

LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE

5/23/17

BOS 5/23/17

#32

May 22, 2017

Robert Peters County Planner,

Thank you for letting us comment on the proposal.

The proposal should be **DENIED** based on the location of Parcel # 102-210-08 to be Located NEAR or on **Federally** protected wetlands and wildlife habitats, rare plants and Valley Elderberry Longhorn beetle insect, amphibians rare toad & bird habitat among others, as protected under National Environmental Policy Act (NEA)(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.

We 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 might 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 that are home to Federally protected plants, insects and Birds. Under the ACT (CFR) Code of Federal Regulations. Our house has a view of that beautiful Preserve.

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, 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 unbiased 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. (These birds that fly over are Federally protected and listed on the National register of Endangered birds.) We also wonder how will you control the noise level as the trees help some to buffer the car traffic noise from Starbucks road but we here only a small amount now and can't imagine what 1600 new cars on the surrounding road will sound like. Need for sound wall on Starbuck road to buffer the noise form housing tracks that can hear traffic on that road due to elevation. No one has mentioned Sound walls? The streets would need speed bumps to control cars speeds in residential subdivisions in the area as there are small children at play and deer that come across the wetland overnight and have for years.

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.

We oppose the proposal because it mentions nothing about pest management practices.

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

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 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. Nothing is mentioned regarding 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 low noise level amenity already known by residents and the ASNA ACT & AIA known by homeowners. We feel no changes to the existing residential zoning should be made.

The proposal mentions nothing about noise attenuation. The rural quiet nighttime we are use to is only 10-20 db(a) (Frogs, owls, bird noises at night) We object because, The proposal would change that db(A). Possible hearing loss could result as well as loss of protected animal habitats. We urge you to deny this proposal PA 16-0007. We thank you for your time and consideration to this life important matter. This proposal doesn't just affect one person it impacts all of us that have come to call El Dorado County home.

Thank you

Mr. & Mrs. Professor C Rodgers, Audubon Constituent



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Opposition to Pomerol Vineyard Estates

1 message

Rescue PTC <ptc.rescue@gmail.com>

Tue, May 23, 2017 at 11:28 AM

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

May 23, 2017

Dear Mr. Trout and Mr. Ranalli,

I am writing to express my extreme displeasure with and opposition to the proposed Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project. This project is not in keeping with the rural character of the surrounding neighborhood, would increase traffic on rural Starbuck Road, would increase the strain on our overcrowded elementary schools, and would require the expansion of utilities in the area, which could promote further growth in the area. Don't destroy our neighborhood!

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 where the infrastructure cannot support high density levels 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,

Rebecca Snyder
1527 Velvet Horn Lane
Rescue, Ca
rebeccajansnyder@gmail.com

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

1 message

sandi <sandi.lockhart@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, May 23, 2017 at 1:45 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

May 23, 2017

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

LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 5/23/17
BOS 5/23/17

Re: Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

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

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 due 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,
Forrest Lockhart
1861 Buckhorn Lane
Rescue, CA 95672
forrest.lockhart@sbcglobal.net



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Pomerol Development

1 message

John Elliott <belliotca@prodigy.net>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us
Cc: Anna Elliott <belliotca@prodigy.net>

Tue, May 23, 2017 at 1:58 PM

Dear Board of Supervisor,

PLEASE Do not rezone this area.I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Vineyard Estates Project.There are not enough roads, sheriff deputies, fire department and water. Do the right thing.Do not approve this development.

Anna & Bill Elliott



Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project/Please Keep Low Density for our Families

1 message

Bill Cooper <Bill.Cooper@ssamarine.com>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 5:43 PM

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

Cc: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "coops6t6@gmail.com" <coops6t6@gmail.com>

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 T. Cooper

4293 Fremonts Loop

Rescue, Ca. 95672

510-772-8022

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Pomerol Vineyard Estates Project

1 message

Rob Kopitzke <rkopitzke@bodyconceptsinc.com>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 6:29 PM

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

Cc: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Mr. Trout,

The letter below 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.

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. 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,

Robert Kopitzke

3110 Whitetail Ln.

Rescue, CA 95672

cc: Michael Ranalli (bosfour@edcgov.us)



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Pomerol Vineyard Estates -- Pre-Application PA16-0007

1 message

Debra MacGregor <macgregordeb16@gmail.com>

Mon, May 22, 2017 at 8:56 PM

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



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

17K

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 <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

STOP BASS LAKE GOLF COURSE DEVELOPMENT

1 message

Tim Snyder <tcsnyder@outlook.com>

Tue, May 23, 2017 at 10:15 AM

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

Cc: Becca <rebeccajansnyder@gmail.com>

I am writing to voice my displeasure about the proposal to over develop the Bass Lake Golf Course in Rescue/Cameron Park.

We do not have the water for that many residences.

Green Valley can't support the traffic it would add.

It would destroy natural sanctuaries for migrating geese, permanent deer herds, and would require redirecting a large natural lake.

This proposal is not in keeping with our rural demographic and this development would destroy the property values of surrounding homes, many of which today are million dollar properties. If this development goes through, it will destroy these communities.

Do we really want more high density housing which will lead to more crime and more trouble for the already over worked El Dorado Sheriff's dept? (By the way, one of the Dept. Sheriff's lives in a property directly adjoining the golf course!)

And finally, we will not become the high density, urban sprawl ghetto of El Dorado Hills! Cameron Park and Rescue are rural and special! We have wineries, farms and families.

Please do not allow a GREEDY land use adjustment by the troubled owner of the golf course (who bought and shut down the course just to make a quick buck!).

Please STOP this land proposal!

Sent from my iPhone