

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Tuesday, July 14, 2009  
Pavilion Meeting Room**

**1021 Harvard Way**

**8:00 a.m.**

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 8:00 a.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Haberman, Davidson, McCray, Rain

Kerrie Diebels, Chairman  
Jeff Haberman, Vice-Chairman  
Jack Davidson, Committee Member  
Cindy McCray, Committee Member  
Don Sgamba, Committee Member  
Lou Rain, Alternate Committee Member  
Ellison Rumsey, Alternate Committee Member

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. Adoption of Agenda, Approval of July 7th Minutes

**END CONSENT CALENDAR**

Adopted

OB1. VILLAGE: Laurel Oaks, Lot 37, APN: 119-360-031  
NAME: Fragee Lofton, III  
SITE: 810 Spinning Wheel Court  
RE: Landscaping (front)/Driveway Extension (reopen 7/1)  
MOTION: Approved with modification (Haberman/Davidson) 3-1 (McCray-no)

The Committee discussed the new proposal submitted by the applicant in response to their meeting with him at last week's meeting requesting a modification to the concrete area that was installed in his front yard without the prior approval of the Committee.

The new plan which reduced the size of the concrete pad and added two additional trees to the landscape proposal was reviewed. A motion was made by McCray and second by Rain

to approve the plan as submitted with a deed restriction recorded on the property to restrict parking on the concrete pad to no more than a 24 hour period thus prohibiting the long-term parking of any vehicles in the front yard area. Davidson and Haberman voted no and the motion did not carry.

A second motion was made by Haberman and seconded by Davidson to shorten the concrete pad by 3' to a total of 27' which would require that the turf be cut back and match up with the end of the driveway—this modification was annotated onto the plan. Also, a deed restriction would be recorded restricting the parking on the new concrete area except for visiting guests not to exceed a 24 hour period. Rain voted yes and McCray no and the motion carried 3-1.

OB2. VILLAGE: Stoneridge, Lot 20, APN: 125-472  
NAME: Wayne Schindler  
SITE: 2083 Shelby Circle  
RE: Room Addition (6/30)  
MOTION: Approved (Davidson/McCray) 4-0

Lindsay Anderson, CSD Attorney, attended the meeting along with Mr. and Mrs. Schindler and neighboring property owner, Mr. Pippin. It was noted that extensive research had been completed by Ms. Anderson which indicated that the Stoneridge Village property had been owned by the Mansour Company and CC&Rs were recorded on the property in 1985.

Then, in 1987, an amendment was made to the CC&R's and the property was sold to Mr. Sathout. In 1988 the property was sold by Mr. Sathout to Mr. Luckey at which time another set of CC&R's was recorded on the property. Since the 1988 set did not replace the first set of documents nor was it referenced as an amendment, it was determined that the 1988 set was the correct set to use when reviewing this room addition project and any future projects for Stoneridge Village.

Since the 1988 set did not directly reference the rear set back, then the Committee would need to use the rear setback that is stipulated by the El Dorado County Building Department, which is 15 feet from the rear property line. Therefore, the plans submitted by Mr. Schindler, which reflect a 15 foot rear set back, were approved as proposed. The exterior paint colors as well as the roofing material and color will be the same as the existing residence.

Mr. Pippin voiced his concern about the project and the fact that he had the original set of CC&R documents which reflect a 30 foot rear setback. But, based upon the information provided by Ms. Anderson, the Committee voted to approve the project as submitted. It was noted to Mr. Pippin that he could appeal the decision of the Design Review Committee to the CSD Board of Directors within 10 working days from the date of the action of the Committee.

**NEW BUSINESS**

NB1. VILLAGE: Governors, Unit 5, Lot 219, APN: 125-292-121  
NAME: James Stewart  
SITE: 3085 Latham Lane  
MAILING: 4247 Warren Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95822  
RE: Re-roof (7/8)  
MOTION: Approved (Davidson/McCray) 4-0

The re-roof with GAF/Elk Timberline, lifetime warranty in the color Weatherwood was approved as submitted.

NB2. VILLAGE: Stonegate, Lot 317, APN; 125-385-021  
NAME: Gary Shelley  
SITE: 1230 Busselton Way  
RE: Re-roof (7/8)  
MOTION: Approved (McCray/Rain) 4-0

The re-roof with GAF/Elk, 50-year warranty in the color Weatherwood was approved as submitted.

NB3. VILLAGE: Stoneridge, Lot 30, APN: 125-463-021  
NAME: Gordon and Antonia Dolfie  
SITE: 1821 Sapphire Way  
RE: Re-roof (7/9)  
MOTION: Approved (McCray) Rain) 4-0

The re-roof with Decra Shake Tile, stone-coated steel in the color Weathered Timber was approved as submitted based upon a modification that was made of the CC&R's for Stoneridge Village which approved the stone-coated steel products, but not the asphalt composition projects.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. El Dorado Hills Fire Training Facility  
(El Dorado County Planning requests comments by July 17<sup>th</sup>)

A list of items was established by the Committee, was provided to the Area Plan Advisory Committee (APAC) and will be provided to the El Dorado County Planning Department in response to their request for comments on this project. The comments are annotated below:

1. **The facility does not conform to Business Park usage.** The Business Park was to be designed with a campus type business atmosphere with businesses that will provide jobs, tax benefits, and businesses of non-hazardous usage. While it may be said that the Fire Department does provide jobs, the training facility itself would provide few, if any. Most facilities of this nature will require the use of smoke and possibly fire. Both of which are a hazard, and may unduly alarm people in the area, especially with its location in the center

---

of the business park and close to future home building. We are also unaware if any potential hazardous materials may be used or stored in the facility.

- 2. This facility will not be in harmony and conformity with other facilities in the business park.** The question should be asked that if someone wanted to put a 70' high rise building, a separate storage facility, a hotel, and several additional non-contiguous outbuildings would this be allowed by anyone else wishing to build in the business park. In addition it is felt that the architecture could never be in conformity between the many buildings. With the limited plans we could not be sure if the buildings were corrugated metal which is not seen anywhere else in the business park.
- 3. The facility is excessive in height.** The high-rise training area will be over 70' tall and approximately that size in width and depth. This building would be nearly twice the height of the current tallest and most readily seen grey building in the park. There should be a clear reason for a building of this height when most of the tallest buildings allowed by the Fire Departments in El Dorado County are 3-4 stories in height (nearly 30' shorter than this building.)
- 4. More time for public comment.** Additional time should be allowed for community taxpayer comment and people who work and own businesses in the park should be made aware of the scope of this facility.
- 5. Facilities like this are available in close proximity.** It was felt this is a huge amount of money for a facility that can be found just across the county line. It has been said this facility may be used to train other departments. Have any such departments shown interest or agreed to fees associated with the use of the facility?