map that are requested for the identified by the Assessor's Parcel Number# 102-210-08 on the letter we received May 7, 2017. We object to the sale of wine to be sold on the premises, knowing there are schools nearby and the community has an issue with drunk driving as per public Eldorado County crime reports.

The Emerald Meadows homeowners and my self as individual party OBJECT to PA 16-0007 on the following grounds:

**1.Environmental Impact:**

The proposed HIGH density land use and over—development of the site, as well as, the adverse impact which the proposed development will have on the character of the neighborhood. We object to the design due to the fact that this parcel is surrounded by Federally Protected Pine Hill State Ecological Preserve, protected animal habitat & Emerald meadows wetlands and flood plain, that is home to Federally protected plants, insects and Birds. Under the ACT (16 U.S.C. 1531 ) (CFR)Code of Federal Regulations,50CFR17.11, 17.12

**2. Traffic and transport:**

Another large subdivision located off or near Green Valley Road, Cameron Park, Rescue Shingle Springs Area will drastically increase traffic, impact our local air quality, safety of pedestrians, particularly, local school children. The traffic data already shows Green Valley Road and surrounding two-lane streets located near the proposed site to be impacted by traffic from the new development subdivision still being built off Green Valley Road and the surrounding new homes off Bass Lake & Silva Parkway already impede traffic flow according to the (Environmental Impact Report.)The Cameron Glenn Estates plan, if completed (15 homes)is adjacent to Green Valley -Road near Starbucks Road, Hastings, Peridot drive, Alexandrite drive listed as the roads listed in the proposal, will impact traffic on all roads, and all roads located near this proposal will be impacted by noise and

traffic congestion. The transportation traffic data does not reassure us that there will not be a significant Negative impact on the health of Rescue, Cameron Park and Shingle Springs.

This will also impact commuters who take public transportation, as traffic increases so will the ability to get to their job . This proposal will cause a need for more public transportation which will impact the air quality of the citizens and animals in the area. Longer commute times will be created by this proposal.

We therefore request that the Planning department and Community Development Agency Supervisors carry out through, independent, and transparent assessment of the traffic and transport issues by an un-biased outside agency. How is the traffic planned to be kept off Tourmaline Way, Malachite Way, Hastings Drive and Dunbar road? TRAFFIC WILL IMPACT THE Surrounding streets which will cause harm to the Federally protected habitat.

We urge the county to consider the noise CNEL level and make sure it isn't beyond the 65 CNEL and 45 CNEL indoors , Set by the State of California . We refuse this proposal because the electricity to light up the subdivision will impact the birds that fly over the California belt way of migrating birds, who rely on the star constellations at night to get to their habitat and more light in the night sky will impede their ability to do so. (Many of these birds that fly over are Federally protected and listed on the National register of Endangered birds.)

### **3. Surface and Ground WATER pollution:**

We also oppose the fact that the zoning for Pomerol to have a vineyard on the property would go against the El Dorado County General Plan related to Oak Woodlands. As the use of the property for agriculture would allow the destruction of the OAK CANOPY needed for the endangered Federally protected habitats of birds and insect and amphibians that surround the parcel. *The Clean Streams Law* would be impacted and Federally protected

fish in the surrounding Lake and runoff streams from the flood plains drainage of small streams would cause contamination to community drinking water and or loss of endangered and protected wetland species. You mention nothing about organic certification for the grapes? So **pesticide** use would subject residents to air borne contaminants and soil contaminants from the pesticides used in Vineyards and grape production. Conventional wine growing can expose local waterways as well as farm workers to fungicides, fertilizers and pesticides which cause cancer, birth defects, nerve problems or allergy symptoms. According to the California Wine impact Assessment.(CWIA)

May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

Who pays for the crop insurance? Who pays for the inspection fees? Who pays for the additional water ?

#### **4. Airport issues.**

We object to the proposal because it conflicts with the FAA Code violations of Title 14 standards on Population Density restrictions for residential land use near airports. The proposed site for construction is at 1.9 miles to the Cameron Park Airpark( 061.) This will affect noise sensitive lands uses and local communities. The location is not near a major freeway, not located near major employment facilities and would not be located near any major recreational area. No New construction or development should be undertaken California Administration Title Code, Title 24 must be maintained only after a detailed analysis of the noise insulation features included in the design.

This would create over development near the Cameron Air Park (061) which could lead to premature death and a change to the existing residential noise level amenity already known by residents. No changes to the existing residential zoning should be made.

The proposal mentions nothing about noise attenuation. The rural quiet nighttime we are used to is only 10-25 db(a) We object because The proposal would change that db(A). Possible hearing loss could result as well as loss of State protected animal , insect, plant habitats. California Administrative Code- Noise Standards-Title 21

5. More Schools, more Police, more Fire stations would be needed to accommodate this request and would impact the livelihood of the residents.

It is therefore determined that we as community & individuals in areas to be affected most by this proposal, object to the pre application of proposal PA 16-0007/Pomerol Vineyard Estates, submitted by Shore Springs Partners, LLC.

We as a community feel this will not maintain the Cameron Park , Rescue, Shingle Springs environment rich in rural Pioneer gold rush history and will pose traffic issues, noise , health, loss of view, loss of habitats, & the reasons stated above. It is our hope that you will deny this application. Please.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. & Mrs. Connie Rodgers, Audubon constituent

cc



May 16, 2017

Proposal PA16-0007

Michael Ranelli- Supervisor Fourth District    bosfour@edcgov.us  
Shiva Frentzen- Supervisor Second District    bostwo@edcgov.us  
John Hidahl- Supervisor First District        bosone@edcgov.us  
Robert Peters- El Dorado County Planning    planning@edcgov.usgov.us  
FAA Environmental , Mr. D Tallamy, Phd, SFWO, AUDUBON, CEQ, S. Sanchez,EID,



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Pomerol Project

1 message

---

**Linda Bailey** <lbailey@bodyconceptsinc.com>  
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>  
Cc: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 1:17 PM

Mr. Trout,

The attached letter is a comprehensive statements of my opposition to the redesignation of the site for urban/suburban development at the current Bass Lake Golf course in Rescue, CA.

Linda Bailey



**Pomerol Project Letter.docx**

17K

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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, ¼-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 prosed 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 a 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,

Linda Bailey  
3110 Whitetail Lane  
Rescue, CA 95672

[lbailey@bodyconceptsinc.com](mailto:lbailey@bodyconceptsinc.com)

cc: Michael Ranalli ([bosfour@edcgov.us](mailto:bosfour@edcgov.us))

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

2017 MAY 22 AM 11: 50

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Dear Mr. Ranalli,

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, ¼-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 prosed 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 a 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,

5/18/17  
2531 Dudley Dr.  
Rescue, Ca 95672

May 19, 2017

Mr. Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

2017 MAY 22 AM 11:51  
RECEIVED  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Trout,

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, ¼-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 prosed 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,

  
William and Diane Palmer  
3026 Whitetail Drive  
Rescue, CA 95672

530-677-4449  
Cell 530-306-6128

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Comment Letter: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Opposition

1 message

---

**Stefanie Lyster** <thelysters@me.com>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 2:42 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us, roger.trout@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us

Attached please find a letter regarding the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates development in the Cameron Park/Rescue area. This development is Item 32 on the May 23 Board of Supervisors agenda. We are opposed to this proposed development and the General Plan land use amendment. We thank you in advance for considering our comments and listening to our community's concerns about this project.

Stefanie and Mike Lyster  
3080 Ridgeline Drive  
Rescue, CA 95672  
thelysters@me.com



---

**Comment Letter\_Pomerol Vineyard Estates\_Lyster\_052217.pdf**

211K

**Stefanie and Mike Lyster**  
**3080 Ridgeline Drive**  
**Rescue, CA 95672**  
**thelysters@me.com**

May 22, 2017

Roger Trout, Division Director  
El Dorado County Planning  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
Via email: [roger.trout@edcgov.us](mailto:roger.trout@edcgov.us)

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

Dear Mr. Trout,

We would like to express our opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. This project would increase traffic on rural Starbuck Road in Rescue, and require the expansion of utilities in the area. Doing so could promote further growth in the area and take away from the rural lifestyle we and other residents of Rescue value so much.

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, as well as comments on the process for the engagement of residents.

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



**Stefanie and Mike Lyster**  
**3080 Ridgeline Drive**  
**Rescue, CA 95672**  
**[thelysters@me.com](mailto:thelysters@me.com)**

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.

**Stefanie and Mike Lyster**  
**3080 Ridgeline Drive**  
**Rescue, CA 95672**  
**thelysters@me.com**

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, ¼-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 prosed 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 a pesticides and fertilizers and the effects on neighboring properties and groundwater.

**Stefanie and Mike Lyster**  
**3080 Ridgeline Drive**  
**Rescue, CA 95672**  
**thelysters@me.com**

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 Environmental Impact Report that fully analyzes the potential impacts that such a development would cause in the area and on County services.

Additionally, we expect a much more robust public engagement process related to this proposed development. The Development Services Department and our county elected officials need to establish a separate time to meet with residents adjacent to the proposed development in order to listen to our concerns and better understand why we oppose it, so you can represent us in this process. A hearing at the Board of Supervisors meeting where we have three minutes to make a public comment is insufficient. And, midday meetings during the work week make it extremely difficult for those of our neighbors who work or have children to pick up from school to be involved. The Development Services Department and county supervisors need to work with residents to identify an appropriate time to meet with us, discuss this proposed development and listen to what we have to say, especially so that all interested parties who want to be involved in these discussions can try to make it. Many people are simply unable to take time away from work or to find childcare during the day, no matter how important they believe voicing their opposition to this project to be. Please do not take people NOT showing up at the Board of Supervisors meeting on May 23 to be a sign they either are not interested or are not opposed to this proposed development; the time is simply inconvenient. Your dedication to hearing the concerns of your constituents and working with us is appreciated and expected.

Please include us on all future correspondence for this project.

Sincerely,

Stefanie and Mike Lyster  
3080 Ridgeline Drive  
Rescue, CA 95672  
thelysters@me.com

cc: Supervisor Michael Ranalli (via email)



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

## URGENT: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project Hearing Tuesday May 23, 2017

1 message

**Mccarthy, Gayle L** <gayle.l.mccarthy@intel.com>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 2:49 PM

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

Cc: "Mccarthy, Gayle L" <gayle.l.mccarthy@intel.com>, "glomom2@gmail.com" <glomom2@gmail.com>, Brian McCarthy <irishdad101@gmail.com>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

May 22, 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,

I would like to express my families major opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project in Rescue, CA. This project has multiple factors which would impact the local citizens and community of **EMERALD MEADOWS** and surrounding neighborhoods.

Residents of **Emerald Meadows**, my residential community, are greatly opposed to the development of such a large proposed development. Most importantly, the opening of our private road, **Peridot Road** for use as an outlet to a largely populated development would create many impacts and safety issues to our community and surrounding neighborhoods. Our residence is located on Peridot road. This outlet would cause environmental hazards exiting and entering our driveway, it would create traffic backup at the signal at all times, as during rush hour there are backups exiting our neighborhood. It currently takes between 5-10 minutes to exit our neighborhood with the backup of school and work traffic on Green Valley and Bass Lake Roads. Has a traffic study been completed to validate the impact of the cars to our surrounding neighborhoods. An estimated conservative proposal (140 homes, times three or more vehicles per family = 420 vehicles per traffic period) Peridot Road, would be the most favorable and easiest access point to enter Green Valley road, rather than going all the way around on Starbuck Road. When we bought our home over 15 years ago, the deciding factor was the quiet golf course and closed community to major streets. Even though we are not gated, we have a safety feature in that our roads do not have a through street. There were no plans for development of any kind to use our road. Emerald Meadows is a very quiet, non-gated community with minimal traffic which enables our children to play outside and families to walk with their families and dogs at all times of the day and night. This would add to an already crumbling road and county infrastructure and where are our tax dollars are going. Our schools are overcrowded, has there been any plan in place to improve our existing schools or build a new school for our district? There are presently no plans to widen Green Valley or Bass Lake Roads or Cameron Park, Cambridge arteries to allow for the increase of development in our area. Our roads are vastly overcrowded. **PLEASE DO NOT CONSIDER OPENING PERIDOT ROAD WHICH IS A PRIVATE OUTLET** and will create safety issues to our quiet community. The homes in our neighborhood were bought for views of the openness and quiet golf course. The developer of Pomerol estates did not consider create a separation between the communities or by building a greenbelt to provide privacy. This only benefits the developer for high density homes and encroach on our utilities. A once beautiful open quite space will be filled with mass homes adding years of construction noise, pollution and traffic safety! **We are greatly opposed to this community being developed behind us. The developer and county should have considered using Alexandrite road as the primary entrance to Pomerol estates, the impact would be three homes vs a community**



**of homes. This development would drive our housing prices downward, and cause for safety and environmental concerns.**

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 re designation 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 re designation 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.

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 1/4-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. The management must also address the impact of neighboring communities, road improvement and infrastructure, impacting a quiet community, Emerald Meadows.

Sincerely,

Brian and Gayle McCarthy

Glomom2@gmail.com; irishdad101@gmail.com; gayle.l.mccarthy@intel.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)