



El Dorado Hills
Area Planning Advisory Committee
1021 Harvard Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

2012 Board
Chair
John Hidahl
Vice-chairman
Jeff Haberman
Secretary/Treasurer
Alice Klinger
Kathy Prevost

November 26, 2012

Roger Trout
Development Services Director
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project General Plan Amendment A11-003/Rezone Z11-0004/Planned Development PD-0002 Parcel Map P11-0003/Green Valley Center

Reference: APAC letters submitted on July 13, 2011, February 20, 2012, March 16, 2012 and October 15, 2012 Subject: Winn Commercial project at Green Valley Road and Francisco Drive

The full El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC) met on Wednesday November 14, 2012 and reviewed the Revised **Negative Declaration** for the rezone from One Family Residential (R1 PD) to Commercial with the Planned Development (C-PD) overlay as required by General Plan Policy 2.2.6.1. The property, identified by APN 124-140-339, consists of 6.85 acres, and is located at southeast corner of Green Valley Road and Francisco Drive in the El Dorado Hills area.

The members voted unanimously (6 to 0) on a motion for reiterating their Non-Support for the General Plan Amendment and that the Revised Negative Declaration is not adequate for the impacts that a commercial project at this location will cause to the environment. APAC formally requests that a full EIR be prepared before the General Plan Amendment is considered and all of the impacts are fully evaluated.

APAC's concerns for the revised negative declaration are as follows:

The proposed right in and right out from the project via Cambria (Attachment B) will make the circulation even worse. When residents drop off their children at the two schools located north of Green Valley Road on Francisco Drive, they will impact two additional intersections which are already at level of service F (LOS F). "The intersections are Francisco Drive/EDH Blvd and EDH Blvd/ Green Valley Road.

The changing of the East bound left turn lane on Green Valley Road to accommodate a U turn from the project is a disaster waiting to happen and a major safety issue. Cars exiting the project who want to go West on Green Valley Road must cross four lanes of traffic to get to the U turn lane which is straight across the street from the project's exit. This intersection is currently at LOS F, so it will be nearly impossible to make a U turn after exiting the project from Green Valley Road.

Recently traffic levels have been increasing on Salmon Falls Road southbound to Green Valley Road, especially during the AM peak period flow. A maximum queue length of approximately 710 feet has been recently observed, with the queue blocking the intersections of both Malcolm Dixon Road and Village Center Drive. Queuing to Malcolm Dixon is not new, but generally postdates the time of the project's TIA. Queuing past Village Center Drive is new. Both cases are associated with operational LOS F on Salmon Falls Road due to long delays at the Green Valley Road signal.

Mitigation M1 calls for reduction of Green Valley Road LOS F at this intersection by signal cycle length optimization and reallocation of green time. This would involve allocating more green time to Green Valley Road, less green time to Salmon Falls Road. This probably would drive Salmon Falls Road past its current periodic LOS F, into chronic LOS F. The County needs to include additional mitigation for that condition (moves the problem point, but doesn't mitigate the overall increase in traffic flow).

The County needs mitigation "Plan B" for the existing actual operational LOS F at the intersection of Green Valley Road and Francisco Drive, as well as for the traffic levels based on 2010 traffic counts. "Plan B" needs to be defined and "shovel-ready" in the 5-year CIP, with funding sources identified and committed for use when the County recognizes LOS F delays.

Ozone Precursors Cumulative Impacts Evaluation: The project is required, per paragraph one of the letter from Mel Pabalinas, subj; Green Valley Commercial Center Cumulative Air Quality Impacts, dated August 30, 2012 to address Ozone Precursors . It states: If the project requires a change in the existing land use designation (a general plan amendment or rezone), then projected emissions of ROG and NOx from the proposed project must be equal to or less than the ROG and NOx emissions anticipated for the site if developed under the existing land use designation". The revised Mitigated Negative Declaration (page 13 Operational Ozone Precursor), evaluation suggests that each house under the current zoning would use a fire place to heat the house during the winter to justify the zoning change would not exceed the limit of the Sacramento Regional Ozone Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP). With natural gas heating options readily available in this area, wood burning fireplaces are rarely used. This is a flawed assumption and must be reevaluated using more realistic numbers. Many Agencies in the AQAP are now restricting the use of wood burning stoves during the winter, which would drastically reduce the amount of ROG and NOx generated from the site if it remains in its current zoning.

APAC comments are repeated here from our October 15th 2012 letter with concerns regarding the project.

The **APAC committee recommended non-support for this project for the following reasons:**

1. The project requires a full EIR to address any impacts to the environment. (This request for land use changes was not cover under the EIR for the 2004 General Plan.
2. The Neg Dec does not address all of the significant impacts the proposed zoning change will cause including Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use Planning, Noise, and Population and Housing.
3. The commercial zoning would have a major negative impact on the residents located at the south end of the parcel.
4. The corner of Cambria and Francisco Dr. is a very dangerous corner as it stands with just the residents of the Francisco Oaks subdivision using it and will become a safety issue.
5. The corner of Green Valley and Francisco, there are already 3 other commercial parcels and within those parcels, there are currently over 20 vacant units. There is limited demand for a commercial project at this location.
6. GP Policy 7.3.3.5 **States:** Rivers, streams, lakes and ponds, and wetlands shall be integrated into new development in such a way that they enhance the aesthetic and natural character of the site while disturbance to the resource is avoided or minimized and fragmentation is limited. Accordingly, the wetland setbacks reduction from 50ft to 25ft **should not be granted.**

APAC comments are repeated here from our July 13th 2011 letter with concerns and recommendations if the project is approved:

A. Resident Opposition. During both of the APAC meetings at which the application was discussed, a significant number of residents expressed their views and most in attendance were strongly opposed. Residents of Francisco Oaks Village have circulated a petition to express opposition. Of the more than 130 people contacted, only one did not sign.

B. Property Values. Without an appropriate buffer between the commercial activity and residences, the adverse impact upon the property value of the latter is certain to be substantial.

C, Traffic. Vehicular traffic, already at level F at the intersection of Green Valley Road and Francisco Drive at peak hours, will be yet more congested and traffic patterns more hazardous. Of particular concern is the increased hazard for children walking and cycling to Marina Village School.

D. Air Quality. The impact of fast food cooking odors and exhaust from cars idling at two drive-through sales points will have a significant negative impact upon air quality in the neighborhood.

E. Tree Preservation and Grading. In contrast to the extensive grading and consequent tree removal that would result from a rezone and commercial development, residential development would entail substantially less grading, save more significant trees and preserve more of the existing suburban atmosphere.

F. Deed Restrictions. CC&R's specify that the property be developed for residential use.

G. Fast Food Location. APAC has regularly opposed development of fast food outlets outside the Highway 50 corridor.

If the APAC position on this application does not prevail and the application is granted, APAC recommends strongly that the following conditions be placed upon eventual development:

A. Architectural Style. The style should be consistent for all three buildings, and no significant alteration should be permitted to meet the demands of a fast food style franchise.

B. Visual Pollution. Free standing signs should be low-profile, non-lighted monument style. Signs on building faces should be back lighted, low intensity and without animation. No signs at all should be permitted on south facing building elevations. Architectural controls should prohibit installation of banner signs outside or inside facing outward. Area lighting fixtures must face downward and be of a design that prevents seepage from the property. Mechanical equipment on roofs must be screened.

C. Sound Pollution. Drive through speakers must be shielded and directed so as to prevent seepage to the adjacent residential areas.

D. Water Pollution. Water sediment collection ponds shall be maintained and landscaped to fit natural landscape or proposed constructed landscape.

E. Traffic Mitigation. Applicant must be made responsible for extending 4 lanes paving on Green Valley Road from Safeway to El Dorado Hills Boulevard.

F. Tree Preservation. Precautions shall be made to preserve native oaks to the extent possible with particular concerns for those on the northeast, east and southern edges of the property.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact John Hidahl at 916-933-2703 or Norm Rowett subcommittee chairman 916 933-2211

Sincerely,

John Hidahl

John Hidahl
APAC Chairman

cc: El Dorado County Planning Department
APAC Read File