



2/21/2020

Edcgov.us Mail - February 25, 2020 Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda Item 33: Vineyards At El Dorado Hills PD16-0001 El Dorado ...



**EDH APAC Vineyards at El Dorado Hills Subcommittee Findings.pdf**

231K

# El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee



## APAC 2019 Board

John Davey, Chair [jdavey@daveygroup.net](mailto:jdavey@daveygroup.net)  
John Raslear, Vice Chair [jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net)  
Timothy White, Vice Chair [tjwhitejd@gmail.com](mailto:tjwhitejd@gmail.com)  
Brooke Washburn, Secretary [BWashburn@murphyaustin.com](mailto:BWashburn@murphyaustin.com)

1021 Harvard Way, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
<https://edhapac.org>

October 23, 2019

El Dorado County Community Development Agency  
Development Services Department, Planning Division  
Attn: Evan Mattes  
2850 Fairlane Court  
Placerville, CA. 95667

The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee would like to submit the following questions, comments, and observations regarding the proposed **Vineyards At El Dorado Hills residential project PD16-0001**.

The El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (EDH APAC) formed a project subcommittee, EDH APAC Vineyards Subcommittee (EDH APAC Subcommittee) to review the project DEIR - those comments were submitted to the El Dorado County Community Development Agency Development Services Department Planning Division on January 7, 2019. The EDH APAC Subcommittee is providing these findings as a review of the FEIR and the overall project.

To begin, EDH APAC was very pleased by the amount of outreach conducted by the project applicant, not only to EDH APAC, but also to the El Dorado Hills Community in the immediate Malcolm Dixon Road area. The applicant has generously presented their project multiple times over the past several years at our EDH APAC meetings, allowing the audience to ask questions, and raise concerns. The applicant also made allowances to extend the DEIR review and comment period well past the time as provided by CEQA.

However, EDH APAC would like to express our disappointment in the timeline provided to review the FEIR, proposed changes to the project addressed in the FEIR's response to comments, staff reports, and the continuing changes to the project being negotiated outside of public review, prior to the public hearing, but not presented to residents via official documents. We understand the sense of urgency to move a project along, as we, as well as the applicants, believed that the FEIR would be available in late summer or early fall 2019 - however, for a project that required a DEIR, we feel that it is appropriate that adequate time be provided to residents to thoroughly review the FEIR to understand any changes, and to be able to respond in an informed manner.

## Transportation and Circulation

EDH APAC Subcommittee finds that the traffic impact analysis provides confusing conclusions. Specifically, the finding that with the left turn movement restriction at Malcolm Dixon Cutoff Road (Cutoff Road) would result in only 4 additional average daily trips to the Malcolm Dixon Road - Green Valley Road intersection. This seems to fail to account for the existing Wilson Estates/Overlook residents, who would lose the ability to complete a south to east left turn movement that they currently have access to.

While EDH APAC feels that both the current east to north, and south to east left turn movements at the Cutoff Road and Green Valley Road to be a less than safe condition - it was our understanding from both the Wilson Estates/Overlook project approvals, as well as the intent of the Malcolm Dixon Area Traffic Circulation Plan (MDATCP), and the Malcolm Dixon Area of Benefit (AOB) improvements, that one of the primary purposes of this segment of the Cutoff Road was to provide mitigation of increased traffic on Malcolm Dixon Road - that is to remove traffic from Malcolm Dixon Road. By eliminating Left Turn movements from the Cutoff Road, and redirecting that traffic flow back on to Malcolm Dixon Road, that this provision of the Vineyards at El Dorado Hills project *effectively eliminates a mitigation of the previous Wilson Estates/Overlook project*, as well as the intent of the MDATCP and AOB.

EDH APAC prefers that the Malcolm Dixon Cutoff Road and Green Valley Road intersection be improved and signalized - preserving the mitigation provided by the construction of the Malcolm Dixon Cutoff Road, removing additional traffic impacts to Malcolm Dixon Road, from this project and future MDATCP developments - and improving the safety and capacity of the Malcolm Dixon Cutoff Road and Green Valley Road intersection.

Malcolm Dixon Cutoff Road - past considerations:

### **Wilson Estates 14-1331E- Staff Report Exhibit P Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study**

#### **XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.**

*Multi-Project Area of Benefit: The project as proposed does not impact Malcolm Dixon Road to a degree that would require full participation in the Malcolm Dixon Area of Benefit Improvements. If this project proceeds in advance of any other project that is required to construct improvements as identified in the Exhibit X & Y of the Malcolm Dixon Area Traffic Circulation Plan (MDATCP), this project would construct the left turn pocket intersection improvements on Green Valley Road and a portion of the "Lot A, New Connector" road from Green Valley Road to the project entrance (approximately 331 feet, or 61 percent of the New Connector) only. In constructing these improvements at the sole cost of the project, the burden*

*of constructing the remaining improvements identified in the MDATCP would be reduced proportionately.*

*However, if the MDATCP improvements are constructed by others, the project would realize a significant benefit. Therefore, in the event that the Malcolm Dixon Area of Benefit Public Financing District (District) is formed, and the MDATCP improvements are constructed by others, the applicant would be required to participate in the District and pay their fair share of the cost of those improvements.*

*The project has been conditioned to dedicate right of way and design slope easements and set-backs consistent with the MDATCP Improvements. Therefore, this project as proposed does not preclude the creation of the District, or the construction of the MDA TCP improvements.*

*The area of benefit includes the following approved tentative maps: a. La Canada Tentative Map TM06-1421 (47 lots, 10/27/09); b. Alto LLC Tentative Map TM06-1408 (23 lots, 5/5/09); c. Grande Amis Chartraw-Malcolm Dixon Road Estates Tentative Map TM05-1401 (8 lots, 6/15/10); and d. Diamante Tentative Map TM06-1421 (19 lots, 10/27/09).*

*Area of Benefit Improvements: Improvements identified in the MDATCP include widening of Malcolm Dixon Road, realignment of the two curves on Malcolm Dixon Road and the connection to Green Valley Road through this project. The projects within the District will share the cost of all of the improvements.*

*The first project will be required to build all of the improvements and then be reimbursed by the subsequent projects their fair share of the costs. Public funds will not be utilized for the improvements.*

*Transportation Division's recommended conditions incorporate the same Area of Benefit conditions to the approved tentative maps listed above in the event that another project constructs the improvements in advance of this project. At the time of this staff report, no Final Maps have been submitted for any of the approved Tentative Maps. Policy 6.2.3.2 directs that the applicant demonstrate that adequate access exists, or can be provided, to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area. Transportation and the Fire Department have recommended conditions to address concerns with the emergency ingress/egress capabilities of the project. Transportation has included conditions of approval to address the direct and cumulative impacts traffic impacts. As conditioned, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) dated March 3, 2011 and Supplemental TIA dated May 3, 2012, and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Traffic Impact Analysis Addendum 2, Wilson Estates, May 15, 2014, are provided as Attachments 17, 19, and 20.*

<https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4958624&GUID=BD6D1083-8424-4A45-877A-2997C6C464CB>

**Planning Commission Hearing(s) Wilson Estates  
14-1331-2A Planning Commission Minutes 10-09-14 11-4-14**

*Commissioner Stewart made the following comments:  
"Reduces traffic onto Malcolm-Dixon Road"*

<https://eldorado.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4958634&GUID=09B96358-AA8B-4704-AD35-C5C4304482BC>

## **Density Bonus - Open Space - Vineyard Operation**

While the density bonus is available by right, the significant change in both the number of lots, and the density of homes in the project, doubles the previously approved 19 home project. This remains a significant departure from the character of the existing community. The 19 home alternative was consistent with the surrounding existing development in the area, and was generally more compatible with the existing zoning.

The benefit of more open space from the 42 home alternative, while welcomed, doesn't particularly provide a community benefit, as most of the open space is only behind the walls and gates of the project. While pathways will be available to the public to access the open space, the only manner of accessing the open space is by foot, or by bicycle, since there are no concessions provided for vehicle parking outside of the project.

The entirety of the proposed vineyard operation remains undefined, therefore actual impacts from the vineyard feature cannot be determined, as they remain only loose suggestions, fluid, and subject to un-monitored changes.

## **Septic Systems**

The EDH APAC Subcommittee has had many questions regarding the proposed septic systems of the project.

Understanding that the project is across Malcolm Dixon Road and the boundary for the El Dorado Hills Community Region, it seems questionable not to have the 42 homes utilize the sewage systems provided by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), which are literally in the road next to the project site. We understand that in the project scoping meeting that a comment was

submitted that utilizing EID sewage systems could be perceived as growth inducing, but that subsequent comments submitted in response to the DEIR from residents indicated that they would prefer to see the project use EID sewage systems. The impact of septic systems on the local soil and groundwater ecosystems of the previously approved 19 home project was spread across much more property, and in a less dense manner, consistent with the surrounding area. When the project applicant spoke at our October 9, 2019 meeting it was indicated that the concept of connecting to EID sewer service had been recently studied, and that the cost to connect to EID sewer service was significantly higher. The applicant suggested that such a connection could be considered later - but that seems unlikely at this point in the approvals process.

**The comment identified as Q17 on Page 26 -28 of the DEIR response raises the question of whether a 1 acre parcel is large enough to support a septic system considering the average area rainfall.**

**Response A-17 addressing Q17 on Page 42 states**

*“County Ordinance 110.32, as well as the associated SWRCB policy language, specifically refers to average lot size. The project exceeds the average lot size for any of the rainfall conditions shown in OWTS Policy 7.8 Table 1, which requires a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres/single family unit for sites with 15 or less inches of rainfall per year and has the lowest minimum lot size requirement of 0.5 acre per single family unit for sites with more than 40 inches of rainfall per year. The average project density would be 2.7 acres per single family dwelling (42 residential lots/114.03-acre project site); this exceeds the minimum density requirements for parcels in the 20 to 25 inches of rainfall per year category and also exceeds the minimum size requirements for all rainfall categories shown in Table 1, meaning that the project density would meet the County requirements for septic under all rainfall conditions. No revision to the Draft EIR is necessary to address this comment.*

**However as the project description states on Page 7:**

*The proposed project includes subdivision of 42 single-family residential lots, one of which would*

accommodate the existing residence, on a total of 42.23 acres. The remaining approximately 71.8 acres would include one 6.22-acre roadway lot and five open space lots totaling 65.58 acres

Since the focus of the SWRCB policy is land for sewage system installation, the average lot size calculation errs as it incorporates some 65.58 acres of open space that is unavailable for septic system consideration . The project density on the non open space is 42 single family residential lots on 47.45 acres for a density of 1.129 acres per single family dwelling. The lower average lot size should be used in project consideration

The comment identified as Q18 on Page 31 asked when testing recommended by the Septic Feasibility Study be done. Response Response A-19 on Pages 42 – 45 provides a modified Mitigation Measure 3.5-3a which identifies the studies are implemented prior to approval of the Final Map. This addresses the question posed.

The EDH APAC Subcommittee is offering a recommendation of Conditional Support

1. Preserving the traffic and circulation mitigation provided by the Malcolm Dixon Cutoff Road from the MDATCP/AOB and Wilson Estates/Overlook COAs by retaining the left turn movement (or signaling the intersection).
2. Ensuring that the septic systems on all 42 lots meet the SWQCB standards, and that Mitigation Measure 3.5-3a which identifies the studies are implemented prior to approval of the Final Map is part of the COAs

EDH APAC appreciates having the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions please contact John Davey, 2019 APAC Chair at [jdavey@daveygroup.net](mailto:jdavey@daveygroup.net), John Raslear, Vice Chair, at [jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jjrazzpub@sbcglobal.net), or Tim White, Vice Chair, at [tjwhitejd@gmail.com](mailto:tjwhitejd@gmail.com)

Sincerely,

John Davey  
El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee 2019 Chair

Cc: EDCO Planning Commission  
EDCO BOS  
APAC read file



2/20/2020

Edcgov.us Mail - Item 33 Vineyard development



#33 public  
comment

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

---

## Item 33 Vineyard development

1 message

---

**DON METTE** <dmmette@yahoo.com>  
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Thu, Feb 20, 2020 at 10:27 AM

Supervisors as a long time resident of Arroyo Vista Way, I writing to encourage the board to stand by the original agreement of 5 acre minimums. As most of you know this development as planned will increase more traffic on Malcolm Dixon road. Malcolm Dixon Rd previous old Green Valley Rd before it was realigned, barely meets the requirements for legal road requirements of today. On a given day you encounter many bike riders, foot traffic from the new development on the old Wilson Ranch. Not to mention the people from the new development exiting onto Malcolm Dixon instead using Green Valley. Please stick to the previous boards agreement of 5 acre minimums.

Thanks for your consideration  
Don Mette  
2080 Arroyo Vista Way  
El Dorado Hills, Calif 95762  
(916)849-4812  
[dmmette@yahoo.com](mailto:dmmette@yahoo.com)  
Sent from my iPad

#33  
public comment



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

## Opposed to the Vineyard Project Increased Density Proposal

1 message

**Jim Shoemake** <JShoemake@sanjuan.edu>  
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fri, Feb 21, 2020 at 8:17 AM

Good morning,

I am very much in favor of developers being able to make money off their investments, but Omni Financial bought this property understanding the zoning. If they wanted to invest in a high density project they should have bought property zoned for that. Please honor our communities desire to keep the Vineyard's at 5 acre parcels. This is also the plan that the developer originally agreed upon so they are not being harmed in any way by you voting to honor the original agreement. They knew what they were getting when they made their investment and it is not the county's role or obligation to assist them with their profit margin. Please vote "no" on Omni's increased density proposal. Thank you.

Jim Shoemake  
Assistant Superintendent  
Schools and Labor Relations  
San Juan Unified School District



#33  
public  
comment

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

---

## Vineyards

1 message

---

**aautry1@aol.com** <aautry1@aol.com>

Fri, Feb 21, 2020 at 11:29 AM

To: jeff.hansen@edcgov.us, james.williams@edcgov.us, gary.miller@edcgov.us, jvega@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

How many times do the people of EDH have to tell you, "NO MORE GROWTH!" How many meetings do we need to attend to get the message across? How many emails do we need to send? Please listen to the people, we don't want any more growth.

Al Autry  
695 Knight Lane  
EDH 95762



## Development/Vineyards

1 message

**xke4pa@aol.com** <xke4pa@aol.com>

Fri, Feb 21, 2020 at 11:07 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, jvega@edcgov.us, gary.miller@edcgov.us, jeff.hansen@edcgov.us, james.williams@edcgov.us

People have a right to live in the type of community they choose. If you like big cities, you live in Sacramento, San Francisco, LA. If you like small quiet towns, you live in EDH, Placerville, Jackson etc. Developers don't have the right to take that choice away from the people and you, the Board of Supervisors, don't have a right to allow them to. These meetings are not about the rezone of the old golf course, or Malcolm Dixon, or the Vineyards or any other development planned, it's about growth and we don't want any more.

The developers are building homes and paving over our community to attract outsiders, not the people of EDH, there are plenty of homes for us. We deserve to have a say in our town, one that is clear and precise, one simple question.....Do you want more growth or not? It's a yes or no answer, not "Stop Gridlock" or "Save the earthworm." We will play the game if we have to but the fight is getting old. We continue to show up at the meetings by the hundreds, you're just not listening to the people who voted you into office. We don't want any more growth, not of any kind. Period

Paula Autry  
695 Knight Lane  
EDH 95762