



COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION

Building C Hearing Room
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
<http://www.edcgov.us/planning>
Phone: (530) 621-5355 Fax: (530) 642-0508

Tom Heflin Chair, District III
Dave Pratt, First Vice-Chair, District II
Walter Mathews, Second Vice-Chair, District IV
Lou Rain, District I
Alan Tolhurst, District V

Char TimClerk of the Planning Commission

MINUTES

Regular Meeting
July 28, 2011 – 8:30 A.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m. Present: Commissioners Rain, Pratt, Heflin, and Tolhurst*; Paula Frantz-County Counsel**; and Char Tim-Clerk of the Planning Commission.

*[*Arrived at 8:46 a.m.]*

***Arrived at 9:26 a.m.]*

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Rain, and carried (3-0), to adopt the agenda as presented.

AYES: Rain, Pratt, Heflin

NOES: None

ABSENT: Mathews, Tolhurst

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. CONSENT CALENDAR (All items on the Consent Calendar are to be approved by one motion unless a Commission member requests separate action on a specific item.)

a. Minutes: July 14, 2011

b. Time Extension: Request for a 24-month time extension for Special Use Permit S05-0031/El Dorado Hills Kingdom Hall submitted by El DORADO HILLS CONGREGATION OF JEHOVAH WITNESSES/SAM MARQUEZ for the construction of a 9,190 square foot church that was approved by the Planning Commission on March 13, 2008. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 117-085-07, consisting of 2.5 acres, is located on the east side of Hillsdale Circle, north of the intersection with Glenhaven Court, in the El Dorado Hills area, Supervisorial District 2. *[Project Planner: Aaron Mount]*

Staff Recommendation: Approval

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Motion: Commissioner Rain moved, seconded by Commissioner Pratt, and carried (3-0), to approve the Consent Calendar.

AYES: Pratt, Rain, Heflin
NOES: None
ABSENT: Mathews, Tolhurst

**5. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
(Development Services, Transportation, County Counsel)**

Pierre Rivas stated that staff had been invited to attend a community meeting on July 20, 2011 sponsored by the applicant for Pre-application PA11-0004/Town Center West (PD95-0002). The public voiced concern with the project and also with staff's relationship with the applicant. Mr. Rivas also commented that in addition to the Commission's complaints on the excessive signage at Panda Express, staff has also received a complaint on the landscaping and the condition of the building (i.e., paint).

Peter Maurer summarized the Board of Supervisors' Special Meeting held on July 25, 2011 discussing the Targeted General Plan amendments, Zoning Ordinance and Land Development Manual/Standard Plans. Staff was directed to work with the Commission on the EIR project description once they receive more direction at the Board of Supervisor's August 9, 2011 meeting. Commissioner Pratt voiced concern on the length of time needed for the review and discussion and suggested having one meeting to discuss the Targeted General Plan Amendments and then have a meeting shortly after to discuss the Zoning Ordinance. Commissioners Heflin and Pratt requested that the process begin prior to October.

6. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Chair Heflin reminded DOT staff that at the last meeting he had requested an update on Snows Road. He would like to get this information soon in order to report back to the Camino Community Action Committee.

9:00 A.M. – TIME ALLOCATION

7. PUBLIC FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT

Tracy Iverson, resident of Shadowfax Lane, expressed concern over the current usage of the nine acre parcel located at the corner of Shadowfax Lane and Green Valley Road. She distributed photographs for reference. Ms. Iverson explained that there are three businesses operating on that land and only two have Special Use Permits, which she questioned if the conditions were being followed. She stated the following:

- Traffic issues (i.e., turn pocket, speed, hill, double-yellow lines);

- Access;
- Grading (no erosion/sediment control by creek); and
- Encroachment permit concerns.

Pierre Rivas indicated that there was an open Code Enforcement case on this site and they are diligently working with Green Valley Landscaping to submit an application, which will be coming before the Commission. The deadline for submittal by the applicant is August 3, 2011.

8. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT/TENTATIVE MAP

PD10-0003/TM10-1498/Serrano Village J2/J3 Lot H submitted by SERRANO ASSOCIATES, LLC for the following: 1. Development Plan for the proposed residential subdivision with modifications to One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District and miscellaneous development standards including minimum lot size, lot coverage, and setbacks; 2. Tentative Subdivision Map of a 25-acre project site creating 83 attached clustered residential lots ranging from 3,113 to 7,602 square feet in size, 9 landscape lots, 1 open space lot, and 1 remainder lot; and 3. Design Waivers of the following El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual (DISM) road standards: (A) Modification of subdivision road improvements under Standard Plan 101B including: (1) Reduction of right-of-way width from 50 feet to 36 feet; (2) Reduction of road pavement width from 28 feet to 27 feet; (3) Construction of 4-foot wide sidewalks along one side of A Street and B Circle and 6-foot sidewalk on one side of C Street; and (4) Construction of modified rolled curb and gutter; (B) Reduction of minimum 100-foot centerline curve radius length to reduced lengths identified on the map; (C) Modification of standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 with custom design encroachment off Serrano Parkway; and (D) Exceed the 3 to 1 width-to-length lot ratio standard for Lot 35. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 123-370-01, 123-370-03, and 123-280-10, consisting of 25 acres, is located approximately one and one-half mile north of Highway 50 along Bass Lake Road at the intersection with Serrano Parkway, in the El Dorado Hills area, Supervisorial District 2. *[Project Planner: Mel Pabalinas]* (Statutory Exemption pursuant to Section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines)** *[continued from 6/9/11 meeting]*

Mel Pabalinas summarized the project and stated that the El Dorado Hills CSD had re-reviewed the project and submitted correspondence to staff, which was included in the Staff Memo dated July 14, 2011. Mr. Pabalinas also reminded the Commission that at the last hearing, a Staff Memo dated June 7, 2011 had been submitted which recommended the addition of two new conditions.

Kirk Bone/applicant's agent agreed with the Staff Report and the June 7, 2011 Staff Memo but was still requesting that the timeline in Condition #8 be changed from 12 months to 6 months.

Bill Wright, representing Rescue Union School District, made the following comments:

- Thought it had been mutually agreed upon to proceed with the 12-month timeline;
- One year is not adequate time for the lengthy process they have to follow;
- Unclear why there is an urgency when only a little over half of the area has been built out;

- Only 50 homes have been built in the last four years;
- Changing the Specific Plan;
- Questioned the ability to do this through a map amendment;
- No final State approval yet; and
- If project is approved with less than 12 months for Condition #8, will most likely appeal to the Board of Supervisors.

Sandi Kukkola, El Dorado Hills CSD Interim General Manager, stated they support Condition #8 as presented. They did not support a barbell-shape due to the safety of the park users/students having to go through the parking lot to access the other side.

Doug Wolcott, Rescue Union School District Director of Maintenance and Facilities, stated that over the years they have looked at four different parcels when contemplating the location of the school site. He said that this is a long process but that it also includes a safety review for the students.

Commissioner Rain felt that having the School District procure land and get the school in would be a benefit to Serrano. He was not in favor of the 6-month timeline as it was too quick and strongly encouraged the School District to get the process done within 12 months.

Commissioner Rain also announced that his daughter served on the Rescue Union School District Board of Trustees. County Counsel Paula Frantz responded that this was not a Conflict of Interest.

Commissioner Pratt was not in favor of the 12 month timeline as the project had already been continued for 2 months and the sites have been analyzed for 20 years. Chair Heflin suggested that as a compromise to have it as a 10-month timeline, which Commissioner Rain agreed with.

In response to Commissioner Tolhurst's inquiry on funding, Mr. Wright explained the school site funding is usually through bonds but that they would be using their own funding. He explained that once the school is built, there is a 50-50 program with the State and they would get reimbursement if money was still available in the program.

Mr. Wright stated that they want to buy the site and as the area builds out then they will build a school. They want to avoid having a school built, but no students.

Mr. Bone appreciated the suggestion for a 10-month timeline, but has reluctantly agreed to accept Condition #8 as presented with the 12-months. He expressed concern that the School District may appeal the decision and also felt that after the 12 months, the School District would not be completed with process and would request additional time.

County Counsel Frantz informed the Commission that they can request the School District to respond if they would appeal the decision if Condition #8 included the 12-month timeline. Mr. Wright responded that they do not support it, but would not appeal if the 12-month timeline is left in Condition #8.

Commissioner Tolhurst requested clarification from El Dorado Hills CSD regarding the Staff Memo dated June 7, 2011 and their ability to place a park in that area. Ms. Kukkola responded that the construction of the park is part of the Mello-Roos that is collected.

No further discussion was presented.

Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Rain, and carried (4-0), to take the following actions: 1. Certify the residential project to be Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines; 2. Approve Planned Development PD10-0003 approving the Development Plan as the official Development Plan based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval; 3. Approve Tentative Map TM10-1498 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified; (a) Addition of new conditions recommended in the Staff Memo dated 6/7/11; and 4. Approve the following Design Waivers: A. Modification of subdivision road improvements under Standard Plan 101B including: (1) Reduction of right-of-way width from 50 feet to 36 feet; (2) Reduction of road pavement width from 28 feet to 27 feet; (3) Construction of 4-foot wide sidewalks along one side of A Street and B Circle and 6-foot sidewalks on one side of C Street; and (4) Construction of modified rolled curb and gutter; B. Reduction of minimum 100-foot centerline curve radius length to reduced lengths identified on the map; C. Modification of standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 with Serrano design encroachment off Serrano Parkway; and D. Exceed the 3 to 1 width-to-length lot ratio standard for Lot 35.

AYES: Tolhurst, Rain, Pratt, Heflin
NOES: None
ABSENT: Mathews

This action can be appealed to the Board of Supervisors within 10 working days.

Findings

1.0 CEQA FINDING

- 1.1 The project is a residential project and a part of an adopted El Dorado Hills Specific Plan EIR, This project is statutorily exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to Section 15182 stating that a residential project is exempt where a public agency has prepared an EIR on a specific plan after January 1, 1980. No impacts have been identified which were not discussed and mitigated in the EIR. Implementation of the project is subject to conformance with applicable mitigation measures detailed in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan in the EIR. No further environmental analysis is necessary
- 1.2 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department - Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

2.1 General Plan

The El Dorado County General Plan designates the subject site as Adopted Plan, a designation in reference to areas where specific plans have been adopted. These plans and the respective land use maps are accepted and incorporated by reference and is hereby adopted as the General Plan Land Use map for such area. Since the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan has been incorporated by reference under General Plan Land Use Element Policy 2.2.1.2, the proposed residential tentative subdivision map and planned development is found to be consistent with the General Plan.

2.2 Specific Plan

The proposed residential development is located within the Village J portion of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan area. The design of the development conforms to the applicable standards under specific policies of the plan. The development would be served by existing public services and have access to amenities provided by Serrano Homeowners Association. Therefore, the proposed tentative map/planned development is found to be consistent with the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan.

2.3 Zoning

The cluster residential development conforms to the One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District standards, as modified under Section 17.04.030.B of the El Dorado Zoning Ordinance (Planned Development). Specifically, the project is residential development contemplated by the El Dorado Hill Specific Plan which is consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan. It has been designed to meet the applicable standards of the EDHSP in order to accommodate the residential development and provide a desirable environment for its future residents. The modified standards correspond to the nature of the design and use of the clustered development. Existing public utility services would be adequately provided by local purveyors. The development is designed to conform to the existing residential neighborhood consistent with the policies and standards of EDHSP.

2.4 Subdivision Ordinance

2.4.1 That the proposed map is consistent with applicable general and specific plans;

The proposed development would create a total 83 clustered residential lots in conformance with the standard and design provisions of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, as adopted by the El Dorado County General Plan.

2.4.2 That the design or improvement of the proposed division is consistent with applicable general and specific plans;

The improvement of the subdivision has been designed in conformance with the identified residential land use requirements in the Specific Plan. The subdivision shall adhere to applicable improvements of the DISM and shall be constructed in accordance to construction plans and permit requirements.

- 2.4.3 That the site is physically suitable for the type of development; and**
- 2.4.4 That the site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development;**

The project site is physically suitable to accommodate the proposed clustered residential development. The site predominantly flat, does not contain sensitive vegetation, and shall conform to the established surrounding residential development in the area. With its proximity to existing drainage swale area, appropriate construction measures shall be adhered to avoid or minimize impacts to the resource subject to verification by affected agencies. The site would have available access and connection to public utilities existing in the area. Modified standards and improvement requirements would sufficiently accommodate the development.

- 2.4.5 That the design of the division or the proposed improvements are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantial and avoidable injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat; and**
- 2.4.6 That the design of the division or the type of improvements would not cause serious public health hazards;**

Development of the clustered residential subdivision is subject to the applicable provisions of El Dorado Hills Specific Plan and mitigation measures under the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) including regulation of proper pad design and layout minimizing impacts to natural resources, adherence to air quality measures, and reduction of noise impacts. Prior to issuance development permit, construction and improvement plans shall be reviewed for conformance to applicable County standards and Serrano Architectural Review Committee requirements. Therefore, the project is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage.

- 2.4.7 That the design of the division or the improvements is suitable to allow for compliance of the requirements of section 4291 of the Public Resources Code;**

The development is subject to the applicable Specific Plan policies involving site design and maintenance of open areas susceptible to brush fires. Further, the subdivision is subject to specific project conditions from the El Dorado Hills Fire Department regarding location of hydrant, construction of non-combustible fencing material, and adherence to Wildfire Fire Safe Plan provisions. Therefore the proposed subdivision conforms to the requirements of Section 4291 of the Public Resource Code;

- 2.4.8 That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.**

In this connection the approving authority may approve a map if it finds that alternate easements for access or for use will be provided and that these will be substantially equivalent to ones previously acquired by the public. This subsection shall apply only to easements of record or to easements established by judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction and no authority is granted to a legislative body to determine that the public at large has acquired easements for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision. (Ord. 3805 §15, 1988: prior code §9702)

Utility easements necessary to serve the subdivision have been adequately depicted on the Tentative Subdivision Map and shall be further verified for any conflicts by the County Surveyor's Office at the time of filing of the final map.

2.5 Design Waivers

The following design waiver requests are subject to specific findings in accordance with Section 16.08.020.A.2a-d of the El Dorado County Subdivision Ordinance. Each request is followed by a response justifying the waiver.

Design Waiver 1: Modification of subdivision road improvements under DISM Standard Plan 101 B including: a) a reduction of right-of-way width from 50 feet to 36 feet; b) reduction and construction of road pavement width from 28 feet to 27 feet; c) reduction and construction of 4-foot wide sidewalks on one side of A and B Circle and 6-foot sidewalk on one side of C Street, and; d) construction of modified rolled curb and gutter;

A. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.

The proposed modified road improvements would serve a private cluster residential development. These improvements would sufficiently accommodate the anticipated vehicular and pedestrian traffic and on-site utilities necessary to serve the development. The streets shall be privately owned and maintained by Serrano Master Homeowner's Association.

B. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.

Application of the standard street right-of-way and related improvements would require wider pavement and result in additional disturbance to the site, thereby posing an encumbrance to the design and functionality of the cluster residential development.

C. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the public.

The modified street improvements would adequately serve the private residential development. The improvements shall be constructed in accordance to standards of the DISM, subject to improvement and other construction plans. Implementation of project

condition of approvals and applicable mitigation measures shall be verified during review and prior to issuance of any construction permits. Therefore, the proposed deviation has been determined not to be detrimental to health, safety, and welfare of the public.

D. The waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or any other law or ordinance applicable to the subdivision.

The modified standards would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or ordinance applicable to the subdivision as this standard would affect streets serving the private clustered residential development. These facilities shall be privately owned and maintained by the HOA. Other applicable improvement standards shall be enforced and verified during review construction plans.

Design Waiver 2: Reduction of minimum 100-foot centerline curve radius length to reduced lengths identified on the map

A. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver;

The modified standard has been designed to sufficiently and safely accommodate of the private clustered residential development. Similar standard have been previously approved in other villages within Serrano.

B. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.

Application of the standard could result in a re-design and adjustments of the site layout that could lead to unnecessary disturbance and impacts. As proposed, the modified standards would sufficiently accommodate on-site vehicular traffic and ensure safety with restrictions to parking and vehicular speed along the private internal streets.

C. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the public.

The proposed deviation would not be detrimental to health, safety, and welfare of the public. The modified turnaround has been designed to sufficiently accommodate the anticipated vehicular traffic and speed anticipated for the private development. The required improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the construction standards of the DISM. Implementation of project condition of approvals and applicable mitigation measures shall be verified during review and prior to issuance of any construction permits.

D. The waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or any other law or ordinance applicable to the subdivision.

The modified standard would not have any nullifying effect on the objectives of this article or ordinance applicable to the subdivision as this standard would affect a street design serving the streets within a private clustered residential development. The design would sufficiently accommodate on-site traffic and circulation conditions, which would be privately enforced by the Homeowner's Association. Construction of this improvement would be conducted in accordance with the DISM, subject to approved plans.

Design Waiver 3: Modification of standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 with custom encroachment design off Serrano Parkway

A. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.

The proposed modified encroachment would serve as an enhanced entrance feature to Serrano Village J2/J3-Lot H development that is distinct to many residential villages developed by Serrano within the EDHSP. This design creates a very unique subdivision look and architectural statement that Serrano has become known for.

B. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.

Application of the standard would result in deviating from the existing modified entrances and would disrupt the very distinctive harmonious theme of the community. Strict application of the standard encroachment entrance would cause an unnecessary hardship in marketing the new subdivisions. Without the continued use of the Serrano "typical", the subdivisions would have a different look in comparison with the balance of the existing community within Serrano and has the potential to create a perception to prospective buyers that the new subdivision was built to a lesser standard than the existing ones.

C. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the public.

The modified design of the encroachment entrance would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the welfare of the public as this improvement would be confined entirely within the project site, serving the residents of the subdivision.

D. The waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or any other law or ordinance applicable to the subdivision.

Granting of the waiver would not have any effect of nullifying effect on the objectives of the Subdivision Ordinance or other applicable subdivision applicable. The modified encroachment entrance, which has been previously used in other Serrano villages, would sufficiently serve the subdivision as well as provide an aesthetically unique amenity for the subdivision.

Design Waiver 4: Exceed 3 to 1 width-to-length lot ratio standard for Lot 35;

A. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver.

As a result the unique design of the proposed cluster development, Lot 35 would exceed the lot width-to-length ratio standard. The cluster lots would be constructed on pad within a predetermined size and configuration designed to accommodate the existing setting of the property and the associated improvements and infrastructures necessary to serve the residential development.

B. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property.

Strict application of the standards would affect the functionality of the cluster design of the subdivision and could result in unnecessary development impacts.

C. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the public.

The modified lot ratio would affect a specific lot within the cluster subdivision. The compact design of this development is unique in comparison with the traditional subdivision in the immediate area. The proposed development would be adequately served by improvements and facilities confined entirely within the project site, serving the residents of the subdivision. Therefore, the adjustment would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to the welfare of the public.

D. The waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of this article or any other law or ordinance applicable to the subdivision.

Granting of the waiver would not have any effect of nullifying effect on the objectives of the Subdivision Ordinance or other applicable subdivision applicable. The modified lot standard would serve to accommodate and support the unique design of the development. All applicable standards of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan, mitigation measures of the EIR, and governing provisions of the county ordinances shall apply.

Conditions of Approval

Project Description

1. The Tentative Subdivision Map and Planned Development, and Design Waivers are based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, the hearing exhibits marked Exhibits M-R, and T and conditions of approval set forth below. Any deviations from the project description, exhibits or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the

County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows:

- A. Development Plan for the proposed residential subdivision with modifications to One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District and miscellaneous development standards including minimum lot size, lot coverage, and setbacks;
- B. Tentative Subdivision Map of a 25-acre project site creating 83 attached clustered residential lots ranging from 3,113 to 7,602 square feet in size, 9 landscape lots, 1 open space lot, and 1 Remainder lot; and
- C. Design Waiver of the following modified El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual (DISM) road standards:
 1. Modification of subdivision road improvements under Standard Plan 101 B including:
 - a. Reduction of right-of-way width from 50 feet to 36 feet;
 - b. Reduction of road pavement width from 28 feet to 27 feet;
 - c. Construction of 4-foot wide sidewalks along one side of A Street and B Circle and 6-foot sidewalk on one side of C Street; and
 - d. Construction of modified rolled curb and gutter;
 2. Reduction of minimum 100-foot centerline curve radius length to reduced lengths identified on the map;
 3. Modification of standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 with custom design encroachment off Serrano Parkway; and
 4. Exceed the 3 to 1 width-to-length lot ratio standard for Lot 35.

The grading, development, use, and maintenance of the property, the size, shape, arrangement, and location of structures, parking areas and landscape areas, and the protection and preservation of resources shall conform to the project description above and the hearing exhibits and conditions of approval below. The property and any portions thereof shall be sold, leased or financed in compliance with this project description and the approved hearing exhibits and conditions of approval hereto. All plans must be submitted for review and approval and shall be implemented as approved by the County.

Planning Services

2. In the event of any legal action instituted by a third party challenging the validity of any provision of this approval, the developer and landowner agree to be responsible for the costs of defending such suit and shall hold County harmless from any legal fees or costs County may incur as a result of such action, as provided in Section 66474.9(b) of the California Government Code.

The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless El Dorado County and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against El Dorado

County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of El Dorado County concerning a subdivision, which action is brought within the time period provided for in Section 66499.37.

County shall notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding and County will cooperate fully in the defense.

3. Prior to filing of final map, the applicant shall remit payment of any outstanding fees as detailed and required in the *Agreement for Payment of Processing Fees* authorized for this project.
4. A Final Subdivision Map shall not be recorded until an EID Water Meter Award Letter or similar document has been issued for all of the lots included in the final map, and a copy filed with the Planning Department.
5. An acoustical analysis shall be conducted and submitted by a qualified acoustical consultant to Planning Services which identifies that recommended measures to shield noise of affected lots have been employed per Policy 1.4.1.4 (Noise) of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. Planning Services shall verify all measures have been incorporated in the project design prior to filing a Final Map.
6. The Development Plan permits the following:
 - A. Tentative Subdivision Map of a 25-acre project site creating eighty-three (83) attached clustered residential lots ranging from 3,113 to 7,602 square feet in size, nine landscape lots, one open space lot, and one Remainder lot;
 - B. Development Plan for the proposed residential subdivision with modifications to One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District and miscellaneous development standards including minimum lot size, lot coverage, and setbacks; and
 - C. Design Waiver of the following modified El Dorado County Design and Improvement Standard Manual (DISM) road improvement standards including:
 1. Modification of subdivision road improvements under Standard Plan 101 B including:
 - A. Reduction of right-of-way width from 50 feet to 36 feet;
 - B. Reduction and construction of road pavement width from 28 feet to 27 feet;
 - C. Construction of 4-foot wide sidewalks along one side of A and B Circle and 6-foot sidewalk on one side of C Street;
 - D. Construction of modified rolled curb and gutter;
 2. Reduction of minimum 100-foot centerline curve radius length to reduced lengths identified on the map;
 3. Modification of standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 with custom encroachment design off Serrano Parkway; and

4. Exceed the 3 to 1 width-to-length lot ratio standard for Lots 35.

Modifications to One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District Development Standards

The following table contains the modified One-Family Residential (R1) Zone District standards that apply to the residential lots with Village J2/J3-Lot H.