

**TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT
AND
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE
AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS
FOR
THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NOTICE OF
PREPARATION**

MAY 25, 2012 THROUGH JULY 10, 2012

**PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ON JULY 12, 2012 FOR
REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION DURING THE 2012 ZONING ORDINANCE WORKSHOP
(WEEK OF JULY 16, 2012)**



F. d: Targeted General Plan Amendment & Zoning Ordinance Update

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>
 Cc: Valerie Zentner <valeriez@edcfb.com>

Wed, Jul 11, 2012 at 8:56 AM

Thank you Valerie

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Valerie Zentner <valeriez@edcfb.com>
 Date: Wed, Jul 11, 2012 at 7:37 AM
 Subject: Targeted General Plan Amendment & Zoning Ordinance Update
 To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 Cc: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, bosfour@edcgov.us, The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Charlene Carveth <charlene.carveth@edcgov.us>

Shawna,

Attached is the Farm Bureau's comment letter on the NOP. We look forward to attending next week's workshops with the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission. We will submit additional comments specific to the Public Review Draft zoning ordinance at that time. In the meantime, if you have any questions on the attached please feel free to contact me.

Valerie Zentner, Executive Director
 El Dorado County Farm Bureau

=====
 Email scanned by PC Tools - No viruses or spyware found.
 (Email Guard: 9.0.0.898, Virus/Spyware Database: 6.20120)
<http://www.pctools.com/>
 =====

--

Shawna L. Purvines
 Sr. Planner
 Development Services
 El Dorado County
 Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
 Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
 If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
 Thank you.

Farm Bureau Comments - EDC TGPA-Zoning NOP.pdf
 45K

July 10, 2012

County of El Dorado
Development Services Department
Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Attention: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update

Dear Shawna,

The El Dorado County Farm Bureau has reviewed the Notice of Preparation for the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA) and Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) and is pleased to provide our comments. In general we find that the project description identifies those areas of concern that have been discussed during the General Plan's five year review process in which we have participated. Following are our remarks on the Project Description:

General Plan Amendments

- **Land Use Map** – We appreciate the county's amendment to the boundary of the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region as well as the expansion of the Agriculture District boundaries. These actions will benefit the agricultural industry by minimizing potential incompatibilities with surrounding land uses.
- **Policies for Amendment** – We support the policies identified for consideration of amendment. Many of the proposed amendments could encourage commercial and industrial opportunities for agriculture in Rural Regions and Rural Centers. Providing for a wide range of support services and streamlining permitting processes are vital to the industry. Allowing ranch marketing opportunities on grazing land will provide important revenue opportunities for our cattle industry.

*Protect, promote, and enhance the economic opportunities and long-term viability
for El Dorado County farmers, ranchers, and foresters.*

- **Policies for Analysis** – Farm Bureau supports the consideration of amending the Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas to include a process for changing these designated areas as needs dictate.

Zoning Ordinance Update A critical part of this effort is to ensure that the Zoning Ordinance is brought into consistency with the policies and objectives of the General Plan. The comprehensive update must include a revised Zoning Map that reflects the underlying Land Uses adopted in 2004. The proposed zoning ordinance needs a comprehensive review to resolve internal inconsistencies.

Landowners of rolled out Williamson Act lands may still be actively engaged in agricultural pursuits. When developing mapping criteria, it should not be assumed that rolled out lands are now residential in nature. We request that all parcels that are currently zoned agriculture, including those no longer under CLCA contract, be reviewed to ensure an agricultural zoning is maintained. As the county implements the new zone designations that are proposed for agriculture, this is an opportunity to ensure consistency within the Agriculture Districts and Rural Regions where agriculture occurs. We support a zoning “opt-in” process that protects existing agricultural uses in the county. This is consistent with the goals of the General Plan and Resolutions of Intent.

Additional comments will be provided on the Public Review Draft ordinance at the Workshops to be held the week of July 16 with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Project Objectives

- **TGPA** – Farm Bureau supports policies that encourage job creation that promote and protect agriculture in the county.
- **Zoning Ordinance Update** – The items identified in the objectives reflect the discussions and priorities of the five year review process. The specific language will be addressed as identified above.

Level of Detail for Environmental Analysis

Farm Bureau agrees that a program-level analysis should identify the additional potentially significant impacts of the proposed changes. We support the county conducting a full range of analysis so that the Board of Supervisors will be equipped with information of the environmental effects of the proposed options so that they may make needed changes to the County’s planning documents.

Alternatives to be addressed in the EIR

We will comment on the proposed project alternatives as they are identified later from the environmental analysis.

We look forward to seeing these issues addressed adequately in the environmental analysis. We thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important process. The point of contact for our organization for all future correspondence is the undersigned. For telephone inquiries, please contact our Executive Director, Valerie Zentner, at (530) 622-7773.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "James E. Davies", with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

James E. Davies
President

cc: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County Agricultural Commissioner, Charlene Carveth



Re: Fwd: NOTE Location - EDHAPACCommunit. CouncilAgenda7-11-2012

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: Arowett <arowett@pacbell.net>
Cc: aliceklinger@earthlink.net, hidahl@aol.com, tgpa-zou@edcgov.us

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 5:07 PM

Thanks Norm,

John...if you would still like to include the cover letter mentioned below I just need it before going to print tomorrow morning.

Thanks
Shawna

On Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 2:42 PM, Arowett <arowett@pacbell.net> wrote:

Shawna I sent the final comments for the nop to john today round noon. he should send to you sometime later if not I'll send them before 5 o'clock
thank you norm

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S. II Skyrocket™, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone.

----- Original message -----

Subject: Fwd: NOTE Location - EDHAPACCommunityCouncilAgenda7-11-2012
From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: aliceklinger@earthlink.net, John H <Hidahl@aol.com>, Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>
CC: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Hi Alice, John and Norm,

I see below discussion of submitted comments on July 3rd and July 9th. I haven't seen them and wanted to make sure we have them.

Can you send them and/or resend them to me.

Thanks
Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Planning Unknown <planning@edcgov.us>
Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:47 AM
Subject: Fwd: NOTE Location - EDHAPACCommunityCouncilAgenda7-11-2012
To: Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Alice Klinger <aliceklinger@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 9:35 PM
Subject: NOTE Location - EDHAPACCommunityCouncilAgenda7-11-2012
To: Alice Klinger <aliceklinger@earthlink.net>

The agenda for the combined meeting is attached.

Alice

AGENDA FOR COMBINED MEETING: Wednesday July 11, 2012 – 7:00 pm

Held at: El Dorado Hills Fire Station 85,1050 Wilson Blvd., El Dorado Hills

1. Call to Order
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Public Comment
4. Guest Speakers: None
5. Correspondence
6. Supervisor Communications
7. APAC:

Subcommittee Reports:

1) Green Valle. Corridor (GVC) Subcommittee Report

- a. Review and approve the Subcommittee's letter on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR report submitted to County on July 3rd, 2012 and finalize APAC's comments.

2) Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA) and Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) Subcommittee Report

- a. Review and approve the Subcommittee's letter on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR report submitted to County on July 9th, 2012 and finalize APAC's comments.

3) Latrobe/White Rock Road Corridor (L/WRC) Subcommittee Report

- a. El Dorado Retirement Residence-review and approve additional subcommittee comments
- b. Silva Valley Road @ Hwy 50- Request for 3 way stop sign letter submittal

4) S02-00037-R- Gold Key Boathouse Revision (El Dorado Hills Self Storage/Dave Ciapponi/Ogilvy Consulting)
TAC meeting was July 9th- A request for a revision to a special use permit to allow marine vessel and non-automotive repair, the sale of new and used marine vessels and non-automotive vessels and the sales of parts and retail items related to boating....recreation items. The self-storage element of the special use permit would be eliminated and replaced with the boat sales and services. Boat storage would continue at the site as a full service business...3.51 acres...on the south side of Suncastr Lane approximately 800 feet West of the intersection with Latrobe Road...

5) Z 11-0007 & TM 11-1504- Wil. on **Estates**- A request to rezone . this is the revised of the project East of the Church on Green Valley Road. Comment is due by July 16th.

Council Member Items

Adjournment

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

7/11/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Fwd: NOTE Location - EDHAPACCommunityCouncilA...

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



F. d: Comments on TGPA/ZOU NOP

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 4:43 PM

To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Cc: Lindell Price <lindellprice@gmail.com>

Thanks Lindell

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lindell Price <lindellprice@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 4:36 PM

Subject: Comments on TGPA/ZOU NOP

To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Cc: Michael Ranalli <mranalli@aol.com>, Claudia Wade <claudia.wade@edcgov.us>

Sorr. that I was not able to send this via the County website or submit it sooner.

Lindell P. ice
Cameron Park, CA
(916) 804-7316

--


Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 TGPA_ZOU NOP.pdf

87K

*A “General Plan” should be general and provide basic goals and policies. Specific details may need to be changed to address new technologies, standards, or circumstances. Therefore, I strongly support (see TGPA/ZOU NOP 19.), “... the removal of Table TC-1 and move to another document (i.e. Standard Plans or Land Development Manual). Additionally, review the impact of reduction of road spacing, right-of-way widths and roadway widths to meet the intent of the housing elements as described in the ROI.” **Overly large intersection spacing, roadway and right of way widths will impede General Plan objectives. Since “roadway” can be interpreted as referring only to the lanes in which vehicles travel or the “traveled way,” replace the words “roadway(s)” with “road(s)” where ever appropriate.***

(see TGPA/ZOU NOP 23.) Policy TC-Xg: Amend to clarify the requirement that development constructs or funds necessary **multimodal** road improvements, and include the requirement to design, or fund design.

(see TGPA/ZOU NOP 26.) *Policies TC 4i, TC-5a, TC-5b, and TC-5c:* Amend to provide more flexibility of ~~when~~ **where** sidewalks are required, **including fees for improved pedestrian circulation (such as road crossings and**

pedestrian paths) on the adjacent major roads in lieu of sidewalks on low-speed, low-volume roads.

(see TGPA/ZOU NOP 28.) *Add New Policy* to support the development of ~~new or substantially improved roadways~~ **roads** to accommodate all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, children, older people, and disabled people, as well as motorists, to comply with Assembly Bill 1358, the Complete Streets Act of 2008. Add implementation measure to update the applicable manuals and standard plans to incorporate elements in support of all users, **including standards for new roads and methodology for prioritizing improvements to the existing road network, so that funding can be identified and cost-effective improvements incorporated with routine maintenance.**

Lindell Price



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Scoping Commens TGPA&ZOupdate

1 message


Lisa Couper <lcouper@fastkat.com>
Repl. -To: Lisa Couper <lcouper@fastkat.com>
To: Shawna Pervines <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>
Cc: Ray Nutting <raynutting@hughes.net>


Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 12:13 PM

For inclusion in the scoping comments on this document.



Lisa

Lisa S. Couper, DVM
LS Couper DVM Photograph. - "The world is my studio."
4610 Grazing Hill Rd
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
[530-677-4558](tel:530-677-4558)
lcouper@fastkat.com

 TGPA& Zoning Ordinance Update Comments LC.doc
529K



Lisa S. Couper, DVM
 4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
 Shingle Springs, CA 95682
 530-677-4558
lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



To: Shawna Purvines
 Senior Planner – El Dorado County
 2850 Fairlane Court
 Placerville, CA 95667
TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

Date: 7/9/2012

RE: Scoping for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update – EIR

General Comments - Overview

The EIR must address and evaluate of the impact the changes in the Zoning Ordinance will have on Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and Air Quality and per its purpose is as stated in *Purposes of the Zoning Ordinance* it must also Encourage economic activities and Maintain cultural resource values.


In reading through the many support documents generated in this process I see ample justification for the loosening of restrictions on high density development in the core areas and along the Highway 50 corridor and for the larger scale businesses and agriculture in El Dorado County. Conversely I see no justification for the significantly increased restrictions on the Residential Lands. The ordinances proposed significantly limit the uses allowed by right on these parcels when compared with the existing Zoning Ordinance. Activities (Uses) and home occupations currently allowed by right will require a CUP or be eliminated.

One of the major issues that arose in the evaluation of the housing to jobs ratio was that El Dorado County was very behind in the creation of jobs. How can any further restrictions on home occupations and uses allowed on residentially zoned lands be justified in the light of this, especially in the current economic times.

In light of the fact that the glossary of Animal; domestic farm, the Permitted Use Matrix and ordinance below when combined do not allow for residents on less than one acre to have a pet dog or cat and other similar issues with the document I question its readiness to go forward into an EIR until these logical inconsistencies have been found and eliminated.

17.40.080 Animal Raising and Keeping



C. No domestic farm animal, as defined in Article 8 (Animal: domestic farm), shall be kept on a lot of less than one acre in any residential zone.



Lisa S. Couper, DVM

4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-4558

lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



Residential Zoning – Home Occupations allowed by right.

The EIR needs to address and quantify the impact that the changes in occupations allowable by right will have on the county economy. Restrictions proposed will lead to fewer home occupations, more commute jobs and increased seeking of goods and services outside of the county. The impact should be compared with alternatives including no change in the current zoning and a change to a more permissive set of occupations.

The EIR must also address the impact that the this change in home occupations will have on Air Quality, Green House Emissions, quality of life and cultural resource values.

There is not proper provision for grandfathering of existing businesses in the Draft Zoning Ordinance. What will be the impact of this.

Residential Zoning – Permitted Uses Matrix

While the Draft Zoning Ordinance admirably reinforces the right to farm on Agricultural Parcels it unduly restricts or eliminates the ability of persons on residential parcels to grow food and raise animals.


Something that was overlooked in the Zoning Ordinance is the provision of small open space plots for community gardens in high density residential areas. There could be an additional density bonus allotted for this in the ordinance. The EIR should address this alternative along with the potential benefits to the community, the cultural values, the economy, the health and well being of the community residents and to the developers of these parcels.

Per the glossary and the Draft Zoning Ordinance.

Animal, Domestic Farm. Any of a number of animal species commonly reared or used for food, fur, herding, riding, or other similar uses, including but not limited to horses, cattle, sheep, herding dogs, goats, pigs, rabbits, poultry, ostriches, emus, and small fur-bearing animals not classified as exotic or wild.

Animal, Exotic. Any bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, or reptile not normally domesticated in the state of California, as determined by the California Department of Fish and Game.



Animal Keeping. (Use Type) The maintaining, keeping, feeding, and raising of animals. (See Section 17.40.070: Animal Raising and Keeping).



Lisa S. Couper, DVM

4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-4558

lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



17.40.080 Animal Raising and Keeping

C. No domestic farm animal, as defined in Article 8 (Animal: domestic farm), shall be kept on a lot of less than one acre in any residential zone.

In RM, R1 and R20K zoning domestic animal keeping is not allowed. What will be the impact to existing and future residents that are not even allowed to keep a pet dog or cat per the Permitted Use Matrix and glossary definition provided in the Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the EIR needs to address the impact of not allowing the keeping of small domestic farm animals such as a few rabbits or chickens (not roosters) on a residential lot.

Further issues from the glossary definitions

Grazing. (Use Type) The raising and feeding of domestic farm animals where the primary source of food is the vegetation grown on the site, including irrigated and non-irrigated pastures.

Livestock, High Density. (Use Type) The keeping and raising of domestic farm animals, such as cattle, horses, pigs, goats, sheep, rabbits, poultry, ostriches, and emus, for commercial purposes, where the primary source of food is other than the vegetation grown on site, such as dairies, feedlots, and similar large-scale operations.

Per the **Livestock, High Density** definition and the seasonality of rainfall in El Dorado County and the lack of water for irrigation almost all domestic farm animals will require a primary feed source (at least a significant part of the year) that is not grown on site and will therefore meet this definition and not be allowed on any residential parcel regardless of size. What will be the impact of this definition or does it just need correcting.

If this is not an error then how will it impact existing resident's ability to house and keep their animals and how will it impact the county and its residents economically and culturally.


Residential Zoning and Crops, Orchards and Vineyards

Once again from the glossary:

The existing Zoning Ordinance for Residential Estate 5 and 10 acre reads:

17.28.190 Uses permitted by right. The following uses are allowed by right, without special use permit or variance:



A. One single-family detached dwelling:



Lisa S. Couper, DVM

4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-4558

lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



1. Accessory uses and structures including, but not limited to, garage, swimming pool, pumphouse, boathouse,
2. The renting of one room within the dwelling,
3. One guest house, not for rent or lease, and not to exceed four hundred square feet of floor space, as an accessory use to an existing dwelling, no guest house shall contain kitchen facilities;

144 (Revised November 2010) El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance

B. Barns, agricultural structures, etc.;

C. Home occupation such as accountant, advisor, appraiser, architect, artist, attorney, author,

broker, dressmaker, draftsman, dentist, engineer, handicrafts, insurance, photographer, physician, therapist, musician, teacher and other similar occupations conducted on the premises or by mail or telephone where the activities do not create a traffic problem; provided, that instruction is not given to groups in excess of four and concerts or recitals are

not held, and no display of goods is visible from the outside of the property; the use must be

carried on in the residence and be incidental to the residential use of the premises and be carried on by a resident thereon;

D. One unlighted sign not exceeding six square feet of message area and eight feet above ground level advertising authorized activities on the premises;

E. Raising and grazing of domestic farm animals and the cultivation of tree and field crops and the sale of such goods when produced on the premises and when in conformity with Chapters 17.14, 17.16 and 17.18;

F. Packing and processing of agricultural products produced on the premises without changing the nature of the products;

And for Single Family Residential Three-Acre it permits by right:


Raising and grazing of domestic farm animals and the cultivation of tree and field crops where it does not constitute a nuisance to adjacent properties and is in conformity with the provisions of Chapters 17.14, 17.16 and 17.18;

But does not permit packing and processing by right.

The Draft Zoning Ordinance states the general guidelines for Larger Residential Parcels as follows:

CHAPTER 17.24—RESIDENTIAL ZONES



3. One-acre Residential (R1A). The R1A, One-acre Residential Zone, is intended to create a more dispersed residential character to an area and to minimize required services by providing for and regulating medium density residential development at the highest range of



Lisa S. Couper, DVM

4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-4558

lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



one dwelling unit per acre. Accessory structures and uses and limited agricultural pursuits are considered compatible with this zone.

4. Two-acre Residential (R2A). The R2A, Two-acre Residential Zone, is intended to create a more dispersed residential character to an area and to minimize required services by providing for and regulating medium density residential development at the mid-range of one dwelling unit per two acres. Accessory structures and uses and limited agricultural pursuits are considered compatible with this zone.

5. Three-acre Residential (R3A). The R3A, Three-acre Residential Zone, is intended to create a more dispersed residential character to an area and to minimize required services by providing for and regulating the development of medium density residential development at the lowest range of one dwelling unit per three acres. Accessory structures and uses and limited agricultural pursuits are considered compatible with this zone.

6. Residential Estate (RE). The RE, Residential Estate Zone is intended to preserve the rural character of an area and to minimize required services by providing for and regulating the development of low density and rural residential development at a range of densities to include one dwelling unit per five acres and one dwelling per 10 acres. Minimum lot size designations of —5 and —10 are applied to this zone based on surrounding land use compatibility, physical and infrastructural constraints, and General Plan land use designation. Said designations represent the minimum number of acres permitted for each lot. Agricultural structures and uses are considered compatible with this zone, as accessory to the residential use of the property.

So while Chapter 17.24 states repeatedly that “and limited agricultural pursuits are considered compatible with this zone” the Permitted Use Matrix and the glossary severely limit or eliminate the growing of crops, vineyards, orchards and the selling or packaging of these products.

From the glossary:


Cropland. (Use Type) Irrigated land that is used to grow grains, alfalfa, fruit or nut orchards, vineyards, or row and truck crops such as berries, pumpkins, or other fruits and vegetables.

Nursery, Plants. (Use Type)

Retail. A facility for the retail sale of plants, seeds, and accessory products, such as fertilizers and gardening supplies.

Wholesale. A place where plant material such as flowers, trees, fruits, vegetables, and/or herbs are cultivated in the ground or in greenhouses for sale to retailers.



Orchard and Vineyards. (Use Type) The cultivation of fruit trees, nut trees, or grape vines for the commercial sale of their agricultural produce.



Lisa S. Couper, DVM

4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-4558

lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



Packing. (Use Type) The handling of fruit, grain, vegetables, trees, and other crops to ready it for shipping and sales without changing the nature of the product. Types of packing are further defined as follows:

Processing of Agricultural Products. (Use Type) The handling of agricultural products whereby the nature of the product is changed or altered, such as making juices, jams, and sauces from fruit, and the slaughtering of animals raised on the premises or on land in the vicinity under common ownership. This use type does not include the processing of grapes and other fruit juice into wine. See definition for Winery.

Produce Sales. (Use Type) The public sale of agricultural products grown on the same property where the sale is being conducted. This term specifically excludes the sale of products grown off site and processed products. (See Section 17.40.240: Produce Sales).

Produce Stand. Producer owned and operated facility for the sale of produce grown on the same site or as part of a shared multi-farm operation. (See Section 17.40.240: Produce Sales).

The logical consequence of the Matrix and the glossary would be:


Residents on R2A and R1A (and smaller) may not even have a garden (crops), grow nursery plants, fruit trees (orchard) or grown grapes (vineyard). They may also not let their animals graze nor may they feed them as they would be classified as a feedlot.

Residents on R3A cannot have nursery plants, nor can they pack or process the products they produce.

Residents on RE are not permitted by right to have nursery plants or to process their products on site and would have to get a conditional use permit.



There are many small scale garden and nursery businesses that can and could function well on small parcels in residential areas. The existing ordinances allow for it. The EIR must address the impact these changes will have on the economy of the county and its residents and on their cultural values. The impact of the decreased ability to grow one's own food or to buy it locally must be addressed in its impacts on local jobs, air quality and traffic. This impact must be compared to the alternative of no change in the existing zoning and to a less restrictive set of ordinances increasing allowable farming activities.

The EIR should address and evaluate the impact of a modified "right to farm" ordinance that would allow for the growing of food in residential areas by right but



Lisa S. Couper, DVM

4610 Grazing Hill Rd.
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-4558
lcouperdvm@fastkat.com



limit the spraying of chemicals and other activities such as dust and noise production that would impact other residents.

Residential Zoning and Slaughter

D. The slaughtering of fowl or domestic farm animals owned by the property owner or lessee is not permitted in any residential zone, including R1, R1A, R2A, R3A, RE-5, and RE-10.

How will this ordinance impact the raising of animals for food and existing businesses with in the county that provide this specific service. How is this supportive of our agricultural heritage in El Dorado County and the cultural values of its residents. It is understandable not to allow a “slaughter house” to be placed in a residential zone but it is not appropriate to prevent a resident from utilizing the food products they have grown on site. What will be the economic, cultural and lifestyle impact of this ordinance. We do not have a slaughter house in El Dorado County, how will this impact residents economically directly and indirectly as more revenue goes out of county and how will it impact air quality and green house gases.

For a county with an agricultural heritage and a strong 4H and FFA program the restrictions that the Draft Zoning Ordinance will place and the impact it will have on the existing cultural values and lifestyle of residents is extensive. We should be encouraging the production of food by our residents not impeding it.

I look forward to seeing these issues addressed in the upcoming EIR.

Signed,

Lisa S. Couper, DVM



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-. ou@edcgov.us>

Re: P. blic Scoping Comments

1 message

TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-. ou@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 12:30 PM

To: Kathleen Newell <knewell@live.com>

Cc: bostwo@edcgov.us, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Hi Kathleen,

The comment period does not close until 5 p.m. today. We are preparing the Workshop Staff Reports and packets for the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission this week and will include copies of all comments received including those from Public Agencies.

Sorry for the confusion, but Kim may have inadvertently reference the week of July 2nd. We had always intended to provide them this week following the close of the NOP comment period. Copies will be made available to the public following a release to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commissioners. The entire packet will be posted to the Board agenda website by end of week.

Thanks

Shawna Purvines

On Mon, Jul 2, 2012 at 12:06 PM, Kathleen Newell <knewell@live.com> wrote:

Dear Shawna,

I'm requesting access to the letters submitted to the Planning Commission Public Scoping Workshop for the Draft Gen Plan/Zoning update held last Thursday, June 28th. Kim Kerr said there was one from Cal Trans. It was not available for view at the workshop.

Also, Kim Kerr said last week at the Planning Commission public scoping workshop that the first wave of scoping comments would be available to the Planning Commission Board and BOS this week (July 2). She said the public would have access to them as well.

It's imperative the public see those comments asap so we can be informed of the issues that will be discussed at the workshops later this month.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Newell
4576 Foothill Drive
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
[530-306-9371](tel:530-306-9371)



F. d: Public Comment for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update

1 me. sage

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 1:41 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lori Parlin <loriparlin@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 10:37 AM
Subject: Public Comment for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update
To: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
Cc: loriparlin@sbcglobal.net

To: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner

Development Services Department

2850 Fairland Court

Placerville, CA 95667

shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

From: Sam and Lori Parlin

3971 Crosswood Drive

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

loriparlin@sbcglobal.net

Re: Public Comment For the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update

We are requesting that the Update process be put on hold until some ver. serious issues are resolved and questions are answered, such as:

1. Why Kim Kerr was hired to lead the Update process when she was being investigated by the Amador County Grand Jury, which found in its 2012 Final Report that Ms. Kerr, as the former City Manager of Ione:
 - a. disregarded findings and recommendations of the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report;
 - b. provided insufficient or misleading information for the City Council to cast intelligent votes;
 - c. did not maintain proper payment procedures for consultants;
 - d. created an unrealistic General Plan for the financial infrastructure in place at that time;

e. did not demonstrate that she had the proper qualifications to perform the duties required of the City Manager position for 2007-2011.

2. Public comments are due by July 10, 2012, yet the Scoping meetings were held up until June 27, 2012. This left attendees of the June 27th meeting with only 13 days (including the July 4th holiday) to thoroughly research hundreds of pages of County documents, several maps, and as many outside sources as possible in order to make intelligent, meaningful comments.

3. The Scoping meetings were procedural and superficial and did not provide the public with any in-depth or project-specific information about how their neighborhoods would be affected by the new plan and policies.

4. Concerns have been raised by the public that the entire process is being hurried before the new Board of Supervisors is in place. It makes sense to put the process on hold so that the new Board can be part of the process, rather than handing them an updated Plan in which the public has no faith.

In the limited amount of time we had to make public comments, we were able to identify the following concerns:

1. We've heard it said repeatedly that people choose to live in El Dorado County because they like its rural characteristics; they like to be able to come home and escape the noise and congestion of nearby urban communities. We want the County to protect and preserve our rural lifestyle and reject projects that put high-density and/or mixed-use developments adjacent to or in the middle of medium- or low-density neighborhoods.

a. Our roadways cannot withstand the additional traffic and we do not want the additional emissions or noise from additional traffic.

b. Our county does not have enough living-wage jobs for its current residents, and a large number of existing residents drive to work outside our county. Increasing the population density will just exacerbate this problem.

c. These types of projects will cause more light pollution.

d. High-density and mixed-use infill projects were originally intended by CEQA for urban use, not suburban or rural uses.

2. We were told at the June 27th Scoping meeting that property owners should do their due diligence when choosing where to live. That would be possible if all we had to do was look at the zoning of the properties in the area. However, the Community Region land use designation is often used to justify the rezoning of properties, which is an injustice to existing property owners and long-time residents and makes due diligence impossible for prospective property owners. At the very least, the Community Region boundaries should be reevaluated and updated based on input from residents within and around the boundaries. Preferably, the Community Region land use designation and its current mapping boundaries would be completely removed from the General Plan as it is misleading and not transparent.

3. The current notification process used by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors is inadequate for our area and needs improvement. I have attended several meetings where people in the audience knew nothing about proposed projects right in their own neighborhood. The 500' distance for mailing notifications is inadequate in our area because of the large parcels and the fact that one person may own several adjacent parcels. The mailing notification distance should be lengthened for increased public awareness of proposed projects. In addition to a larger mailing distance, a road sign placed at main intersections near the site would give people affected by the change the opportunity to see the notification as they drove by the site.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding this process.

Lori and Sam Parlin

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Re: Shingle Spring's San Stino

1 message

Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>
Cc: Pierre Rivas <pierre.rivas@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 5:57 PM

We don't have a project on this property yet, so I am not sure where we should store these. Any ideas?

On Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 5:19 PM, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us> wrote:

There is a facebook page directing individuals to send comments to the TGPA-ZOU e-mail. I will be taking them out of the TGPA and sending them to you.

Thanks
Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Cierra Baumunk <foreverlovehayden@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 2:41 PM
Subject: Shingle Spring's San Stino
To: "TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us" <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

July 11th, 2012

To: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner

El Dorado County

2850 Fairlane Ct.

Placerville, CA 95667

TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

From: Cierra Baumunk

670 Forni Road, Placerville

and

parent of 2 children who attend the

California Montessori Project

4645 Buckeye Road, Shingle Springs

RE: Notice of Preparation Public Comment For the Draft General Plan Amendments/Zoning Update

I am deeply concerned with the San Stino plans. Not just for the residents, but as a parent as well. My children attend the California Montessori Project on Buckeye Road. The school has worked incredibly hard to build the school you see before your eyes, and I think building a new road to supply hundreds of new home owners destroys the beauty and value of the school. The traffic, noise, air pollution, and increased population, will negatively impact the location and school grounds.

I only want what's best for my children and all of the children at the California Montessori Project. These plans are not in the best interest of the children or school. I want to see all of these children and future generations to have a bright future at this school.

Shingle Springs is a gorgeous community. We know several people who own homes in this area, including next to Holiday Lake, and I know this is not what those residents want. People move to these types of areas because that is what they are used to and grew up in or simply want to escape the bustle of noisy life. Shingle Springs is a beautiful hidden country life, and we as a county should cherish that land. Not destroy it.

Thank you for your time and I hope these thoughts are considered.

Cierra Baumunk

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--
Roger Trout
Director Development Services Department
El Dorado Count.

[\(530\) 621-5369](tel:5306215369)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Response to NOP for TGPA and ZOU from Green Valle. Community Alliance

1. message

Cheryl McDougal <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 4:42 PM

To: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

TO: Shawna Purvines

This communication is to respond with El Dorado Community concerns regarding not only the proposed changes but to the process as well.

1) With changes of this scope, magnitude and complexity, there should have been an opportunity for interactive dialog with the County as to better understanding both the changes and the underlying reasons for the changes. Instructing the public to read through extensive documentation across different documents is not reasonable. The terminology used is not common for the average El Dorado County resident with no engineering/land development/governmental background.

2) The NOP should have been communicated better and more extensively throughout the county. Many residents don't know that these changes are being proposed let alone know that they are "encouraged" to send in their comments and concerns within a very aggressive 45-day due date time frame.

3) The scoping meeting in El Dorado Hills held at the Community Center was at the same time as open swimming on a hot day. Thus, many people that had planned on attending could not find a parking spot, and thus, were not able to attend to hear about the "process." And for the people that attended, they did not have the opportunity for interactive dialog to better understand the proposed changes.

4) This NOP should not have been held concurrently with the NOP for the Dixon Ranch. It was difficult at best to divide and invest the effort required between the two NOPS to effectively read, evaluate and respond to both NOP's.

Attached, please find a summary of concerns that was compiled by the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Council. The many residents that comprise the Green Valley Community Alliance are referring to this summary as to their concerns as the typical resident did not have the time nor the expertise to author their specific individuals comments and concerns.

Regards,

Cheryl McDougal submitting on behalf of the Green Valley Community Alliance

7/11/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Response to NOP for TGPA and ZOU from Green Valley C...



EDAPAC TGPA ZOU NOP Summar. .doc

78.

EDHAPAC TGPA/ZOU NOP Response Matrix

July 8, 2012

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2-1-Major Concern</p> <p>Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p>High Density Residential Use: Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>	<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase in size of the buildings to accommodate the additional units could overwhelm the surrounding area. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. Please analyze this issue.</p> <p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional noise at these sites. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The inclusion of the additional density per acre could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>This increase in density should be carefully analyzed to determine all of the impacts caused by increasing the density by 50%.</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4- Major Concern</i></p> <p>Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of “improved open space” on site, set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the “improvement” of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county’s citizens.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This lost of open space will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1-Major Concern Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Density Bonus has encouraged developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from density bonuses.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from density bonus could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The density bonus will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. . An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4-Major Concern Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential.</p> <p>Consider deleting policy.</p>	<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then I don't believe <u>any</u> open space is required to develop a property. Pack-um and stack-um! Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of planned development could reduce open space and lower County design standards. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces and County design standards.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	be developed. Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region.		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>New Policies-Major Concern</i> Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>	<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed language by staff for “Promote Infill Development” item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence “, <u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>”.</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density from infill sites will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from infill sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The infill sites will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from infill projects could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p><i>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1-Major Concern</i> Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, Tc-1w, TC-4f, TC-4i, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of housing affordable to all income levels.</p>	<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues.</p> <p>Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The decreasing of road widths will cause traffic accidents and safety issue for pedestrians and bicycles. A very high percentage of El Dorado County streets do not have sidewalks. If the streets widths are narrowed without sidewalks this will cause a safety issue. The EIR should analyze these impacts and provide detailed mitigation measures.</p>	
<p><i>Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w-Moderate Concern</i> Consider amending policies to clean up language including; TC-1m delete “of effort” TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.</p>	<p>Why replace the word “accidents” with the word “crashes”? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents that the other? Why not include both “accidents and crashes”? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads</p>	<p>No Comment at this time</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 7.1.2.1-Major Concern Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.</p>	<p>Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion).</p> <p>The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality Construction of homes on 30% or greater grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Hazards & Hazardous Material Construction on steeper slopes will cause additional exposure to soil perturbations and will cause air born particles of dust and asbestos. Please analyze this issue and provide mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 -Major Concern <u>High Density Residential</u>: Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre</p>	<p>Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from 5 units to 8 units/acre.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The 5 to 8 units per acre increase in density and will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this out of balance condition be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre will cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1-Major</p>	<p>These areas should be identified before</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The changing or adding new areas</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change or adding of these</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Concern Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas</p>	<p>analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>in either the rural or Community Regions could have a major visual impact on the affect areas. Please analyze the visual impacts that would be caused in areas that would be subject to this policy.</p> <p>*Air Quality Please analyze the air quality impact of all possible change that could occur with the new policy.</p> <p>*Population/Housing Please analyze all of the population changes and impacts that will occur as result of the policy.</p>	<p>centers could cause different traffic patterns. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads in any area that might be subject to this new policy.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning Please analyze the entire existing infrastructure that would be affected by this policy.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. <u>The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p>	<p>No Comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers <u>in identified</u> mixed use areas as defined in <u>the Zoning</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p> <p>“Identified” mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><u>Ordinance.</u> The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. <u>The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>an EIR is prepared.</p>		
<p>Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf- Major Concern Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.</p>	<p>This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service.</p> <p>Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change of the definition of worsen could cause more projects to be approved with out the supporting infrastructure to prevent congestion. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads that would be subject to lessening of traffic standards in any area that might be subject to this new definition.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.2.1.5- Major Concern Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy</p>	<p>The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from "shall" to "may" could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd- Moderate Concern Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>	<p>Traffic is one of the two most observable items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	<p>EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item "<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>". This second item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1- Moderate Concern</i> Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the word “<u>shall</u>” and replace with the word “<u>may</u>” in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word “<u>may</u>” might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words “<u>if reasonably available</u>” should be replaced with “<u>if appropriate</u>”, otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not “reasonably available” an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality The change from shall to may will increase well water use and could cause a lowering of the water table to existing residents. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from these additional sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The additional sites approved from this change in policy will cause more houses in the Community region, which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase housing from this policy change could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011- ;- Major Concern</p> <p>6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>	<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues.</p> <p>The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>



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

2012 Board
Chair
John Hidahl
Vice Chair
Jeff Haberman
Secretary/Treasurer
Alice Klinger

July 10, 2012

El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services
Attn: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C"
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: APAC Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Notice of public scoping meeting for the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment and the Zoning Ordinance Update

Dear Shawna,

The El Dorado Hills APAC TGPA/ZOU subcommittee was established in February 2012, based upon notification from County of the intent to make modifications to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Since APACs next General meeting will be held on Wednesday July 11th, the APACs subcommittee is submitting this report to meet the July 10th timeline. Following the review of the subcommittee's report at our July 12th meeting a final report will be submitted.

We would like to acknowledge and thank the various members of the County Planning Department, DOT and members of EDAC who have helped define and clarify the range of changes being proposed and under consideration. However, these TGP amendments and zoning changes are very complex and difficult to understand without additional time to analyze the intended results. **Therefore APAC respectfully requests that the County extend the comment period for 60 days to allow an in-depth review of all of the proposed changes.** APAC would like to work further with the EDAC committee and County Staff during this period to consider changing the scope of the amendments and zoning changes.

Based on our cursory review we have identified several proposed changes that may have significant impacts to EDH, dependent upon the range of applicability of the proposed change.

Attached is a copy of a Summary Matrix with comments from ED residents that APAC has received via various communications.

If you have any questions on any of the comments and/or concerns expressed herein, please contact one of the TGPA & ZOU Sub-Committee Co- Chairmen; John Hidahl @ (916 933-2703) or Jeff Haberman @ (916 933-3430)

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

John Hidahl,
TGPA & ZOU Sub-Committee Co- Chairman, APAC

cc: BOS1, BOS 2, BOS 3, BOS 4, BOS 5
Planning Commission
APAC Read File

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
10 JUL 11 AM 8:04

El Dorado Hills APAC - Non-partisan Volunteers Planning Our Future

120102

EDHAPAC TGPA/ZOU NOP Response Matrix

July 10, 2012

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2 Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p>High Density Residential Use: Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>	<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase in size of the buildings to accommodate the additional units could overwhelm the surrounding area. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. Please analysis this issue.</p> <p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional noise at these sites. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The inclusion of the additional density per acre could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>This increase in density should be carefully analyzed to determine all of the impacts caused by increasing the density by 50%.</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4- Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of "improved open space" on site, set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the "improvement" of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county's citizens.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This lost of open space will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1 Consider amending the Density Bonus Ordinance to allow for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through zoning ordinance.</p>	<p>Density Bonus Ordinance encourages developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from density bonuses.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from density bonus could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The density bonus will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential.</p> <p>Consider deleting policy.</p>	<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then don't believe any open space is required to develop a property. Pack-up and stack-up. Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The loss of planned development could reduce open space and lower County design standards. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for loss of open spaces and County design standards.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	be developed. Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region.		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>New Policies Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>	<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure. The proposed language by staff for "Promote Infill Development" item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence ", <u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>".</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density from infill sites will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated? *Land Use/Planning The increase density from infill sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The infill sites will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented? *Transportation/Traffic The increase density from infill projects could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1- Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, TC-1w, TC-4f, TC-4j, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of housing affordable to all income levels.</p>	<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues. Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The decreasing of road widths will cause traffic accidents and safety issue for pedestrians and bicycles. A very high percentage of El Dorado County streets do not have sidewalks. If the streets widths are narrowed without sidewalks this will cause a safety issue. The EIR should analyze these impacts and provide detailed mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w Consider amending policies to clean up language including; TC-1m delete "of effort" TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.</p>	<p>Why replace the word "accidents" with the word "crashes"? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents than the other? Why not include both "accidents and crashes"? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads</p>	<p>No Comment at this time</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 7.1.2.1 Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.</p>	<p>Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality Construction of homes on 30% or greater grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Hazardous & Hazardous Material Construction on steeper slopes will cause additional exposure to soil perturbations and will cause air born particles of dust and asbestos. Please analyze this issue and provide mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 <u>High Density Residential</u>: Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre</p>	<p>Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure. This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from 5 units to 8 units/acre.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The 5 to 8 units per acre increase in density and will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this out of balance condition be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre will cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1</p>	<p>These areas should be identified before</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The changing or adding new areas</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change or adding of these</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas</p>	<p>analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>in either the rural or Community Regions could have a major visual impact on the affect areas. Please analyze the visual impacts that would be caused in areas that would be subject to this policy.</p> <p>*Air Quality Please analyze the air quality impact of all possible change that could occur with the new policy.</p> <p>*Population/Housing Please analyze all of the population changes and impacts that will occur as result of the policy.</p>	<p>centers could cause different traffic patterns. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads in any area that might be subject to this new policy.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning Please analyze the entire existing infrastructure that would be affected by this policy.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p>	<p>No Comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers in identified mixed use areas as defined in the Zoning</p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p> <p>"identified" mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><u>Ordinance</u>. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. <u>The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p> <p>Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.</p>	<p>an EIR is prepared.</p>		
<p>Policy 10.2.1.5 Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy</p>	<p>This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service.</p> <p>Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change of the definition of worsen could cause more projects to be approved with out the supporting infrastructure to prevent congestion. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads that would be subject to lessening of traffic standards in any area that might be subject to this new definition.</p>	
<p>Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd- Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>	<p>The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from "shall" to "may" could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.</p> <p>Traffic is one of the two most observable items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	<p>EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item "<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>". This second item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1. Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the word "shall" and replace with the word "may" in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word "may" might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words "if reasonably available" should be replaced with "if appropriate", otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not "reasonably available" an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality The change from shall to may will increase well water use and could cause a lowering of the water table to existing residents. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from these additional sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The additional sites approved from this change in policy will cause more houses in the Community region, which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase housing from this policy change could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011- :- 6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>	<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>

In regards to the TGPA and Zoning plan update I have some general comments and then some specific questions.

In general, the way the plan is written, it has a tendency of reducing the restrictions of big development and hits the little guy with more restrictions.

Based upon the purpose stated in 17.10.10 section C. How can there be even consideration of denser housing levels with the water shortages we have in this county and the State of California? What would the **environmental impact** of increasing housing density on available water resources? What **cultural impact** would it have on the rural nature of our county? As two alternatives, what would be the impact of leaving it the way it is, or what would be the impact of a decrease in housing density in consideration of this vital resource as a more realistic alternative; especially in lieu of the fact that agriculture is a major industry in need of water here?

In regards to **high density residential regions**, what would be the impact of requiring community gardens to be provided, which could also qualify as part or all of the open space required. This would fit better into sustainable and affordable food sources and less need to travel outside the area, decreasing the carbon footprint.

In Article 8, the Glossary, There are several definitions that need to be revised.

Domestic Farm Animal should also include rare, heritage breeds of livestock and poultry that are not necessarily considered "normally domesticated" to help increase bio and genetic diversity.

Livestock, High Density (Use Type)- As written, this includes most of the domestic animals in El Dorado County. The phrase "where the primary source of food is other than the vegetation grown on site" should be deleted. The examples sited are feed lots, dairies, (it should state Large Dairies, as CDFA is working on creating rules for small and micro-dairies to help support local communities) and similar operations, such as Confined Animal Feeding Operations, (CAFOs)

How would **High Density Livestock** impact the purpose of **17.10.10 section F? Maintain and protect the county's natural beauty, vegetation, air and water quality, natural landscape features, etc.**

What impact would **High Density Livestock** have on **available water resources**, aesthetics and animal health in our rural county. The carbon footprint to haul in large amounts of GMO corn and grain, which is a primary food for these operations, is also unsustainable.

Under Article 2, 17.24.020 Cropland and Orchards are not permitted if the lot size is under 3 acres. What is the **economic and cultural impact** of not allowing the sale of one's abundance? If this is an issue of chemical spraying etc. Perhaps this can be modified to include no applications of dangerous pesticides or herbicides. Most folks at

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

12 JUL 10 AM 9:43

110086

this level grow organically and sustainably. It is about local healthy food and folk should be allowed to share their bounty and again, have some form of monetary compensation if they choose.

Stables (use type) Private This definitions does not take into account boarding of domestic livestock for folks who don't have the land to do so, but want to own an animal in whole or in part, for their own healthy food source. The coming food sovereignty ordinance allows for this type of activity. It should be redefined as; an accessory building to a primary residential use that is used to shelter horses and other domestic farm animals, or for training and horse boarding consistent with a home occupation. Or perhaps there should be a similar type of definition for a Barn. It is not defined, but is in the Zoning along with Stable.

Under Article 4, 17.40.080 section C.

How will limiting all livestock to lots greater than one acre impact the **cultural lifestyle**, such as 4-H and the **economic viability** of raising one's own healthy food. Perhaps an alternative to allow for small livestock, such as Rabbits, Chickens, perhaps a milk goat on these smaller parcels would create a more sustainable lifestyle and community. There are already communities in this county, with CC&Rs, for those who don't like the rural qualities of El Dorado County.

Under Article 4, 17.40.080 section D.

If animal keeping is permitted, why prevent animal slaughter for one's own use? What **cultural impact** does adding this restriction have on a residents ability to sustain themselves? What **cultural impact** on 4-H and FFA? What **health impact** by not allowing those who choose to raise their own chemical free food animals? What **economic impact** on those who would supplement their income from the sale of their excess bounty and for **access** to those who wish to know their "farmer" and buy healthy food? **How does this restriction encourage economic activities creating potential employment opportunities in the county, even if only part time?**

7-10-12
Patricia Chelatt
2772 Ponderosa Rd
Shingle Springs CA
95682

19 JUL 10 AM 9:16
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT



Re: Comments to the NOP

1 me. sage

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 To: Tara Mook <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>
 Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at

All comments will be provided to the Board of Supervisors. So please continue your review and forward any comments you wish to share with the Board.

Shawna

On Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:31 PM, Tara Mook <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Shawna,

Does this mean formally excepted. We need an exception to be able to go through a mountain of information and give good comments to the County
 Tara

Sent from my iPod

On Jul 10, 2012, at 5:26 PM, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Yes TGPA-ZOU NOP comments were due by 5 p.m. today. But TGPA-ZOU Project comments are always excepted.

Thanks
 Shawna

On Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 5:10 PM, Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

These were thrown together I didn't have much time. They were do today by 5pm right?
 Tara

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 To: Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>
 Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>
 Sent: Tue, Jul. 10, 2012 5:03:13 PM
 Subject: Fwd: Fw: Comments to the NOP

Thank. Tara

Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>
 Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 5:01 PM
 Subject: Fw: Comments to the NOP
 To: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

I concur with comments drafted by the El Dorado Hills APAC
 Tara Mccann

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>
 To: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
 Sent: Tue, July 10, 2012 4:59:16 PM
 Subject: Comments to the NOP

Comments to the TGPA NOP

1. Analyze consultant contracts for Conflict of Interest:

Board of Professional Engineers Attorney :

"conflict of interest (COI) occurs when an individual or organization is involved in multiple interests, one of which could possibly corrupt the motivation for an act in the other."

The EIR for some discretionary projects as an example Dixon Ranch is being done by LSA it has been my understanding as a 25 year registered Civil Engineer in the State of California the EIR consultant is not allowed by law to be doing some of the studies included in the EIR. Which LSA stated they were. Please clarify and analyze.

2. Changes being proposed to the Land Use Development Manual and County Design Improvement Standards can not be a separate process they are directly related to the Tentative General Plan Update. If the County is making changes to these without public input and without direct analysis to the Tentative General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update that would be significantly flawed and would be disingenuous to the public. This is forcing an outcome by changing the standards by which to measure. The zoning changes that are being proposed in the Zoning Ordinance Update can not be valid with some of the existing current Standards and existing policy in the Land Use Development Manual that now exist. They could only be valid if Standards and Land Use Manual were changed this is obvious and apparent to many in the Green Valley Alliance and also the El Dorado Hills APAC working groups. For the County to change the Design Standards and The Land Use Development Manual without full analysis alongside the zoning change proposals would be a significant flaw in the process. This is not transparent, the EIR needs to analyze and include these changes in the TGPA & ZOU process.

3. Land Use Policy Programmatic Update and Tentative General Plan Update seem to be used interchangeably on the County's web site and in referring to County process. This TGPA & ZOA should be done as a full General Plan Amendment and go to the voters for approval. There is too much significant policy changes that effect an unprecedented broad spectrum that are not being addressed or analyzed. The Transportation Circulation Element of the General Plan is being significantly changed yet the County states they are not doing a Transportation Circulation Element Update. Again this needs to be an all encompassing all element update General Plan Amendment and go to the voters for approval.

4. Historic Overlay should be analyzed for El Dorado Hills. There is significant cultural resources that have not been recorded and are not on the County preservation list. Some examples are the old gold miners school house on Malcomn Dixon and the old one lane Malcomn Dixon historic bridges.

5. High-Density Residential (HDR): "This land use designation identifies

those areas suitable for intensive single-family residential development at

densities from one to five [optional review would include up to 8]

dwelling units per acre, as stated in the 2004 General Plan. Allowable residential structure types include single-family attached (i.e., air-space condominiums, townhouses) and detached dwellings and manufactured homes. Except as provided in Policy 2.2.2.3, this designation is considered appropriate only within Community Regions and Rural Centers." This needs to be analyzed for the suitability of the Community Region unilaterally designating High Density Land Use as identified as a holding zone for high intensity development. Some areas where proposed high density developments are trying to get approved are not compatible with surrounding low density and rural adjoining land as well as lack of infrastructure and traffic circulation problems. The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update should analyze the appropriateness of all Community Region zoning to only allow density's compatible and that can be supported by infrastructure and not 20 years down the road. The Community region should not be labeled a holding zone for highest intensity densities when it is not compatible with surrounding land uses, can not be supported in the near term by adequate traffic infrastructure, adequate circulation, adequate public services, and significant environmental impacts not mitigable. Many Developers are making broad brush statements that because it is a Community Region that gives them carte blanc for the highest intensity densities. EIR should analyze changing Land Uses where this is not adequate or not compatible in the Community Region.

6. Needed Traffic Infrastructure and circulation needs to be analyzed in the Community Region for existing and cumulative impacts.

7. TC-Xa Measure Y: Define "fix". Should analyze engineering practices needed transportation infrastructure. Should include mixed use and multi family projects.

8. The unincorporated areas should have more formalized Regional Councils to dialog better on issues with the County. These should be members voted in by community.

9. Please analyze clarifying the structure of County Departments and how to communicate that to the public so that the public has a better idea of how Departments are structured and can more effectively work with them.

10.)The process of Discretionary Projects needs to be fully analyzed to improve inconsistency's and processes. There should be more public input throughout the initial stages.

Tara Mccann

.-

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County

Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--
Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner

7/11/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Comments to the NOP

Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

F. d: EDHAPAC Letter regarding the NOP for the EIR- the EDCo TGPA and ZOU

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:56 PM

To: "Hidahl, John W (IS)" <John.Hidahl@ngc.com>

Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Thanks John

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Hidahl, John W (IS) <John.Hidahl@ngc.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 6:12 PM

Subject: EDHAPAC Letter regarding the NOP for the EIR- the EDCo TGPA and ZOU

To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Cc: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bostthree@edcgov.us" <bostthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "lou.rain@edcgov.us" <lou.rain@edcgov.us>, Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>, "jeff.h@ix.netcom.com" <jeff.h@ix.netcom.com>

Hi Shawna,

Attached please find the EDHAPAC Subcommittee.s letter on the NOP for the TGPA and ZOU. Please note that APAC has requested a 60 day extension of the review period within the letter due to the complexity of the subject and the quantity of applicable documents. Our full APAC committee will review the subcommittee's report at our regular monthly meeting tomorrow night (7/11/12) and will submit a subsequent full APAC voting member report NLT Friday 7/13/12.

Thanks, John

--

Shawna L. Purvines
 Sr. Planner
 Development Services
 El Dorado County
 Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

2 attachments



APAC TGPA and ZOU Subcommittee Report on the NOP7-10-12 R1.docx
 292K



apac TGPA ZOU NOP matrix7-6-12 revised (3).doc
 77K



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

2012 Board
Chair
John Hidahl
Vice Chair
Jeff Haberman
Secretary/Treasurer
Alice Klinger

July 10, 2012

El Dorado County Development Services Department, Planning Services
Attn: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C"
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: APAC Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Notice of public scoping meeting for the El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment and the Zoning Ordinance Update

Dear Shawna,

The El Dorado Hills APAC TGPA/ZOU subcommittee was established in February 2012, based upon notification from County of the intent to make modifications to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Since APACs next General meeting will be held on Wednesday July 11th, the APACs subcommittee is submitting this report to meet the July 10th timeline. Following the review of the subcommittee's report at our July 12th meeting a final report will be submitted.

We would like to acknowledge and thank the various members of the County Planning Department, DOT and members of EDAC who have helped define and clarify the range of changes being proposed and under consideration. However, these TGP amendments and zoning changes are very complex and difficult to understand without additional time to analyze the intended results. **Therefore APAC respectfully requests that the County extend the comment period for 60 days to allow an in-depth review of all of the proposed changes.** APAC would like to work further with the EDAC committee and County Staff during this period to consider changing the scope of the amendments and zoning changes.

Based on our cursory review we have identified several proposed changes that may have significant impacts to EDH, dependent upon the range of applicability of the proposed change.

Attached is a copy of a Summary Matrix with comments from ED residents that APAC has received via various communications.

If you have any questions on any of the comments and/or concerns expressed herein, please contact one of the TGPA & ZOU Sub-Committee Co- Chairmen; John Hidahl @ (916 933-2703) or Jeff Haberman @ (916 933-3430)

APAC appreciates having the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

John Hidahl

John Hidahl,
TGPA & ZOU Sub-Committee Co- Chairman, APAC

cc: BOS1, BOS 2, BOS 3, BOS 4, BOS 5
Planning Commission
APAC Read File

EDHAPAC TGPA/ZOU NOP Response Matrix

July 10, 2012

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2 Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p>High Density Residential Use: Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>	<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase in size of the buildings to accommodate the additional units could overwhelm the surrounding area. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. Please analysis this issue.</p> <p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional noise at these sites. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The inclusion of the additional density per acre could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>This increase in density should be carefully analyzed to determine all of the impacts caused by increasing the density by 50%.</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4-</i> Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of “improved open space” on site, set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the “improvement” of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county’s citizens.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This lost of open space will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1 Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Density Bonus has encouraged developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from density bonuses.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from density bonus could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The density bonus will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. . An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4 Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential.</p> <p>Consider deleting policy.</p>	<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then I don't believe <u>any</u> open space is required to develop a property. Pack-um and stack-um! Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of planned development could reduce open space and lower County design standards. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces and County design standards.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	<p>be developed.</p> <p>Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region.</p>		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>New Policies Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>	<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed language by staff for “Promote Infill Development” item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence “, <u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>”.</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density from infill sites will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from infill sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The infill sites will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from infill projects could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1- Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, Tc-1w, TC-4f, TC-4i, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of housing affordable to all income levels.</p>	<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues.</p> <p>Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The decreasing of road widths will cause traffic accidents and safety issue for pedestrians and bicycles. A very high percentage of El Dorado County streets do not have sidewalks. If the streets widths are narrowed without sidewalks this will cause a safety issue. The EIR should analyze these impacts and provide detailed mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w Consider amending policies to clean up language including; TC-1m delete “of effort” TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.</p>	<p>Why replace the word “accidents” with the word “crashes”? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents that the other? Why not include both “accidents and crashes”? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads</p>	<p>No Comment at this time</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 7.1.2.1 Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.</p>	<p>Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion).</p> <p>The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality Construction of homes on 30% or greater grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Hazards & Hazardous Material Construction on steeper slopes will cause additional exposure to soil perturbations and will cause air born particles of dust and asbestos. Please analyze this issue and provide mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 <u>High Density Residential:</u> Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre</p>	<p>Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from 5 units to 8 units/acre.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The 5 to 8 units per acre increase in density and will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this out of balance condition be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre will cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1</p>	<p>These areas should be identified before</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The changing or adding new areas</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change or adding of these</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas	analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.	<p>in either the rural or Community Regions could have a major visual impact on the affect areas. Please analyze the visual impacts that would be caused in areas that would be subject to this policy.</p> <p>*Air Quality Please analyze the air quality impact of all possible change that could occur with the new policy.</p> <p>*Population/Housing Please analyze all of the population changes and impacts that will occur as result of the policy.</p>	<p>centers could cause different traffic patterns. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads in any area that might be subject to this new policy.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning Please analyze the entire existing infrastructure that would be affected by this policy.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. <u>The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.	No Comment at this time.	
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers <u>in identified</u> mixed use areas as defined in <u>the Zoning</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p> <p>“Identified” mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before</p>	No comment at this time.	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><u>Ordinance.</u> The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. <u>The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>an EIR is prepared.</p>		
<p>Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.</p>	<p>This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service.</p> <p>Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change of the definition of worsen could cause more projects to be approved with out the supporting infrastructure to prevent congestion. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads that would be subject to lessening of traffic standards in any area that might be subject to this new definition.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.2.1.5 Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy</p>	<p>The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from "shall" to "may" could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd- Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>	<p>Traffic is one of the two most observable items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	<p>EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item "<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>". This second item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.</i> Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the word “<u>shall</u>” and replace with the word “<u>may</u>” in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word “<u>may</u>” might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words “<u>if reasonably available</u>” should be replaced with “<u>if appropriate</u>”, otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not “reasonably available” an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality The change from shall to may will increase well water use and could cause a lowering of the water table to existing residents. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from these additional sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The additional sites approved from this change in policy will cause more houses in the Community region, which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase housing from this policy change could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011- ;-</p> <p>6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>	<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues.</p> <p>The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>



Re: Commens for TGPA/ZOU

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net
Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Wed, Jul 11, 2012 at 5:51 AM

Thank you Rich,

Shawna Purvines

On Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 11:59 PM, Rich Stewart <rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Shawna:

My comments in regard to the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update are provided below. I wish I had more time to spend reviewing these documents, but with the Dixon Ranch NOP deadline last Thursday, my efforts had to be focused there. I have given the El Dorado Hills APAC some additional comments that fit with their points of focus and they have been included in APAC's comments.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process as a member of the general public that clearly has no development or business interests in the County. The goal of my comments is to preserve the quality of life in the County without taxing the residents through burdensome regulations while maintaining the rural feel (yes, even in the El Dorado Hills area--remember, it's all relative). I do believe that we need to make changes that will attract business and provide revenue for the County; however, we need to remember that the changes we make today will impact the County for an eternity. Just because we are currently in a poor business/economic cycle doesn't mean that we need to panic and make changes our community will regret forever. There are some quite dramatic changes being proposed, and this process deserves whatever time it takes to get it right!

I will do my best to stay involved in the process and continue to devote as much of my time as I can to see that the County succeeds.

Rich Stewart

Targeted General Plan Amendment:

-

Community Regions:

Please consider removing APNs [126-020-01-100](#), [126-020-02-100](#), [126-020-03-100](#), [126-020-04-100](#), and [126-150-23-100](#) (Dixon Ranch proposed project) from the El Dorado Hills Community Region (EDHCR). It is my understanding that these parcels were added during the 2004 General Plan process (was there any public notice to surrounding parcels and the EDHCR at the time?). This may have been a strategic move on the part of the owner, but as it is being demonstrated as the Dixon Ranch project goes through the review process, it is not appropriate to be included in the EDHCR. Thus, one case that needs to be included for evaluation in the EIR for the TGPA/ZOU is the removal of these parcels from the El Dorado Hills Community Region.

-

-

Zoning Ordinance:

Article 2, Chapter 17.24. Residential Zones, p. 32, Section 17.24.010.A.4:

- Please add “excessive traffic” after the words “excessive noise” in this sentence. Preventing excessive traffic is a key to quality of life in the County. The purpose of this chapter ought to reflect this core value held by most all of the County.s residents.

Landscaping and Lighting Sections:

Please make it clear that residential homeowners do not have to hire a multitude of professionals to plant flowers, change a light bulb, or add sprinklers to their property. If we want to hang out the welcome mat for people to come to our county, we don't want to have to say “By the way, it's going to cost you an additional \$5,000+ to landscape your property or change a light bulb outside.” In addition, we should not burden our current residents with this significant extra cost.

See the following sections of the proposed Zoning Ordinance:

- Landscaping Standards Article 3, p. 56 Section 17.33.010 states the purpose of the standard is to comply with Water Conservation in Landscaping Act: Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (Gov. Code 65591 – 65599)
 - + I could not find anywhere in the Act a requirement for a Certified Landscape Irrigation Auditor, a Landscape Architect, Civil Engineer, Architect, or Landscape Contractor
 - + p. 59, 17.33.050.B requires hiring a professional
 - + p. 68, 17.33.110.B.3.b.11 requires hiring a professional
 - + p. 69, 17.33.110.B.4.a.7 requires hiring a professional
 - + p. 72, 17.33.110.B.4.g.1 requires hiring a professional
- Outdoor Lighting Article 3, p. 75 Section 17.34 also requires hiring some very costly professionals
 - + p. 78, 17.34.030.D requires hiring a professional
 - + p. 82, 17.34.070 Any nonconforming luminaire that is replaced, re-aimed, or relocated must meet the standards of this Chapter. Again, could be read as to require hiring a professional.

Suggestion: For this entire Article, allow a homeowner to act as their own professional much like an owner-builder can act as their own general contractor. Or, state clearl. in the applicability that it does not apply to a single residential homeowner. Also, make it clear that a homeowner does not have to apply for a permit and pay another fee to landscape their property or change a light bulb.

Landscaping Section:

Please add to the allowed landscaping use of artificial turf in lieu of grass. The quality and appearance of artificial turf has improved tremendously since the days of Astro-turf. Artificial turf saves water, eliminates the use of fertilizers, herbicides, and insecticides (that all wash into our waterways), as well as eliminating noise and air pollution from lawn mowers and string trimmers. This is a significant environmental benefit.

-

-

Glossary:

Definitions Article 8, p. 3 section 17.80.020 .Animal Keeping” refers to Section 17.40.070 appears to be a typographical error. The reference maybe should be 17.40.080?

-
-

Appendix A: Landscape and Irrigation:

Many of the indigenous shrubs listed in this section are significant fire hazards. Please have the appropriate expert review with the Fire Marshall prior to including on these lists. Place warnings next to those that should not be planted in areas that are defensible space near structures and roads.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Comments Regarding TGPA-ZOU

1 message

Marion Franck <marionf2@gmail.com>
To: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 9:42 AM

July 9, 2012

Dear County Planners (especially Shawna and Lillian who I met),

The scoping meeting I attended (Cameron Park) was very helpful, thank you. My husband and I own property on the South Fork of the American river in Lotus.

I am specifically concerned about the possible elimination of the existing rule that property cannot be subdivided in a flood corridor. It would be disastrous if a dam break led to inundation and people were unable to escape because the roads couldn't handle the surge of humanity. Under the existing rules, the number of people living in the area is limited. We should keep it this way.

At the very least, the upcoming Environmental Impact Report should study the flood risk. If it is significant (and previous policy makers obviously thought so), then the river corridor should not be opened for more dense development.

As the owner of two parcels, one large and undeveloped, I could profit if the county changed the rules. But please don't. The river is an economic and aesthetic resource of inestimable value. It is better for all of us--and safer--if we keep the river corridor as undeveloped as we can.

Marion Franck

5225 Petersen Lane

Lotus, CA 95651

Paul Raveling
2737 Carnelian Circle
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
Paul.Raveling@sierrafoot.org (916) 933-5826
July 9, 2012

El Dorado County
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Attn: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Subject: Comments on Notice Of Preparation for Targeted General Plan Amendment EIR

Dear Ms Purvines,

Please accept the pages immediately following this cover letter as my comments for the record. The same materials are being sent to you today by email, with a few Ccs to a small list of others in County government. These are on-record comments for EIR scoping purposes. Those most directly "normal" to an EIR scoping process are in the appended matrix of EDH APAC responses, which might slightly predate the formal submission from APAC. My own personal comments are mainly in the nature of recommendations for expansion of the scope of the project to cover traffic and non-economic provisions in the General Plan.

My thanks go to you and to the others among County staff for your work on behalf of the people of El Dorado Hills and El Dorado County.

Sincerely,


Paul Raveling

10 JUL 10 11:33:59
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

110103



**Comments on Notice Of Preparation
Environmental Impact Report for Targeted General Plan Amendment
July 9, 2012**

submitted by Paul Raveling
2737 Carnelian Circle, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
Paul.Raveling@sierrafoot.org

The main body of these comments is in two parts.

- Part 1 suggests additions to this project, the Targeted General Plan Amendment, generally referenced below as "TGPA").
- Part 2 affirms my support for comments from the El Dorado Hills Area Planning on the TGPA proposals.

My personal review does not cover the proposed Zoning Code. This is due only to the required scope of personal effort for such a review.

Two comments in Part 1, Comment 1 and Comment 8, present issue-specific proposals which will seem extreme to sensible readers. In part, Comment 1 responds to situations which I see as essential in provision of city services and already extreme in their absence. Comment 8 involves a bit of metaphorically blowing off some steam to finish up the section. If it's read as a tongue-in-cheek note, its implicit message to County Planning is similar to what Rodney King said to the Los Angeles Police: "Can't we all just get along?". In this case Comment 8 means that both the General Plan and County planning actions need and deserve a stronger focus on local noneconomic values. Comment 1 carries the same message more explicitly but is inclusive for economic values.

A second purpose for a degree of extremity in Comments 1 and 8 is recognition that proposals for General Plan amendments are the start of processes that tend to involve forms of negotiation. Prudent negotiation starts by establishing a cognitive anchor at a level leaving room for compromise. Stated colloquially in language of American Pickers and Pawn Stars, a seller needs to start with a high asking price in order to ultimately reach a fair deal.

My 20-year history of generally just suggesting a fair deals has mainly had a generally dismal record in producing appropriate results. There's merit in the commonly heard definition of insanity as repeating the same action over and over and expecting a different result. By that criterion many parts of Comments 1 and 8 are an attempt to cling to sanity. Other opinions of these comments may be equally valid. In my view the ultimate challenge

to sanity is lack of a city government in the County's largest actual city, which houses a quarter of the County's population.

Part 1: Suggestions for additions to the project

A thorough review of the General Plan and of civic needs, especially in El Dorado Hills, could be expected to enlarge this list.

Comment 1. Public Services and Utilities Element:

Consider amending Goal 5.1 and adding Policies 5.1.1.0 through 5.1.1.0.4 as follows.

GOAL 5.1: PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES

Provide and maintain a system of safe, adequate, and cost-effective public utilities and services; maintain an adequate level of service to existing development while allowing for additional growth in an efficient manner; and, ensure a safe and adequate water supply, wastewater disposal, and appropriate public services for rural areas. Anticipate migration of services from the County to a future city government.

Policy 5.1.1.0:

The County shall provide a Community Region Council in unincorporated Community Regions whose population exceeds 10,000. These councils are advisory to the Board of Supervisors and to County commissions and committees. The County Board of Supervisors shall consult with each such Community Region Council regarding County business affecting its specific Community Region. Authority and responsibility for such business remains with the Board of Supervisors, unless the Board delegates specific authority and responsibility to individual Councils.

Members of Community Region Councils shall be elected by popular vote of the registered voters within their Community Region. Council members must themselves be registered voters residing in the Community Region. Councils may appoint local advisory commissions and committees.

Policy 5.1.1.0.1:

The County shall establish and maintain robust communication with all Community Region Councils.

Policy 5.1.1.0.2:

Any matter subject to decisions by the Board of Supervisors which affects a Community Region shall first be heard in one or more meetings of the relevant Community Region Council(s).

Policy 5.1.1.0.3:

County government shall establish and maintain appropriate staff presence in each unincorporated Community Region. Staff presence shall be substantially equal to that of a city government in unincorporated a Community Region whose population exceeds 20,000.

Policy 5.1.1.0.3:

The County shall maintain a separate Road Maintenance Fund for each unincorporated Community Region whose population exceeds 20,000. Each such Road Maintenance Fund shall be funded at the level of revenue which the Community Region would receive as an incorporated city.

Rationale: Such "virtual cities" need road maintenance funding the higher levels normally dedicated to cities under California law.

Policy 5.1.1.0.4:

Until a full-time "virtual city government" can be established in El Dorado Hills, all County government operations shall be conducted in El Dorado Hills during one week of each month.

Quantitative basis for this specific policy proposal: The 2010 Census found that 23.3% of the population of El Dorado County lived in El Dorado Hills. This percentage is gradually increasing: Statistics for building permits continue to show that approximately 2/3 of all new housing construction is in El Dorado Hills. This policy is essentially a time-share proposal based on population proportionality.

Overall Rationale:

Unincorporated communities in these size ranges need more intensive communication with County government and a more intensive level of service delivery than has historically been typical in unincorporated Community Regions. As a consequence, they need a greater degree of local influence, if not local control. An important part of local influence and local control is planning

a city's road system in advance to support its actual land use. Please note that existing nearby cities appear to have demonstrated the value of local insight and a local focus in governance at the community level. In the case of road networks, this is arguably demonstrated by their prevalent use of LOS C instead of E as the minimum required level of service on their roads.

Experience over the past 20 years has demonstrated need in public affairs for communications networks based on interpersonal contact. I refer to this as "Facenet". Facenet networks have proven to be largely infeasible in urbanized areas such as El Dorado Hills when local government is geographically remote. Colocation of local government with community regions is vital to both citizens and local agencies.

A second part of the rationale for this suggestion is the likelihood that it is no longer fiscally feasible to incorporate El Dorado Hills as a city. The "Great Recession" demonstrated that fiscal sensitivity analysis for an incorporation must include zero growth as a realistically possible circumstance.

The 2005 incorporation's Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis (CFA) sensitivity analysis covered only 25% reduced growth. Extrapolating from its results for nominal growth and 25% reduced growth lead to zero (100% reduced) growth produces a finding that the city's General Fund would have been essentially at break-even given the 2005 level of revenue neutrality payments. Commercial and residential growth since then has the effect of having increased the amount required for revenue neutrality payments. The result is that the General Fund would be in deficit at zero growth and could be in jeopardy at a newly identified level of nominal growth after incorporation.

In short, it may be economically necessary for El Dorado Hills to remain unincorporated for the foreseeable future due to California revenue neutrality law. Consequently, the County needs to begin setting up a governmental structure to provide a "virtual city government" as EDH grows from its 2010 population of 42,108 to approximately 70,000 or more at buildout.

Comment 2. Land Use Element and Public Services/Utilities Element:

Consider updating Figure LU-1 in accordance with the following new Goal and Policy to be added to the Public Services/Utilities Element:

Goal 5.2: Reserve land areas central to each Community Region for use as a Civic Center by local governance and local public agencies.

Policy 5.2.1:

Land Use for each Community Region shall designate a Civic Center area. This area shall be reserved for use by the local government and local public agencies serving the Community Region.

Policy 5.2.2:

Land designated for use as a Civic Center area shall be chosen as nearly as feasible to maximize convenience of access by Community Region residents and by representatives of local businesses. Location choice should anticipate planned buildout conditions in the Community Region.

[An appropriate measure for optimizing convenience of access can be derived by a variation of a moment summation or center-of-gravity calculations, with trip times via the road network substituted for conventional linear measures of moment arm length.]

Policy 5.2.3:

While a Community Region is unincorporated its Civic Center area and improvements thereon shall be owned and operated by the County of El Dorado. When any Community Region or substantially equivalent land area becomes incorporated as a city, ownership and operating responsibilities shall be reassigned to the new city. Such reassignment shall occur within a one-year transition period following a new city's date of incorporation.

Rationale:

As Community Regions grow their need for local presence of local government and local public agencies increases. Such a Civic Center needs a land allocation whose size depends on the ultimate size of the Community Region or of a future city which will assume legal responsibility for the Community Region.

Comment 3. Land Use Element:

Consider amending Objective 2.1.1 and Policy 2.1.1.2 approximately as follows:

OBJECTIVE 2.1.1: COMMUNITY REGIONS

Purpose: The Community Region boundary and an internal urban limit line establishes a line on the General Plan land use maps demarcating where the urban and suburban land uses ~~will be developed~~ are permitted, subject to

careful review by a Community Region Planning Advisory Committee. Urban and suburban planning and development is to provide opportunities that allow for continued population growth and economic expansion while preserving the character and extent of existing rural centers and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life and economic health of the County. Avoidance of traffic congestion and delays is the most important element common to all of these objectives.

~~The Community Region boundaries as depicted on the General Plan land use map shall be the established urban limit line. An urban limit line may be established within the area of each Community Region. Permission of urban development is intended to provide opportunities that allow for continued population growth and economic expansion while preserving the character and extent of existing rural centers and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life and economic health of the County.~~

Policies related to adopt a specific choice of urban limit line must recognize that this choice is sensitive to the values, experiences, and judgment of local citizens.

Policy 2.1.1.2

Establish Community Regions to define those areas which **contain a mix of land use types ranging from urban to rural in character. Urban portions** are 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, the location of major topographic patterns and features, and the ability to provide and maintain appropriate transitions at Community Region boundaries **and at urban limit line boundaries**. These boundaries shall be shown on the General Plan land use map.

All local project-level development decisions shall be reviewed by a Community Region Planning Advisory Committee whose members reside in the Community Region. Committee approval shall be required for changes to urban limit lines. The Committee shall additionally have authority to require the County to submit changes in urban limit lines to the Community Region's voters for a binding referendum.

Overall Rationale:

One General Plan issue is conditional permission versus entitlement. An example is a notion that "if High Density Residential (HDR) land use is permitted in a Community Region, then any application for a corresponding land use (and/or zoning) change for specific parcels must be granted."

The suggested amendments to Objective 2.1.1 and Policy 2.1.1.2 attempt to convey that such a change must be conditioned on a variety of factors in a Community Region. Some of those "other factors" are consequences of having a sparse road network by the standards of most cities and suburbs:

- Sparse/low capacity roads in a genuinely urban or suburban area tend to produce traffic congestion and delays.
- Sparse/low capacity roads in a surrounding rural area effectively extend the functional scope of a community into a surrounding Rural Region.
- A factor not caused by the road network is existence of areas of rural and semirural land use within a Community Region. For reasons of human psychology, especially in a high-density community, it is appropriate to provide proximate access within the Community Region to areas which are variously natural, open, and used at low intensity.

A current example potential growth impacts is Dixon Ranch, in the LDR area south of Green Valley Road. As planned, this will replace an area generally in the nature of oak woodland with sparse housing with 709 homes in HDR land use. Generation of approximately 7,000 Average Daily Trips is a further challenge to local traffic, including the portion of Green Valley Road with existing LOS F problems.

Two factors call for increased local participation, if not control, for management of development in Community Regions such as El Dorado Hills.

One factor is that knowledge of local conditions and values is better among local residents than among those who live and work at a distance. (Placerville's County Government center is about 21 miles from my own home.)

Another factor is a general perception that a Placerville-based County government is biased toward service to the Placerville area. Purely objective metrics from project history of the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) are strongly consistent with such a view, as is the history of that commission's Placerville-dominated board in rejecting participation by El Dorado Hills. The perception of a divide that disempowers EDH residents is enhanced by an extremely common human tendency to unconsciously employ

false dichotomy logical fallacies. Combining fact and perception produces a legitimate need among the El Dorado Hills population for improved local control, especially with respect to development.

Comment 4. Land Use Element:

Consider revising designated occupancy ratios for Persons Per Housing Unit in Table 2-2 to account for locality-specific differences..

Rationale:

This is important to assure reasonable accuracy in forecasting

1. Attaining appropriate accuracy in population forecasts may require specializing this metric for different localities.

Example: The 2010 Census reported 2.97 persons per household in the El Dorado Hills Census Designated Place, indicating 14,178 dwelling units. The General Plan assumes 2.8 persons per household in High Density Residential areas, which produces a population estimate of 39,698 for the EDH CDP. Actual population was approximately 6.1% higher than would be expected from General Plan forecasts.

In El Dorado Hills, underplanning by 6.1% would result in actual population exceeding estimates by about 4,000. This would couple into a actual traffic exceeding estimates by about 30,000 to 40,000 Average Daily Trips. For purposes of adequate traffic demand analysis and road system planning it is important to either increase the level of refinement in forecasting local population or to over-specify the required road system capacity.

2. Attaining needed accuracy may require accounting for additional factors. In addition to the 6.1% factor cited above, actual traffic counts in El Dorado Hills have grown significantly during the period of nearly zero housing growth from 2008-2011. One count location on Green Valley Road, a point with a current LOS F issue, recorded a traffic increase of 19.4% from 2008 to 2011. This is sufficient to move a roadway previously operating at LOS C into LOS F.

The most apparent possible causal factors are level of economic activity, including but not limited to unemployment rate, and changes in home occupancy. The traffic count change noted above occurred mainly in a time of stagnant unemployment until approximately 2011. A more significant factor may be the recently reported trend for young adult children to remain in their parents' household for more years than in the past.

Such factors are likely to also be locality-specific: While EDH traffic levels have increased since 2008, traffic counts have remained depressed in other areas of the County. Also, past statistics for Census tracts have shown substantial variation among different parts of the County.

Comment 5. Transportation and Circulation Element:

Consider amending Policy TC-Xd to require a minimum standard of LOS C, except for LOS D within ½ mile of a state or federal highway.

This would replace the existing minimum standard of LOS E in Community Regions, LOS D in Rural Centers and Rural Regions, and LOS F on the road segments designated in Table TC-2.

Rationale:

1. LOS C is generally achievable.
Commonly cited maximum traffic levels for LOS C, based on roadway demand-to-capacity ratio, are about 81% of those for LOS E. Nearby communities, such as the City of Folsom, have traffic counts demonstrating ability to maintain LOS C at most locations.
2. LOS C is highly more desirable to drivers than LOS E or LOS F.
3. Maintenance of LOS C instead of LOS E would be economically advantageous to businesses in El Dorado Hills and other Community Regions.

LOS C is the existing standard in the Placer County General Plan and in the General Plans of all most almost all cities in our region. Those that I've checked to date include Folsom, Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Substantially all of these General Plans include minor variations of the suggested permission of LOS D within ½ mile of a highway or freeway.

Comment 6. Transportation and Circulation Element:

Consider amending the Circulation Map (Figure TC-1) to add new arterials and major collectors in areas of increasing population density. Where possible, increase connectivity and parallel capacity by adding major road segments using the topology of a rectangular mesh.

No specific routes are proposed here, this is in the nature of a major planning project.

Rationale:

Parts of the County need both proactive and remedial road system development to meet reasonable Level Of Service requirements.

El Dorado Hills is probably the most critical of these areas. In the Circulation map its density of mapped roads is almost exactly 2/3 that of an identical rectangular land area centered on US 50 in west Placerville. EDH is continuing to experience the highest rate of residential growth in the County, according to building permit statistics for new homes.

Comment 7. Transportation and Circulation Element:

Consider requiring conversion of signalized intersections to roundabouts wherever feasible.

Rationale:

Benefits cited by numerous U.S. sources include these:

- Roundabouts increase traffic capacity 30% to 50% relative to signalized intersections.
- Roundabouts nearly eliminate off-peak delay.
- Roundabouts decrease fatal accidents by 90%.
- Roundabouts decrease injury accidents by 75%.
- Roundabouts cost less than traffic signals and provide lower costs for use and maintenance.
- Roundabouts do not necessarily require more space than traditional intersections.
- Roundabouts reduce required roadway width for intersection approach lanes and turn lanes.

In El Dorado Hills, roundabouts may be the most cost-efficient and most quickly-buildable solutions to traffic issues on the Green Valley Corridor. Those issues include current LOS F at two intersections and close approach to LOS F at a third.

Comment 8. Land Use Element:

Consider rewriting Policy 2.6.1.5 approximately as follows:

Policy 2.6.1.5

~~All development on ridgelines shall be reviewed by the County for potential impacts on visual resources. Visual impacts will be assessed and may require methods such as setbacks, screening, low-glare or directed~~

~~lighting, automatic light shutoffs, and external color schemes that blend with the surroundings in order to avoid visual breaks to the skyline.~~

Development on ridgelines is strictly prohibited. In the case of existing ridgeline building in Serrano which is visible from the general area of US 50, Town Center, and El Dorado Hills Blvd., the County of El Dorado shall be directly responsible for fully mitigating this visual blight, with a deadline of 2015 for completion of mitigation.

Rationale and notes:

The County permitted that ridgeline building, and it *REALLY* looks disgusting. It makes our downtown area look like a slum. (ok, this is personal opinion.) Frank Lloyd Wright was right: Never build on top of a hill or a ridge. A "Shining Brow" (Taliesin) is ok, putting boxes on top to dominate the ridge isn't. As Wright also said, architecture should be in harmony with its environment. Hills and ridges are esthetically displeasing when dominated by large boxy houses -- metaphorically, rectangular warts on nature's ridge..

Maybe there's actually a way to mitigate this. The Bureau of Reclamation currently has a spare hill or two of dirt and rock at Mormon Island Dam and probably also near Dike 8. If someone is persuasive enough perhaps the County can convince the Bureau to move its hills onto our ridge at the Bureau's expense. Filling the ridge top out horizontally would be a start, planting native oaks on the new hillside might finish the job after the trees have grown for a couple decades. Until then, what? Camouflage paint on the houses? Camouflage netting to hide them? Perhaps we should call in some Disney Imagineers.

Part 2: NOP Comments on TGPA proposals

Comment 1:

My earlier review of the main ROI document showed that most of the proposed General Plan changes serve almost exclusively economic purposes. They generally tend to authorize an increased scope of development in terms of population density, land use intensity, and traffic levels. A summary of those ROI findings is:

- 15 proposed changes are especially problematic for El Dorado Hills.
- 16 proposed changes are less problematic but still tend to increase traffic and land use intensity.

- 10 proposed changes are variously not problematic, not applicable to EDH, or unclear.

The proposed changes do not include corresponding updates to mitigate either increased levels of traffic or existing deficiencies in the General Plan's Circulation Diagram and its Transportation and Circulation element. Some degree of other environmental impacts are possible due to changes in the character of land use, especially in parts of the County where current land use is generally rural or suburban.

El Dorado Hills is especially sensitive to traffic impacts. Both the 1996 and 2004 General Plans were deficient in provision of road system infrastructure needed to mitigate traffic from increased development.

If the TGPA goes forward as it now stands, there is a compelling need for the County to initiate a new process to review and update the 2004 General Plan in the interest of traffic mitigation and noneconomic values. The County should do this immediately.

EDH APAC Comments:

I concur with the comments drafted by the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee. Those comments result from discussion and written input from committee members, including myself. The APAC comments are appended in the paper submission of these personal comments. They are included as an attachment in the email submission of these personal comments.

EDHAPAC TGPA/ZOU NOP Response Matrix

July 6, 2012

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2-1-Major Concern</p> <p>Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p><u>High Density Residential Use:</u> Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>	<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase in size of the buildings to accommodate the additional units could overwhelm the surrounding area. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. Please analysis this issue.</p> <p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional noise at these sites. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The inclusion of the additional density per acre could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4-Major Concern</p> <p>Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of "improved open space" on site; set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the "improvement" of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county's citizens.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics</p> <p>The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning</p> <p>If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise</p> <p>Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1-Major Concern Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Density Bonus has encouraged developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from density bonuses.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from density bonus could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The density bonus will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. . An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4-Major Concern Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential. Consider deleting policy.</p>	<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then I don't believe any open space is required to develop a property. Pack-um and stack-um! Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of planned development could reduce open space and lower County design standards. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces and County design standards.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region. be developed.		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>New Policies-Major Concern</p> <p>Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>	<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed language by staff for "Promote Infill Development" item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence ", <u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>".</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density from infill sites will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from infill sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The infill sites will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from infill projects could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1-Major Concern</p> <p>Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, TC-1w, TC-4f, TC-4i, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of housing affordable to all income levels.</p>	<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues.</p> <p>Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The decreasing of road widths will cause traffic accidents and safety issue for pedestrians and bicycles. The EIR should analyze this impact and provide detailed mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w-Moderate Concern</p> <p>Consider amending policies to clean up language including: TC-1m delete "of effort" TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.</p>	<p>Why replace the word "accidents" with the word "crashes"? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents that the other? Why not include both "accidents and crashes"? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads</p>	<p>No Comment at this time</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
--------------	------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 7.1.2.1-Major Concern Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.</p>	<p>Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality Construction of homes on 30% or greater grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Hazards & Hazardous Material Construction on steeper slopes will cause additional exposure to soil perturbations and will cause air born particles of dust and asbestos. Please analyze this issue and provide mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 -Major Concern High Density Residential: Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre</p>	<p>Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure. This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from 5 units to 8 units/acre.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The 5 to 8 units per acre increase in density and will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this out of balance condition be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre will cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely real world traffic mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1-Major</p>	<p>These areas should be identified before</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The changing or adding new areas</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change or adding of these</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Concern</p> <p>Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas</p>	<p>analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>in either the rural or Community Regions could have a major visual impact on the affect areas. Please analyze the visual impacts that would be caused in areas that would be subject to this policy.</p> <p>*Air Quality Please analyze the air quality impact of all possible change that could occur with the new policy.</p> <p>*Population/Housing Please analyze all of the population changes and impacts that will occur as result of the policy.</p>	<p>centers could cause different traffic patterns. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads in any area that might be subject to this new policy.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning Please analyze the entire existing infrastructure that would be affected by this policy.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3</p> <p>Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. <u>The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p>	<p>No Comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5</p> <p>Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers <u>in identified mixed use areas as defined in the Zoning</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p> <p>"Identified" mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Ordinance. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. <u>The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>an EIR is prepared.</p>		
<p>Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf- Major Concern Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.</p>	<p>This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service. Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change of the definition of worsen could cause more projects to be approved with out the supporting infrastructure to prevent congestion. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads that would be subject to lessening of traffic standards in any area that might be subject to this new definition.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.2.1.5- Major Concern Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy</p>	<p>The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from "shall" to "may" could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd- Moderate Concern Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>	<p>Traffic is one of the two most observable items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	<p>EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item "<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>". This second item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1 - Moderate Concern</p> <p>Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the word "shall" and replace with the word "may" in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word "may" might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words "if reasonably available" should be replaced with "if appropriate"; otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not "reasonably available" an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality The change from shall to may will increase well water use and could cause a lowering of the water table to existing residents. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from these additional sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The additional sites approved from this change in policy will cause more houses in the Community region, which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase housing from this policy change could cause traffic congestion. An accurate traffic analysis using a traffic modeling program with current traffic conditions must be used to analyze this impact. Timely mitigation measures should be provided to address these impacts.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011-; -; Major Concern</p> <p>6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>	<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues.</p> <p>The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

F. d: TGPA and Zoning update comments

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: pattie@m.sistersfarm.com
Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:38 AM

Hi Patricia,

We will take the comments any way we can get them. So thank you for sending your comments attached to an e-mail.

Shawna Purvines

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Patricia Chelseth <pattie@mysistersfarm.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 9:38 PM
Subject: TGPA and Zoning update comments
To: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

After 9 hours of working on this, I couldn't fit it into the 1000 character comment form.

In Service to Freedom, Love and Laughter

Pattie Chelseth
[916-704-4372](tel:916-704-4372)

Know your Farmer
If you don't have one, find one
If you can't find one, become one

My Sisters' Farm

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone: [\(530\) 621-5362](tel:(530) 621-5362)


shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 Zoning_Commen.s.doc
26.

In regards to the TGPA and Zoning plan update I have some general comments and then some specific questions.

In general, the way the plan is written, it has a tendency of reducing the restrictions of big development and hits the little guy with more restrictions.

Based upon the purpose stated in 17.10.10 section C. How can there be even consideration of denser housing levels with the water shortages we have in this county and the State of California? What would the **environmental impact** of increasing housing density on available water resources? What **cultural impact** would it have on the rural nature of our county? As two alternatives, what would be the impact of leaving it the way it is, or what would be the impact of a decrease in housing density in consideration of this vital resource as a more realistic alternative; especially in lieu of the fact that agriculture is a major industry in need of water here?

In regards to **high density residential regions**, what would be the impact of requiring community gardens to be provided, which could also qualify as part or all of the open space required. This would fit better into sustainable and affordable food sources and less need to travel outside the area, decreasing the carbon footprint.

In Article 8, the Glossary, There are several definitions that need to be revised.

Domestic Farm Animal should also include rare, heritage breeds of livestock and poultry that are not necessarily considered “normally domesticated” to help increase bio and genetic diversity.

Livestock, High Density (Use Type)- As written, this includes most of the domestic animals in El Dorado County. The phrase “where the primary source of food is other than the vegetation grown on site” should be deleted. The examples cited are feed lots, dairies, (it should state **Large Dairies**, as CDFA is working on creating rules for small and micro-dairies to help support local communities) and similar operations, such as Confined Animal Feeding Operations, (CAFOs)

How would **High Density Livestock** impact the purpose of **17.10.10 section F**? **Maintain and protect the county’s natural beauty, vegetation, air and water quality, natural landscape features, etc.**

What impact would **High Density Livestock** have on **available water resources**, aesthetics and animal health in our rural county. The carbon footprint to haul in large amounts of GMO corn and grain, which is a primary food for these operations, is also unsustainable.

Under Article 2, 17.24.020 Cropland and Orchards are not permitted if the lot size is under 3 acres. What is the **economic and cultural impact** of not allowing the sale of one’s abundance? If this is an issue of chemical spraying etc. Perhaps this can be modified to include no applications of dangerous pesticides or herbicides. Most folks at

this level grow organically and sustainably. It is about local healthy food and folk should be allowed to share their bounty and again, have some form of monetary compensation if they choose.

Stables (use type) Private This definitions does not take into account boarding of domestic livestock for folks who don't have the land to do so, but want to own an animal in whole or in part, for their own healthy food source. The coming food sovereignty ordinance allows for this type of activity. It should be redefined as; an accessory building to a primary residential use that is used to shelter horses and other domestic farm animals, or for training and horse boarding consistent with a home occupation. Or perhaps there should be a similar type of definition for a Barn. It is not defined, but is in the Zoning along with Stable.

Under Article 4, 17.40.080 section C.

How will limiting all livestock to lots greater than one acre impact the **cultural lifestyle**, such as 4-H and the **economic viability** of raising one's own healthy food. Perhaps an alternative to allow for small livestock, such as Rabbits, Chickens, perhaps a milk goat on these smaller parcels would create a more sustainable lifestyle and community. There are already communities in this county, with CC&Rs, for those who don't like the rural qualities of El Dorado County.

Under Article 4, 17.40.080 section D.

If animal keeping is permitted, why prevent animal slaughter for one's own use? What **cultural impact** does adding this restriction have on a residents ability to sustain themselves? What **cultural impact** on 4-H and FFA? What **health impact** by not allowing those who choose to raise their own chemical free food animals? What **economic impact** on those who would supplement their income from the sale of their excess bounty and for **access** to those who wish to know their "farmer" and buy healthy food? **How does this restriction encourage economic activities creating potential employment opportunities in the county, even if only part time?**



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Comments Regarding TGPA-ZOU

1 message

Laurel Brent-Bumb <chamber@eldoradocounty.org>

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 10:53 AM

To: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

Cc: Kim Beal <kimberlyabeal@gmail.com>

Dear Ms. Purvines,

Please refer to the attached document originally submitted to the County on 10/24/2011, and amended February 21, 2012 and forwarded to you in an email on February 22, 2012.

This email is being sent to express the concerns of both the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce and the El Dorado County Association of Realtors. In reviewing the County's draft HOO dated May 25th 2012, we noticed the optional analysis for the HOO is not fully incorporated into the draft.

We are requesting that the optional analysis used be the one submitted by the EDAC, Regulatory Reform Home Occupation subcommittee. Copy is attached. To the extent that other provisions throughout the draft zoning ordinance would adversely affect the Home Occupation Ordinance, we are requesting change and or elimination of such provisions.

Laurel Brent-Bumb, A.C.E.
Chief Executive Officer
El Dorado County Chamber
www.neighboromics.com
"neighborhood economics it's good for all of us"

I am using the Free version of SPAMfighter.
SPAMfighter has removed 26232 of my spam emails to date.

Do you have a slow PC? Try free scan!

 **EDC_HOO_EDAC_BOS_presentation.docx**
20K

120091

Home Occupation Ordinance (HOO) Outline

Presented to the Board of Supervisors 10/24/2011

Amended 2/21/12

- Today, many existing home based businesses utilize employees, work in the home or a detached building, create occasional noise, and have operated for years without complaint or impact on neighbors, but are illegal.
- General Plan Policy 10.1.7.4 states “Home occupations shall be encouraged and permitted to the extent that they are compatible with adjacent or surrounding properties.”
- Program 10.1.7.4.1 reads “Establish standards in the Zoning Ordinance that provide compatible home businesses that complement residential uses in Community Regions, Rural Centers and Rural Regions.”
- Program 10.1.7.4.2 reads “Land use regulations shall disallow Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions that preclude home occupations or work-at-home activities.”
- Purpose of Home Occupations: to provide opportunities for businesses incidental to and compatible with surrounding residential and agricultural uses in order to encourage employers to offer home workplace alternatives, promote economic self-sufficiency of County residents, reduce commuting on U.S. Highway 50, and reduce vehicle trips on local roads, while minimizing conflicts with adjacent property owners and protecting the public health, and safety and welfare.
- San Bernardino County is an example of a HOO that encourages HO by allowing HO classes based on standards.

17.40.160 Home Occupation Ordinance

- A Home Occupation is the use of one’s residential property for business, which may be conducted within the home, within another onsite building or outdoors. It is permitted only if the home is used primarily as a residence, by the homeowner or tenant, and the business will not alter the residential character of the area.

Three Classifications:

Class I – Community Regions

- If the parcel is less than one acre, one employee is allowed by right
- If the parcel is between one acre and five acres, two employees are allowed by right
- If the parcel is five acres or more, four employees are allowed by right

- All work shall be predominately done by telephone, mail, facsimile, internet, one client face-to-face at a time set by appointment only, or off-site work.
- Student Instruction shall be allowed by appointment only, with group lessons limited to a maximum of six students at any one time, once per day
- Storage of business products shall be within a building, and/or screened from public view
- Only those types of commercial vehicles normally used in residential areas are allowed, unless the vehicle is parked within an enclosed structure and/or screened from public view
- Business conducted outdoors shall be screened from public view

Class II - Rural Centers

- If the parcel is less than one acre, one employee is allowed by right
- If the parcel is between one acre and five acres, two employees are allowed by right
- If the parcel is between five and ten acres, five employees are allowed by right
- If the parcel is ten acres or more, ten employees are allowed by right
- Allows a limited number of clients or customers on site at one time
- Student Instruction shall be allowed by appointment only, with group lessons limited to a maximum of eight students at any one time, twice per day.
- The business may have a limited impact on the neighborhood
- Any business allowed in Class I shall be allowed in Class II
- Storage of business products and business vehicles shall be screened from public roadways
- Business conducted outdoors shall be screened from public roadways

Class III – Rural Regions

- If the parcel is less than five acres, four employees shall be allowed by right
- If the parcel is between five and ten acres, seven employees are allowed by right
- If the parcel is ten or more acres, ten employees are allowed by right
- Allows a large number of clients or customers on site at one time
- A business may have more impact on the neighborhood than allowed in Class I or Class II
- Any business allowed in Class I or Class II shall be allowed in Class III
- Storage of business products and business vehicles shall be screened from public roadways
- Business is allowed to take place outdoors

Permit Requirements

- A permit is not required for businesses having up to two employees, provided all parking is on site and there is no other impact on the neighborhood

- A permit is required for businesses having more than two employees
- A permit is required for businesses that will have a significant impact on the neighborhood

General Standards

- All businesses must have a Business License
- A home occupation shall be permitted in any zone that allows single- or multi-unit residential use
- All employee parking shall be on site
- A tenant operating a Home Occupation is required to provide the property owner's notarized, written permission for that specific use of the property
- Should the owner of the business own contiguous parcels, the aggregate of the acreage shall be used to determine the number of employees, customers and clients allowed
- Hours of operation are allowed between 7:00 AM and 9:00 PM
- The Home Occupancy Ordinance shall not override other County Ordinances

Additional Standards will be written as the ordinance is being created, to provide setbacks, standards for each Class, signage and more. Also, it is anticipated that there will be at least 2 types of permits, one being an administrative permit and the other being a Special Use Permit

The initial HOO outline was prepared and presented to the Planning Commission on September 22, 2011. KAB

The First Amendment of the HOO was approved by the EDAC HOO Committee on October 21, 2011, and presented to the Board of Supervisors on October 24, 2011. KAB

Within Article 4, Chapter 17.40, the County changed the Home Occupation Section number from 17.40.170 to 17.40.160, and incorporated herein on February 21, 2012. KAB



Re: Citizen Question

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 12:05 PM

To: samparin@sbcglobal.net

Cc: Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Hi Sam,

As Mike indicates below the General Plan Land Use designation of Medium Densit. Residential (MDR) and the Zoning of Residential One Acre (R1A) for the two parcels located within the proposed Tilden Park project in Shingle Springs will not be changed or amended as part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA) and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) . They will remain MDR and R1A.

As we discussed on the phone, the TGPA and ZOU also does not propose revisions to the findings required to be made by the Board of Supervisors for a specific development project seeking a General Plan Amendment. Tilden Park is required to be processed under a separate application with a separate environmental review.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Shawna Purvines

On Fri, Jun 29, 2012 at 4:37 PM, Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us> wrote:

Shawna:

At the Cameron Park scoping meeting Mr. Sam Parlin inquired about how the TGPA/ZOU does or does not affect the Tilden Park Project. Without the address or APN available Wednesday night, he called me this afternoon to discuss.

For both Tilden Park APN's the land use is Medium Density Residential. The current and proposed zoning is Single-Family Residential 1-acre. Mr. Parlin would like to know if there is anything in the TGPA's or zoning ordinance changes that would make it easier for the property owner to increase to high density and/or commercial.

I thought you would be the most knowledgeable. Would you mind giving Mr. Parlin a call on his cell at (916) 880-0399 or at home at (530) 672-6425?

Sincerely,

Mike Applegarth
Principal Analyst
Chief Administrative Office
El Dorado County
(530) 621-5123

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--
Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Fwd: Zoning ordinance update

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 8:49 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Bill Bishop <pla.ball95667@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, Jul 7, 2012 at 9:59 PM
Subject: Zoning ordinance update
To: "shawna.purvines@edcgov.us" <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Dear Shawna,

As you discussed with my wife Tracey, I am sending you a request (attached file) regarding the proposed zoning of our parcel.

Sincerely,

Bill & Tracey Bishop

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

Shawna Purvines_Eden Bishop request.PDF

4453K

Shawna Purvines
El Dorado County Development Services
2850 Fairlane Ct., Building C
Placerville, CA 95667

July 6, 2012

Subject: Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update

Dear Shawna,

The purpose of this letter is to request an alternative zoning designation for our parcel (APN 329-171-74) at 4260 Boyd Lane, Placerville as part of your consideration of the Zoning Ordinance Update. The proposed designation is R3A and we are requesting R1A for the following reasons.

My wife and I purchased the parcel with my wife's parents, Reg and Dianne Eden, in the early 1990s with the intention of subdividing the 3.4 acres into three 1+ acre parcels for retirement income. Before we bought the property we talked to a planner in your department to find out what the general plan designation and zoning was. We were told the general plan designation was high density residential and the zoning was RE10. We were also told that the RE10 was a holding zone until a specific project (a rezoning or parcel map) was proposed and that because there were 1 acre parcels along our parcel map rode and around our parcel, there was a strong likelihood that the parcel could be rezoned to R1A. There was also a proposed 1 acre subdivision to the west of and adjacent to our parcel on APN 329-171-15 and a high density tentative subdivision map on the Hagen Ranch properties which ajoin our parcel to the southwest. We also determined that El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) service would be available for a 3-way parcel split (see attached EID Facility Improvement Letter) and that adequate fire flow and hydrants were on site for 3 parcels (see attached Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Department letter).

We understand that there are no guarantees when it comes to subdividing, but felt we did our due diligence in determining the feasibility of subdividing and actually paid a premium for that potential in the cost of the parcel.

In reviewing the zoning maps proposed as part of the Zoning Ordinance Update, the proposed zoning for our parcel is RA3 instead of the R1A designation we expected. As a result, we would like to request that you reconsider the zoning for our parcel and designate it as R1A consistent with the surrounding parcels along our access road and the adjoining Hagen Ranch property.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



William and Tracey (Eden) Bishop





El Dorado Irrigation District

In reply refer to: E0592-256

June 1, 1992

Dianne and Reginald Eden
4459 Panorama Drive
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: Facility Improvement Letter; Parcel Split
Assessor's Parcel No. 329-171-36, 38

Dear Mr & Mrs. Eden:

This letter is written in response to your request dated May 16, 1992 and is pursuant to District Policy Statement No. 22 which states the procedure agreed upon between the District and the County to indicate water and sewer improvement requirements necessary to support your proposed parcel split. Your proposed project is a 3 way parcel split.

Please be advised that at the time of issuing this letter the District is in a declared state of water emergency, under Water Code Section 350. This letter is not a commitment to serve, but does address the location and approximate capacity of existing facilities anticipated to serve your project. In terms of water supply, as of June 1, 1992 there were 6,400 EDU's available. Your project as proposed on this date would require 2 EDU's in addition to the 1 EDU being served presently.

This letter is valid for a period of two years. If your project has not received Tentative Map approval within two years of the date of this letter, a revised Facility Improvement letter may be required.

This property is within the District boundary.

Water:

There is a 4-inch water main in Nanas Lane east of the property and an 8-inch water main that runs through the property from the northeast to the southwest portion of the property.

At this time these facilities are adequate to meet the anticipated domestic needs for this property. As indicated by your letter from the Fire Department, the existing fire protection available to your property is adequate.

Letter No. E0592-256
June 1, 1992
Page 2 of 2

As part of the requirements for this parcel split a 20-foot easement will be required for the 8-inch water main that crosses a portion of the property.


The County is the lead agency for environmental review of this project per section 15051 of the CEQA Guidelines. The County's initial study should include a review of the alignments for required offsite water lines as well as a review of the project site.

All service shall be provided in accordance with El Dorado Irrigation District Regulations and Policies from time to time in effect. As they relate to conditions of and fees for extension of service, District Regulations and Policies will apply as of the date of a fully executed Extension of Facilities Agreement. As they relate to conditions of and charges for initiation of service and for ongoing water service provided to the customer, District Regulations and Policies will apply as adopted and amended from time to time by the District's Board of Directors.

Questions regarding District water facilities should be directed to Kyle Ericson, who may be reached at (916) 622-4534. Questions regarding line extensions should be directed to our Customer Service Department at (916) 622-4513.

Sincerely,

EL DORADO IRRIGATION DISTRICT



David E. Powell, P.E.
Senior Engineer
Planning

KE: rl

Attachment: Map

cc: Customer Service Department

Dave Powell

CHECKLIST FOR FACILITY IMPROVEMENT LETTER REQUEST

In order to start the process to obtain a Facility Improvement Letter the following information will be required. Should you have any questions or concerns please feel free to ask one of our Business Service Representatives.

Has a Service Capability Letter been previously issued? Yes ___ No X
If yes please attach a copy.

1. Applicant's Name and Address: (Who letter should be addressed and sent to)

DIANNE & REGINALD EDEN Contact Person: DIANNE EDEN
4459 PANORAMA DR Phone Number: 626-8307
PLACERVILLE, CA

2. Project Information: HAVE 1- 1" METER TO BE SEPARATED INTO 2 SERVICES. NEED 3- 3/4" METERS AND REMOVE 1" METER

3. Is project within any EID Assessment or Improvement District? Yes ___ No X

Number of Lots, Apt/Condo Units 3 Meter Size Requested 3/4"

Number of Landscape Meters 0 Meter Sizes —

Project Name: EDEN
(Attach Parcel Map if Applicable)

4. Services Being Requested (Please check those that apply):

	<u>Water</u>	<u>Sewer</u>		<u>Water</u>	<u>Sewer</u>
Single Family	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industrial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Apartments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Condominium	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Landscape	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Townhouses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fire Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Attach any Comments to Form)		

(The Facility Improvement Letter will not be written until the Fire Department has issued a letter stating fire flow requirements for all projects except subdivisions. Subdivisions will be required to obtain a letter from the Fire Department as part of the Facility Plan Report).

5. Site Information:

Assessor's Parcel Number (s) 329-171-36, 38
Current Zoning R1D Proposed Zoning R1A Total Acreage 3.4
General Plan/Ultimate Build Out HIGH DENSITY

6. Required Fees:

Fire Protection Only	\$50.00
Parcel Splits or Subdivisions	\$50.00 + 2.00 per parcel or lot
Commercial/Industrial	\$50.00 + 2.00 per EDU- 7 per acre
Apartments/Condos, (.75 EDU's)	\$50.00 + 2.00 per EDU
Schools	\$50.00 + 2.00 per EDU based on site facilities
Revision	\$75.00

THESE FEES ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE

After reviewing your request, Staff may determine that additional fees are required. Please make your check payable to El Dorado Irrigation District. A return envelope has been provided for your convenience.

For EID Staff use only

Reviewed by	<u>lll</u>	Project EDU's	<u>3</u>
Date Received	<u>5-16-92</u>	Landscape EDU's	<u>0</u>
Fees Due	<u>56.00</u>	ZONE	<u>7</u>
Fees Received	<u>5-16-92</u>	System Map	<u>L</u>
Inside/Outside District Boundaries	<u>Inside Dist</u>	Parcel Map	<u>L</u>
		Bond Segregation Required	<u>no</u>



Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District

Fire Prevention Division

P.O. Box 741, Diamond Springs, California 95619
916-626-3190

May 15, 1992

Mrs. Dianne Eden
4459 Panorama Drive
Placerville CA 95667

RE: Fire Hydrant Requirements

Dear Mrs. Eden,

The Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District has determined that your parcel split will not require the installation of a fire hydrant.

A fire hydrant already exists with the required distance to the parcels in questions, APN # 329:171:036 and 329:171:038. The existing fire hydrant produces the required gallons per-minute and as stated above no additional fire hydrants will be required.

If you have any questions regarding this project or any other projects please feel free to contact me at 622-3190.

Thank you,

Scott Wylie, Captain - Fire Prevention Officer
Diamond Springs/El Dorado
Fire Protection District



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

TGPA NOP COMMENTS

1 message

Bill Welty <wmwelt.@gmail.com>
To: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 8:49 AM

Hey Shawna,

Attached are my comments: mirrored comments of the EDH APAC (we collaborated). Appreciate your work on this. I know it's been grueling; and often you guys are caught between the proverbial rock and hard spot. Gotta love those community meetings, eh?

The citizenry is fortunate to have smart, personable, energetic and committed people like you and Kim and the rest working on projects like this (they take you for granted and have no idea what it takes to do what you do!).

Having worked in the bowels of government I can appreciate all the pressure points you guys have to contend with, top to bottom, bottom to top, from the inside out, and outside in. Not idle words, these. Being a gyroscope helps, they say. Keeps ya agile.

Anyway.... file my comments. And good luck to us all in the final result.

- Bill Welty

 apac TGPA ZOU NOP matrix 7-9-2012.doc
75K

EDHAPAC TGPA/ZOU NOP Response Matrix

July 6, 2012

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2-1-Major Concern</p> <p>Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p>High Density Residential Use: Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>	<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase in size of the buildings to accommodate the additional units could overwhelm the surrounding area. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. Please analysis this issue.</p> <p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional noise at these sites. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The inclusion of the additional density per acre could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. The new traffic demand model should be used to analyze this impact.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4- Major Concern</i></p> <p>Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of “improved open space” on site, set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>	<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the “improvement” of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county’s citizens.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1-Major Concern Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>Density Bonus has encouraged developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from density bonuses.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from density bonus could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The density bonus will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density could cause traffic congestion. The new traffic demand model should be used to analyze this impact.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4-Major Concern Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential.</p> <p>Consider deleting policy.</p>	<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then I don't believe <u>any</u> open space is required to develop a property. Pack-um and stack-um! Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of planned development could reduce open space and lower County design standards. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces and County design standards.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	be developed. Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region.		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>New Policies-Major Concern</i> Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>	<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed language by staff for “Promote Infill Development” item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence “, <u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>”.</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density from infill sites will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from infill sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Population/Housing The infill sites will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from infill projects could cause traffic congestion. The new traffic demand model should be used to analyze this impact and mitigation measures should be provided.</p>
<p><i>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1-Major Concern</i> Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, Tc-1w, TC-4f, TC-4i, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of housing affordable to all income levels.</p>	<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues.</p> <p>Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The decreasing of road widths will cause traffic accidents and safety issue for pedestrians and bicycles. The EIR should analyze this impact and provide detailed mitigation measures.</p>	
<p><i>Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w-Moderate Concern</i> Consider amending policies to clean up language including; TC-1m delete “of effort” TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.</p>	<p>Why replace the word “accidents” with the word “crashes”? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents that the other? Why not include both “accidents and crashes”? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads</p>	<p>No Comment at this time</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Policy 7.1.2.1-Major Concern Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.</p>	<p>Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion).</p> <p>The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality Construction of homes on 30% or greater grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Hazards & Hazardous Material Construction on steeper slopes will cause additional exposure to soil perturbations and will cause air born particles of dust and asbestos. Please analyze this issue and provide mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 -Major Concern <u>High Density Residential</u>: Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre</p>	<p>Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The increase density would remove natural vegetation and trees which provides a rural atmosphere and a more harmonious environment. Please assess the impact on aesthetics with the increase density from 5 units to 8 units/acre.</p> <p>*Air Quality The County already often exceeds the State air quality limits to avoid health risks associated with air pollution. This increase density will cause higher levels of air pollution. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Noise The increase in density will cause additional traffic and other related noises. How will this be mitigated?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The 5 to 8 units per acre increase in density and will cause additional density per acre which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this out of balance condition be prevented?</p> <p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase density from 5 to 8 units per acre will cause traffic congestion. The new traffic demand model should be used to analyze this impact and mitigation measures should be provided with real world traffic mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1-Major Concern Consider analyzing the possibility of</p>	<p>These areas should be identified before analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The changing or adding new areas in either the rural or Community Regions could have a major visual</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change or adding of these centers could cause different traffic patterns. Please analyze</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas</p>	<p>clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>impact on the affect areas. Please analyze the visual impacts that would be caused in areas that would be subject to this policy.</p> <p>*Air Quality Please analyze the air quality impact of all possible change that could occur with the new policy.</p> <p>*Population/Housing Please analyze all of the population changes and impacts that will occur as result of the policy.</p>	<p>all of the possible impacts to roads in any area that might be subject to this new policy.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning Please analyze the entire existing infrastructure that would be affected by this policy.</p>
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. <u>The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p>	<p>No Comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers <u>in identified</u> mixed use areas as defined in <u>the Zoning Ordinance</u>. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full</p>	<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p> <p>“Identified” mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before an EIR is prepared.</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>range of single and/or multi family design concepts. <u>The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>			
<p>Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf- Major Concern Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.</p>	<p>This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service.</p> <p>Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The change of the definition of worsen could cause more projects to be approved with out the supporting infrastructure to prevent congestion. Please analyze all of the possible impacts to roads that would be subject to lessening of traffic standards in any area that might be subject to this new definition.</p>	
<p>Policy 10.2.1.5- Major Concern Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy</p>	<p>The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from "shall" to "may" could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	
<p>Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd- Moderate Concern Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>	<p>Traffic is one of the two most observable items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by</p>	<p>No comment at this time.</p>	

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
	<p>the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item "<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County's 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>". This second item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>		

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p><i>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1- Moderate Concern</i> Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>	<p>The proposal is to remove the word “<u>shall</u>” and replace with the word “<u>may</u>” in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word “<u>may</u>” might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words “<u>if reasonably available</u>” should be replaced with “<u>if appropriate</u>”, otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not “reasonably available” an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>	<p>*Hydrology/Water Quality The change from shall to may will increase well water use and could cause a lowering of the water table to existing residents. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning The increase density from these additional sites could exceed the surrounding infrastructure and services. How will this be prevented?</p> <p>*Population/Housing The additional sites approved from this change in policy will cause more houses in the Community region, which could exceed population balance for Community regional areas. How will this be prevented?</p>	<p>*Transportation/Traffic The increase housing from this policy change could cause traffic congestion. The new traffic demand model should be used to analyze this impact and mitigation measures should be provided.</p>

Issue	EDH-APAC Position	NOP Response	NOP Response
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011- ;-</p> <p>Major Concern</p> <p>6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>	<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues.</p> <p>The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>	<p>*Aesthetics The lost of open space will detract from the visual appearance of housing project. Please address mitigation measures that will compensate for lost of open spaces on view shed.</p> <p>*Land Use/Planning If open space is not required, project design will put houses on less than desirable land. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>*Noise Vegetation and trees which are in most open spaces provide sound attenuation. How will this increase in sound and noise be mitigated when open space is removed from housing projects?</p>



Fwd: Personalized ZO data request

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 8:42 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>
Date: Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 8:33 AM
Subject: Re: Personalized ZO data request
To: kathyerussell@sbcglobal.net
Cc: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Kathye:

I have attached the print outs for both APNs as a single document. There is a zoning change under consideration for APN 061-100-44 (from Estate Residential 10 Acre to Rural Lands 10 Acre), so I have included the proposed zoning text.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Sincerely,

Mike Applegarth
Principal Analyst
Chief Administrative Office
El Dorado County
[\(530\) 621-5123](tel:5306215123)

On Sun, Jul 8, 2012 at 1:39 PM, Kathye Russell <kathyerussell@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Hi Mike and/or Shawna: (not sure if you're both around!)

I understand you've not gotten the new ZO parcel data program online yet --- the one where you can input APN/landowner's name at LUPPU public meetings to get a personalized print-out of information that shows what the new ZO options might be on their land.

Is it possible to have you run two APNs for me from that program ??? I would like to re-check my information and also see how it works/what it shows on parcels I'm working on right now and thought this a good way to familiarize myself with that program/info.

APNs are: 061-520-07 and 061-100-44 under the Musso Trust.

Thanks if you can provide this information: I've not done a site-visit yet but am prepping to meet with the owner.

Kath

Kathye Russell

home phone [530 622-3488](tel:5306223488)

cell phone [530 306-1303](tel:5303061303)

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your -----

7/9/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Personalized ZO data request

s.stem.
Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.


Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

2 a. tachment

 DOC000.PDF
39K

 Proposed Zoning Ordinance (Ch. 17.21).pdf
68K

**Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update
DRAFT (TGPA/ZOU)**

Property Information Inquiry

Owner Name:	MUSSO RODGER BRUCE TR
Site Address:	0
Assessor's Parcel Number	061-520-07

Under the 2004 Adopted General Plan, the land-use designation for this parcel is: **LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL**

Does the proposed TGPA/ZOU include a change to this parcel's land-use designation? **NO**

Under the current Zoning Ordinance, the zoning designation for this parcel is: **Estate Residential 5 Acre**

Under the proposed Zoning Ordinance, the zoning designation proposed for analysis on this parcel is: **Estate Residential 5 Acre**

Is this parcel eligible for the Agriculture "Opt-in"? **NO**

In General Plan AG District Overlay? **NO**

Parcel Acreage: **16.55 acres**

How are General Plan land-use designations different from Zoning?

Every parcel in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County is assigned a General Plan Land-Use designation and a Zoning designation. General Plan designations identify generalized permitted land uses such as Commercial or Multifamily Residential. Zoning designations, which by law must be consistent with the General Plan designations, provide more detail on permitted uses and development standards; a single General Plan designation may be consistent with a number of different zoning designations. For example, a parcel with a General Plan designation of Medium Density Residential could potentially have a Zoning designation of residential one acre (R1A), residential two acres (R2A), or residential three acres (R3A) under the current Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance Update addresses inconsistencies between the General Plan designations and current Zoning designations

PLEASE NOTE: Property information is based on the most recent data available and may not reflect recent activity. Acreage is an estimate based on the Assessor's parcel maps.

Agriculture Opt-in applies only to current agricultural zone properties or Residential Estate parcels within agricultural districts.

**Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update
DRAFT (TGPA/ZOU)**

Property Information Inquiry

Owner Name:	MUSSO RODGER BRUCE TR
Site Address:	1301 LOGHOUSE RD
Assessor's Parcel Number	061-100-44

Under the 2004 Adopted General Plan, the land-use designation for this parcel is: **RURAL RESIDENTIAL**

Does the proposed TGPA/ZOU include a change to this parcel's land-use designation? **NO**

Under the current Zoning Ordinance, the zoning designation for this parcel is: **Estate Residential 10 Acre**

Under the proposed Zoning Ordinance, the zoning designation proposed for analysis on this parcel is: **Rural Lands 10 Acre**

Is this parcel eligible for the Agriculture "Opt-in"? **NO**

In General Plan AG District Overlay? **NO**

Parcel Acreage: **69.47 acres**

Draft Public Review of the Zoning Ordinance Update Zone Definition:

Rural Lands 10 Acre

The RL, Rural Lands Zone, is intended to identify those lands that are suitable for limited residential development based on topography, access, groundwater or septic capability, and other infrastructural requirements. This zone is intended to recognize that resource-based industries in the vicinity may impact residential uses. Commercial support activities that are compatible with the available infrastructure may be allowed within this zone to serve the surrounding rural and agricultural communities. For special setback purposes, the RL zone is not considered to be an agricultural or timber zone. Minimum lot size designators shall be applied to this zone based on the constraints of the site, surrounding land use pattern, and other appropriate factors. The designator shall represent the minimum number of acres and shall be in the following increments: *, 20, 40, 80, and 160.

How are General Plan land-use designations different from Zoning?

Every parcel in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County is assigned a General Plan Land-Use designation and a Zoning designation. General Plan designations identify generalized permitted land uses such as Commercial or Multifamily Residential. Zoning designations, which by law must be consistent with the General Plan designations, provide more detail on permitted uses and development standards; a single General Plan designation may be consistent with a number of different zoning designations. For example, a parcel with a General Plan designation of Medium Density Residential could potentially have a Zoning designation of residential one acre (R1A), residential two acres (R2A), or residential three acres (R3A) under the current Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance Update addresses inconsistencies between the General Plan designations and current Zoning designations.

PLEASE NOTE: Property information is based on the most recent data available and may not reflect recent activity. Acreage is an estimate based on the Assessor's parcel maps.

Agriculture Opt-in applies only to current agricultural zone properties or Residential Estate parcels within agricultural districts.

CHAPTER 17.21 – AGRICULTURAL, RURAL, AND RESOURCE ZONES

Sections:

- 17.21.010 Purpose and Intent
- 17.21.020 Matrix of Permitted Uses
- 17.21.030 Development Standards

17.21.010 Purpose and Intent

- A. The purpose of the agricultural, rural and resource zones is to achieve the following:
 - 1. To identify, conserve and protect important agricultural lands and those lands having suitable space and natural conditions for horticulture, animal husbandry, and other agricultural uses, as well as those lands containing timber and other natural resources.
 - 2. To promote and encourage agriculture and timber harvesting uses, and to increase their economic viability by providing opportunities for sale, packaging, processing, and other related activities.
 - 3. To protect agriculture, grazing, timber harvesting, or other resource based uses from the encroachment of unrelated and incompatible uses in order to provide a healthy, stable, and competitive environment necessary to sustain them.
 - 4. To protect the viability of the rural lands by providing economic opportunities that support and complement the rural lifestyle and promote tourism based on the historical, cultural, agricultural, and natural scenic resources of the county.
- B. This Chapter lists the uses that may be allowed within an agricultural and a resource zone established by Section 17.02.10 (Zoning Map and Zones), determines the type of planning permit/approval required for each use, and provides basic standards for site layout and building size.
- C. The purpose of the individual agricultural and resource zones and the manner in which they are applied is as follows:
 - 1. **Planned Agricultural (PA).** The PA, Planned Agricultural Zone, is intended to regulate and promote the development of agricultural enterprises and land uses whether encumbered by a farmland conservation contract or not. This zone shall be utilized to identify those lands most capable of supporting horticulture, aquaculture, ranching, and grazing, based on existing land use, soil type, water availability, topography, and similar factors. Agricultural enterprise is intended to be the primary use of

these lands, but compatible commercial uses, as listed in Table 17.21.020 below, may also be permitted in compliance with the provisions of this Chapter. Minimum lot size designators shall be applied to this zone based on commodity type, soil type, surrounding land use pattern, and other appropriate factors. The designator shall represent the number of acres and shall be in the following increments: 10, 20, 40, 80, and 160.

- 2. Limited Agricultural (LA).** The LA, Limited Agricultural Zone, is intended to identify, regulate, and promote the development of agricultural enterprises and land uses, whether encumbered by a farmland conservation contract or not. This zone shall be utilized to identify those lands most capable of supporting horticulture, aquaculture, ranching, and grazing, based on existing land use, soil type, water availability, topography, and similar factors. The LA zone is distinguished from the PA zone in that it provides limited opportunities for ranch marketing and commercial winery uses. Minimum lot size designators shall be applied to this zone based on commodity type, soil type, surrounding land use pattern, and other appropriate factors. The designator shall represent the number of acres and shall be in the following increments: 10, 20, 40, 80, and 160.
- 3. Agricultural Grazing (AG).** The AG, Agricultural Grazing Zone, is intended to identify and protect lands suitable for grazing whether encumbered by a farmland conservation contract or not. This zone shall be utilized to identify those lands that are being used for grazing and/or that have the potential for commercially viable grazing operations, based on existing land use, soil type, water availability, topography, and similar factors. Grazing and other agricultural activities are intended to be the primary use of these lands, but other compatible commercial uses may also be permitted in compliance with the provisions of this Chapter. Minimum lot size designators shall be applied to this zone based on land use designation and other appropriate factors. The minimum lot size designator shall be in the following increments: 40 and 160 acres.
- 4. Timber Production (TPZ).** The TPZ, Timber Production Zone, is intended to identify and regulate lands subject to the Forest Taxation Reform Act of 1976. (California Government Code Section 51110, et seq.). Criteria for establishing a TPZ is located in Section 17.40.350 (Timber Production Zone: Criteria, Regulations, and Zone Change Requirements).
- 5. Forest Resource (FR).** The FR, Forest Resource Zone, is intended to identify and protect lands containing valuable timber or having the potential for timber production, but that are not subject to TPZ zoning requirements in compliance with Section 17.40.350.H (Forest Resource Zone Criteria). The purpose of this zone is to encourage timber production and associated activities, and to limit noncompatible uses from restricting such activities. Minimum lot size designators shall be applied to this zone based on elevation and other appropriate factors. The minimum

lot size designator shall be in the following increments: 40, 80, and 160 acres.

- 6. Rural Lands (RL).** The RL, Rural Lands Zone, is intended to identify those lands that are suitable for limited residential development based on topography, access, groundwater or septic capability, and other infrastructural requirements. This zone is intended to recognize that resource-based industries in the vicinity may impact residential uses. Commercial support activities that are compatible with the available infrastructure may be allowed within this zone to serve the surrounding rural and agricultural communities. For special setback purposes, the RL zone is not considered to be an agricultural or timber zone. Minimum lot size designators shall be applied to this zone based on the constraints of the site, surrounding land use pattern, and other appropriate factors. The designator shall represent the minimum number of acres and shall be in the following increments: *, 20, 40, 80, and 160.

*Optional analysis to allow for 10 acre minimum lot size in Rural Lands (RL) Zone.

17.21.020 Matrix of Permitted Uses

Uses are permitted in the following zones subject to the requirements of this Title as designated in Table 17.21.020 below:

Table 17.21.020 Agricultural and Resource Zone Districts Use Matrix

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Agricultural							
Animal Keeping	P	P	P	P	P	P	17.40.080
Barn; Stable, private; Storage structure	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.030
Cropland	P	P	P	P	P	—	
Grazing	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Livestock, high density	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	—	—	
Nursery, plants: Wholesale	P	P	P	P	A/CUP ¹	A/CUP ¹	

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Orchards and Vineyards	P	P	P	P	P	—	
Packing: On site products	P	P	P	P	P	CUP	
Off site products	P/ CUP	P/ CUP	P/ CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Processing, on site products	P	P	P	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Produce Sales	P/MUP	P/MUP	P/MUP	P/MUP	P/MUP	—	17.40.240
Timber	P	P	P	P	P	P	17.40.350
Residential							
Child Day Care Home: Small family day care home	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.110
Large family day care home	CUP	A	A	A	A	—	
Community Care Facility: Small (serving 6 or fewer)	—	—	—	P	—	—	
Large (serving 7 or more)	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Dwelling: Single-unit, detached	P	P	P	P	P	CUP	17.40.350
Temporary during construction	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.190
Employee Housing: Agricultural	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	—	17.40.120
Construction	—	—	A	A	A	—	17.40.190
Seasonal Worker	—	—	P/A/CUP	P/A/CUP	P/A/CUP	—	17.40.120
Guest House	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.150
Hardship Mobile Home	TMA	TMA	TMA	TMA	TMA	—	17.40.190
Kennel, private ²	P/CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	—	17.40.080
Room Rental: One bedroom, only	P	P	P	P	P	—	
Secondary Dwelling	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.060, 17.40.300
Commercial							
Agricultural Support Services	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.070
Animal Sales and Service: Veterinary Clinic	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Contractor's Office: Off site	—	—	—	TUP	TUP	—	17.40.190
Home Occupation	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	—	17.40.160
Kennel, commercial	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.070
Lodging Facilities: Agricultural Homestay	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	—	—	17.40.170
*Agricultural and Timber Resource Lodging	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Bed and Breakfast Inn	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Dude Ranch	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Health Resort and Retreat Center	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Vacation Home Rental	A	A	A	A	A	—	17.40.370
Nursery, plants: Retail	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Outdoor Retail Sales: Garage Sales	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.220
Temporary Outdoor	A/T	A/T	A/T	A/T	—	—	
Ranch Marketing	CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.260
Wineries	CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	CUP	—	—	17.40.400
Industrial							
Mineral Exploration	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	Chapter 17.29
Mineral Production	—	—	—	CUP	—	A/ CUP	
Mining	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	A/ CUP	
Slaughterhouse	—	CUP	CUP	—	—	—	
Storage Yard: Equipment and Material Permanent	—	—	—	—	—	P/ CUP	17.40.320
Temporary	T	T	T	T	T	T	
Recreation and Open Space							
Campground	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.100
Camping, Temporary	—	—	—	—	—	P	
Golf Course	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Hiking and Equestrian Trail	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Hunting/Fishing Club, Farm, or Facility	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Marina: Non-motorized Craft	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area	—	—	—	—	CUP	—	
Park, day use	—	—	—	CUP	CUP		17.40.210
Picnic Area	CUP	P	P	P	P	P	
Resource Protection and Restoration	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Ski Area	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.210
Snow Play Area	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	
Special Events, temporary	T	T	T	T	T	—	
Stable, commercial	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.210
Trail Head Parking or Staging Area	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Civic Uses							
Cemetery	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Churches and Community Assembly	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	
Community Services:							
Cultural centers, living history facilities	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Intensive	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	
Schools:							
College and University	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	17.40.230
Elementary and Secondary, Private	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Transportation							
Airports, Airstrips, and Heliports	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	17.40.070
Utility and Communication							
Communication Facilities	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	CUP	17.40.130
Public Utility Service Facilities:							
Intensive	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	17.40.250

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Minor	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Wind Energy Conversion System	See Table 17.40.390.1 (WECS Use Matrix)						17.40.390
NOTES: ¹ Administrative permit when plant material grown for restocking purposes; all other purposes require Conditional Use Permit. ² Dogs used for herding or guardian purposes in ranching or browsing operations are allowed by right subject to licensing requirements of Animal Control in compliance with Title 6.							

17.21.030 Development Standards

Permitted uses and associated structures shall comply with the following development standards in addition to any other applicable requirements of this Title:

Table 17.21.030 Agricultural and Resource Zones Development Standards

	LA	PA	AG	TPZ	FR	RL
Minimum Lot Size ¹	10 acres or as designated	10 acres or as designated	40 acres or as designated	160 acres	40 acres below 3,000 ft. elev. or as designated; 160 acres 3,000 ft. and higher	20 acres or as designated *Optional 10 acre minimum
Setbacks: (in feet) Agricultural (ag) structure, Front, sides, rear	50	50	50	50.	50	50
Non-ag structure, Front, sides, rear	30	30	30	30	30	30
Building Height: (in feet) Ag structure	50	50	50	50	50	50
Non-ag structure	45	45	45	45	45	45
Lot Frontage (in feet)	200	150	200	200	200	150
<p>Notes: ¹ An agricultural preserve may consist of a lot or contiguous lots of between 10 and 20 acres in compliance with Section 17.40.060 (Agricultural Preserves and Zones, etc.)</p>						



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

F. d: Comments for TGPA/ZOU

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: kmulvan. @gmail.com
Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:33 AM

Thanks Karen,

Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Karen Mulvany <kmulvany@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 3:54 PM
Subject: Comments for TGPA/ZOU
To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Hello,

Attached are comments for the TGPA/ZOU. These pertain to Objective 6.7.1 El Dorado Count. Clean Air Plan: "Adopt and enforce Air Quality standards to reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions" and El Dorado County campgrounds.

Thank you,

Karen Mulvany

530-642-9805

--


Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 Jul. 9 Mulvany Pierce comment letter smoke.doc
247.

PO Box 768
Lotus, CA 95651
July 9, 2012

Shawna Purvines
Senior Planner
Development Services Department, Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court, Building C
Placerville, CA 95667
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

VIA EMAIL

Dear Ms. Purvines,

Thank you for extending the comment period for the TGPA and ZOU to 45 days to give the public additional time to review and comment. We also appreciate the many meetings that were held for the public.


We strongly support Objective 6.7.1 El Dorado County Clean Air Plan: "Adopt and enforce Air Quality standards to reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions."

Our comments, which pertain to El Dorado County campgrounds and Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, to be addressed in the EIR, are as follows:

- We would like to ask that the county specifically address regulations for small particulate matter pollution, specifically, wood smoke. Many people believe that wood smoke is safe, but recent research over the past 10 years has concluded that wood smoke, which contains small particulate matter and other carcinogens, is one of the most dangerous airborne pollutants for human health.
- In particular, we are concerned about the Lotus Coloma valley, a canyon carved by the South Fork of the American River. It is heavily impacted by smoke from campground campfires that burn throughout the summer, at a time when open fires are not permitted elsewhere. In the colder months, the smoke from campfires rises and largely escapes the river canyon. Unfortunately, warm summertime conditions trap evening wood smoke from campgrounds in the canyon for most of the night, exposing residents to high levels of small particulate matter pollution on a daily basis.
- In the Lotus Coloma area, there are 4 public campgrounds and numerous other campgrounds operated by river outfitters, all of which border the river and residential properties. These campgrounds are currently zoned Tourist Recreational and are proposed to be rezoned as Recreational Facility - High or Recreational Facility- Low. The public campgrounds permit up to 100 nightly fires, resulting in several hundred fires nightly in a small, confined region. The

resulting wood smoke is sufficiently thick to cloud visibility and has even set off home smoke alarms.

Lotus Coloma River Valley



- Recreational Facility
- Recreational Facility - Low
- Recreational Facility - High

- We support the county's goal to encourage development of the tourism industry in the County. However, we believe that wood fires are not necessary for riverfront campgrounds to experience continued strong patronage, and alternative solutions are available that are less dangerous to resident health:
 - As long-time whitewater boaters, we believe that the experience of fires in river canyons is the exception, not the rule, in summertime months. For nearly 20 years we have camped along various rivers throughout the west, and we have found that campfires are almost never permitted in summertime months.
 - New technology has emerged to offer cleaner alternatives to wood campfires. Propane fired campfires have come on the market as other communities have outlawed open fires. Propane solutions would enable campground owners to replace sales of wood fuel, as significant source of additional campground revenue, with sales of propane fuel.

During the summertime and fall no-burn season, please reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions by requiring that campfires in river canyon campgrounds be fueled by propane or other safer sources.

Thank you for considering our comments,

Karen Mulvany and Tim Pierce
530-642-9805

Parcel Owners
105-080-24-100
105-340-41-100
071-490-06-100
088-100-02-100
060-361-38-100
105-230-22-100



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

F. d: Comments for TGPA/ZOU

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: kmulvan. @gmail.com
Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:33 AM

Thanks Karen,

Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Karen Mulvany <kmulvany@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 3:54 PM
Subject: Comments for TGPA/ZOU
To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Hello,

Attached are comments for the TGPA/ZOU. These pertain to Objective 6.7.1 El Dorado Count. Clean Air Plan: "Adopt and enforce Air Quality standards to reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions" and El Dorado County campgrounds.

Thank you,

Karen Mulvany

530-642-9805

--


Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 Jul. 9 Mulvany Pierce comment letter smoke.doc
247.

PO Box 768
Lotus, CA 95651
July 9, 2012

Shawna Purvines
Senior Planner
Development Services Department, Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court, Building C
Placerville, CA 95667
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

VIA EMAIL

Dear Ms. Purvines,

Thank you for extending the comment period for the TGPA and ZOU to 45 days to give the public additional time to review and comment. We also appreciate the many meetings that were held for the public.


We strongly support Objective 6.7.1 El Dorado County Clean Air Plan: "Adopt and enforce Air Quality standards to reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions."

Our comments, which pertain to El Dorado County campgrounds and Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, to be addressed in the EIR, are as follows:

- We would like to ask that the county specifically address regulations for small particulate matter pollution, specifically, wood smoke. Many people believe that wood smoke is safe, but recent research over the past 10 years has concluded that wood smoke, which contains small particulate matter and other carcinogens, is one of the most dangerous airborne pollutants for human health.
- In particular, we are concerned about the Lotus Coloma valley, a canyon carved by the South Fork of the American River. It is heavily impacted by smoke from campground campfires that burn throughout the summer, at a time when open fires are not permitted elsewhere. In the colder months, the smoke from campfires rises and largely escapes the river canyon. Unfortunately, warm summertime conditions trap evening wood smoke from campgrounds in the canyon for most of the night, exposing residents to high levels of small particulate matter pollution on a daily basis.
- In the Lotus Coloma area, there are 4 public campgrounds and numerous other campgrounds operated by river outfitters, all of which border the river and residential properties. These campgrounds are currently zoned Tourist Recreational and are proposed to be rezoned as Recreational Facility - High or Recreational Facility- Low. The public campgrounds permit up to 100 nightly fires, resulting in several hundred fires nightly in a small, confined region. The

resulting wood smoke is sufficiently thick to cloud visibility and has even set off home smoke alarms.

Lotus Coloma River Valley



- Recreational Facility
- Recreational Facility - Low
- Recreational Facility - High

- We support the county's goal to encourage development of the tourism industry in the County. However, we believe that wood fires are not necessary for riverfront campgrounds to experience continued strong patronage, and alternative solutions are available that are less dangerous to resident health:
 - As long-time whitewater boaters, we believe that the experience of fires in river canyons is the exception, not the rule, in summertime months. For nearly 20 years we have camped along various rivers throughout the west, and we have found that campfires are almost never permitted in summertime months.
 - New technology has emerged to offer cleaner alternatives to wood campfires. Propane fired campfires have come on the market as other communities have outlawed open fires. Propane solutions would enable campground owners to replace sales of wood fuel, as significant source of additional campground revenue, with sales of propane fuel.

During the summertime and fall no-burn season, please reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions by requiring that campfires in river canyon campgrounds be fueled by propane or other safer sources.

Thank you for considering our comments,

Karen Mulvany and Tim Pierce
530-642-9805

Parcel Owners
105-080-24-100
105-340-41-100
071-490-06-100
088-100-02-100
060-361-38-100
105-230-22-100



The General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Changes

1 me. sage

Christina Karle <mckarle@sbcglobal.net>
To: Shawna Purvines <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Sat, Jul 7, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner, 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

Notice of Preparation Public Comment

I came to the Public Forum for the Notice of Preparation in Camino, and had opportunity to speak to several staff about proposed amendments to the plan.

My family and friends are concerned that the proposed changes restrict the average resident with more restrictions on legal use of personal property.

Should not increase the housing density allowances due to water restrictions/shortages. Propose maintaining density in original document.

My family and I request that cropland and orchards not be restricted by lot size, but instead, restrict the application of dangerous chemical spraying.

Most people grow organically when on small scale farm. Freedom to grow and sell one's crops should not be restricted. Our family lives in a rural area on 1.15 acres, and wish to retain ability to grow and sell crops, eggs, and other farm products, with the ability to make this a business venture.

Residents/citizens of this rural county should have the right to support themselves with small sustainable farming on their land, restricted by the size of their property. This applies to small numbers of livestock (milk goat, rabbits, chickens, etc.) for family use, or the produce from these animals, (eggs, soap, cheese, milk, meat) being available for cottage industry start-ups. Likewise, the ability to slaughter a small farm animal should be allowed, with restriction based upon housing density/zoning. We do NOT want to lose our ability to do these activities on our property by right.

Thank you,

Christina Karle

4521 Treasure Rock Lane

Placer. ille, CA. 95667

[530 647-1821](tel:5306471821)

cell [530 919-0651](tel:5309190651)

The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in the moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy"

. Martin Luther King Jr 1963~





TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Notice of Preparation Public Comment For the Draft General Plan Amendments/Zoning Update

1 me. sage

Kathleen Newell <knewell@live.com>
To: shawna <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>
Cc: bostwo@edcgov.us

Sat, Jul 7, 2012 at 11:03 AM

July 7, 2012

To: Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner

El Dorado County

2850 Fairlane Ct.

Placerville, CA 95667

TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

From: Kathleen Newell

4576 Foothill Drive

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

RE: Notice of Preparation Public Comment For the Draft General Plan Amendments/Zoning Update

First I want to emphasize that this whole process needs to be extended, so the public can study it further, and fully understand the magnitude of these changes. I've attended several EDAC Reg reform meetings and all the scoping meetings (except Tahoe) to get clarification on the changes and I'm still confused. I'm not alone, and during the reg reform meetings, the committee members often voiced the same concern. With that said, here are just a few of the issues I have with the draft plan.

1) I am against residential mixed-use developments to increase density from 16 to 20 units per acre, and Multi-family density increase from 24 to 30 units per acre. The traffic, noise, air pollution, increased population, etc., will adversely impact the environment, and existing neighborhoods of the project area.

2) Not allowing the slaughtering of farm animals on R1A, R2A, R3A, RE5, RE10 will adversely impact my rural lifestyle. The right to (small) farm for personal use must be protected.

3) The 30 percent open space requirement for Planned Development community regions and rural centers to allow a lesser area of "improved open space" on site, with the option of allowing a portion of the required open space off-site or by an in-lieu fee option will adversely impact the environment in the project areas.

4) The Ag opt-in choice should be granted whether they are a 'donut' or not.

5) I am against community region boundaries. Those red lines have walled in existing rural neighborhoods and the high-density land-use policy being proposed for inside community regions will adversely impact our rural lifestyle. When the 2004 General Plan drew those lines and named them community regions, the public was not aware it meant, "okay to build high-density urban."

And with that said...

6) Aligning El Dorado County's General Plan/Zoning, Housing Element, and Travel Demand Model to conform to California's "sustainable communities strategy (SCS)" which demonstrates how the region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning is a trickle down set of mandates derived from U.N. Agenda 21 and will ultimately adversely impact my constitutional freedoms. Instead of conforming, we should be pushing back. I highly recommend you contact Commissioner Richard Rothschild in Carroll County Maryland, who is saying no to 'sustainable policy,' and discuss a strategy to end this here in El Dorado County. Others have done so, and he is more than happy to help in any way he can. <http://www.richardrothschild.org/>

Thank you for this opportunity to provide public comment.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Newell



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

(no subject)

1 me. sage

QUIG1995@aol.com <QUIG1995@aol.com>

Fri, Jul 6, 2012 at 1:59 PM

To: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

I have reviewed the presentations that you have available online and am unable to understand the maps that are presented. I was unable to locate a "map key" to discern what the different colors represent or what areas are even targeted for change. Where can we view maps that show the existing zoning etc. of specific locations and the maps that indicate the changes.

Thank you.



Fwd: Letter to Placerville Cit. Council

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 9:16 AM

To: Robert Smart <rsmart41@comcast.net>

Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Thanks Bob

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Robert Smart <rsmart41@comcast.net>

Date: Thu, Jul 5, 2012 at 7:13 AM

Subject: Letter to Placerville Cit. Council

To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Shawna, I have attached a letter I sent to the Placerville City Council addressing parks in our area. The Placerville Area Parks Master Plan addressed lands adjacent to the City and was partially financed by the County. It should be considered a source of information for the General Plan Amendment process. Bob

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

2 attachments

Ltr Placerville Council 7-5-12.docx
16K



NOP CAC letter 6-21-12.doc
39K

Robert A. Smart, Jr.
4520 Lon Court
Diamond Springs, CA 95619
July 5, 2012

Mark Acuna, Mayor
City of Placerville
3101 Center Street
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Mayor Acuna and Members of the City Council:

El Dorado County is currently involved in a general planning effort that could be modified to address the current and future recreation impacts on the City of Placerville. The City must act quickly if your interests are to be addressed.

The Placerville Area Parks and Recreation Master Plan does an excellent job of describing the recreation impacts the City absorbs because El Dorado County has not provided adequate parks for its adjacent existing population.

http://www.foothill.com/PlacervilleAreaParks/pdf/Park_and_Recreation_Master_Plan%20Final.pdf

El Dorado County has embarked on a general plan amendment process and currently proposes to exclude addressing recreation issues. If this preliminary determination continues, the study will not address the adverse impacts that currently exist, the cumulated impacts of new development, and potential solutions (which might include Placerville). The attached letter from the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Advisory Committee explains the committee's concerns. You will see the impacts to Placerville are a part of the committee's concerns.

El Dorado County plans to close the comment period on scope of work on July 15, 2012. Please encourage El Dorado County to address the recreation issues in the Diamond Springs-El Dorado community region that are having negative impact on the City of Placerville; these impacts will be exasperated by future development in the region unless properly mitigated.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Smart, Jr.

Attachment: 6-21-12 Letter Diamond Spring-El Dorado Community Advisory Committee
CC: El Dorado County Supervisor Jack Sweeney
Shawna Purvine, El Dorado County
Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Advisory Committee



DIAMOND SPRINGS AND EL DORADO
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Diamond Springs Fire Station
501 Main Street
Diamond Springs, CA 95916

June 21, 2012

Shawna Purvine
County of El Dorado,
Development Services Department, Planning Services,
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C,"
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: NOTICE OF PREPARATION for THE EL DORADO COUNTY TARGETED
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE

The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Advisory Committee takes strong exception with the implication in the NOP that the recreation issues in Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Region (DS-El Do CR) will somehow be corrected by future individual development projects and thus will not be addressed in the Targeted General Plan Amendment And Zoning Ordinance for which the EIR is being prepared. It is irresponsible for El Dorado County to expect individual developers to assume and fix the burden of years of neglecting the recreation needs of the Diamond Springs-El Dorado residents.

The 2012 El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan identifies Diamond Springs-El Dorado community region, which currently has no parks, as needing four neighborhood parks to meet the needs of the existing population. The Plan says "The need for neighborhood parks in these areas is already significant". Another quote from the Master Plan:

"In addition, the El Dorado County General Plan Housing Element identifies the need to provide affordable housing with adequate amenities and facilities, including proximity to parks. Both the General Plan Land Use and Housing Elements have designated the Diamond Springs and El Dorado areas as locations to absorb a significant portion of the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for moderate and below moderate incomes. These areas also have the greatest impact on overutilization of parks in the City of Placerville."

Since the General Plan was approved in 2004, numerous developments have been approved or are well into their planning phase, and there has been no progress on providing the parks the residents need. On May 1, 2012, El Dorado County approved a

circulation map for a portion of the (DS-El Do CR) that will accommodate the transportation needs of approximately 7 new subdivisions with 1,112 new lots and 85 apartments; where are the maps showing the location of the parks for the existing population and the parks for all these future residents?

The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update should clarify the requirement for new development projects to provide and maintain improved ("turn-key") park sites to serve new residents if impact fees and/or annexation to a recreation service district/provider is not possible.

If new development is allowed to proceed without providing the parks needed to serve the new population this serious problem will be exacerbated.

The existing General Plan requires the following:

- Policy 9.2.2.2 - New development projects creating community or neighborhood parks shall provide mechanisms (e.g., homeowners associations, or benefit assessment districts) for the ongoing development, operation, and maintenance needs of these facilities if annexation to an existing parks and recreation service district/provider is not possible.
- Policy 9.2.2.5 - The County shall establish a development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreation improvements and acquisition of parklands such that minimum neighborhood, community, and regional park standards are achieved. This fee is in addition to Quimby Act requirements that address parkland acquisition only. The fee will be adjusted periodically to fully fund the improvements identified in the Parks and Capital Improvement Program concurrent with development over a five-year period.

There is no Community Service District or Recreation District to serve the needs of the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community region. For budget reasons, the County eliminated its Parks and Recreation Department and currently there is no entity addressing recreation needs for the area.

The current need for parks in the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Region is called "significant" in the Parks and Trails Master Plan. At a minimum, the scope of the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance needs to be expanded to address the current and future recreation needs in the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Region, and potentially the other underserved areas identified in the Master Plan.

/s/ Robert A. Smart, Jr.
Robert A. Smart, Jr.
Chairperson



F. d: FW: DRAFT ZONING MAP/ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS

1 me. sage

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jul 9, 2012 at 8:53 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kirk Bone <kbone@parkerdevco.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 3, 2012 at 9:31 AM
Subject: FW: DRAFT ZONING MAP/ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS
To: "shawna.purvines@edcgov.us" <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Here you go. Let me know if you need anything else.

-----Original Message-----

From: John Tyler [mailto:jtyler@placertitle.com]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2012 11:10 AM
To: Kirk Bone
Subject: DRAFT ZONING MAP/ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS

Hi Kirk,

Attached please find a copy of your email and Andrea's regarding the Draft Zoning Map Comments. I have indicated the appropriate Assessor's Parcel Numbers after each, except that, for item 2 Serrano. To list each and every number assigned by the Assessor's Office will take a significant amount of time. They have assigned an APN for each portion of every road on every Assessor's Page in the development. Portion of item 11 fall into this same category. I have also included copies of the Assessor's Plat maps for he above entries.

Hope this helps,

John

John Tyler
President-Title Operations
Placer Title Company
5828 Lonetree Blvd., Suite 200
Rocklin, CA 95765
(916) 624-8141

-----Original Message-----

From: 4119-RocklinPlant-DistGrp
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2012 10:25 AM
To: John Tyler
Subject: Document from Placer Title

DEVICE NAME: 4119t3
DEVICE MODEL: SHARP AR-M550N
LOCATION: PTC Rocklin Plant

FILE FORMAT: PDF MMR(G4)
RESOLUTION: 300dpi x 300dpi

Attached file is scanned image in PDF format.
This file can be read by Adobe Acrobat Reader.
The reader can be downloaded from the following URL:

<http://www.adobe.com/>


CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message transmission contains information from Mother Lode Holding Company which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended

be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone (877) 958-8485 or electronic mail (etghelpdesk@mlhc.com) immediately.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

 AR-M550N_20120702_102523_c712996d36f0.. df
2245K

John Tyler

From: Kirk Bone [kbone@parkerdevco.com]
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2012 11:17 AM
To: John Tyler
Subject: FW: Draft Zoning Map Comments
Attachments: ZONING MAP_Draft comments.docx


Will you please give me a call this afternoon? Thanks.

From: Andrea Howard
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 11:53 AM
To: Kirk Bone; mcook@hsmlaw.com
Subject: Draft Zoning Map Comments

Mike and Kirk,

FYI, the County has released a draft of the proposed zoning map and I have assembled my comments (see attached). Let me know if you see any others.

Andrea Howard
Principal Planner



EST. 1956

PARKER DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Over 50 Years of Pride in the Communities We Build

4525 Serrano Parkway • El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
tel 916/939-4060 • fax 916/939-3567

New APN's



Andrea's Comments on draft zoning map

June 18, 2012

Reference Documents:

1. Link to General Plan Land Use Map (Figure LU-1):
http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Government/Planning/Adopted_General_Plan.aspx
2. Link to proposed zoning map (Detail 1):
http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Government/Planning/Draft_Zoning_Maps.aspx
3. Link to proposed zoning ordinance:
http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Government/Planning/Zoning_Ordinance_Updates.aspx
4. Link to current zoning ordinance:
http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/Government/Planning/Zoning_Ordinance_November_2010.aspx

✓ Saratoga Commercial:

120-690-04

1. Saratoga is currently assigned a split zoning designation of Planned Commercial (Chapter 17.32) - Design Control and R1. The R1 portion is inconsistent with the Commercial Land Use Designation and the draft zoning map cleans it up. The entire site is now proposed for Community Commercial-Design Review. See Table 17.22.020 for Matrix of Permitted Uses which seem to be okay to me.

✓ Pedregal:

120-050-01 + 05

1. The piece along EDH Boulevard has a Land Use Designation of Multi-Family Residential, but the draft zoning map shows it as R1. It needs to be assigned a Residential Multi-unit zone.

Executive Golf Course:

121-160-03

1. The Land Use map designates the site largely as Open Space and a very small piece at the northern tip as Commercial. The draft zoning map designates it entirely Recreational Facility-High (see Table 17.25.020 for Matrix of Permitted Uses), which seems to be consistent with the current zone district of Recreational Facilities (Chapter 17.48). Are there any concerns about losing the small Commercial piece?

~~120-050-01 + 05~~

Marble Valley:

1. The proposed zoning map designates the MVLLC portion as Marble Valley Tentative Map (true) and the Arts Center as Recreational Facility-High, which seems appropriate. The glossary (pg 7) defines concert halls and the like as Indoor Entertainment under the Commercial Recreation use type, which is a permitted use under the RFH zone.

087-200-74, 119-220-56+57
119-230-13 THRU 19

Serrano:


1. The D2 park is proposed for OS zoning; should be R1. = 121-120-20
2. Some of the roads in Villages D1, B and H-I-L are proposed OS with a red hash mark that I can't define. Should be R1. *121-140-64, 121-320-45 - CASE FOR EVERY ASSESS PAGE*
3. All school sites are proposed for R1 except that Silva Valley School is a green designation for some sort of Ag or Residential Estate (too many shades of green to know for sure). Should be R1. *121-210-07, 121-190, 22, 25, 47
122-070-35+37*
4. The Village Green is assigned Community Commercial and at first blush it may seem like Limited Commercial would be a better fit for the Specific Plan uses. However, medical offices are not permitted in Limited Commercial (and we currently have a dentist on site), so I think Community Commercial is appropriate. The Specific Plan designation was simply C-Commercial. The map still shows the PD overlay which will direct staff to the Specific Plan for consistency. *121-210-17, 20, 21, 26-33, 35-37, 40+41*
5. The Village C water tank is proposed for split zoning of OS and R1. Should be all OS like the Rolling Hills tank. *122-180-20+122-210-43*
6. Change the proposed R1 zone to OS for open spaces in Villages D2, E, F, G, J4, I-FGH, I-A. *D-2 = 121-120-14+22, 121-320-42*
7. The Major Road designation along Serrano Parkway should extend all the way to Bass Lake Road. Same goes for Bass Lake to Highway 50 and Silva Valley from Serrano Parkway to Highway 50. *SEE 122-600-10*
8. The 8th fairway of the Serrano Country Club golf course (between Villages I and K) is proposed for OS zoning when the rest of the golf course site is R1. R1 is correct to match with the zoning exhibit in the Specific Plan. *123-230-75*
9. Villages J5/J6 Residential and J7 is proposed for Commercial Zoning consistent with the old 45-acre designation. It should be changed to R1. Roughly 17 acres of Commercial remain in Village J5. *123-040-05-11*

↗ = 123-820-10

→ = 123-260-06 & 07

10. Village M3 and M4 should be R20k (not R1) to be consistent with our TM approvals. M3 needs the PD overlay too.

✓ 11. Open space: should it have the PD overlay since it's in a Specific Plan area?



SEC. 3, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M. &
 POR. SECS. 2, 10, 11, T.9N., R.8E. M.D.M. &
 POR. SEC. 8, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.

Book 120

1" equals 800'

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify items and/or dimensions and acreage.



Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Grey Tone

Rev. Nov. 2009

Assessor's Map Bk. 120, Index
 County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SECS. 2, 3, 10 & 11, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.

120:69



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA, Assessor's Office. Acreage estimates are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.


Adjacent Map Pages Show: Deer Trail, Arrowhead Dr, Kings Canyon Dr, Mammoth Way, Hills Ct, Saratoga Way, El Dorado Hills Blvd, Park Dr. Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. March 1, 2010

Assessor's Map Bk. 120, Pg. 69
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SECS. 34 & 35, T.10N., R.8E., & POR. SEC. 3, T.9.N., R.8E., M.D.M.

120:05



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office for informational purposes only. All acreage and dimensions are not guaranteed. Users should verify them with a professional land surveyor.

Acreages Are Estimates


Adjacent Map Folios, Shown in Gray. This Assessor's Book Numbers Shown in Blue. Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Green.

Rev. July 12, 2008

Assessor's Map Bk. 120 - Pg. 05
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SEC. 1, T.9N., R.8E., &
POR. SECS. 35, & 36, T.10N, R.8E., &
POR. SEC. 31, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.
INDEX BOOK 122 - 123

Book 122



1" equals 1,000'



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Grey Text

Rev. June 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 122, Index
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SECS. 25, 26, 35 & 36, T.10N., R.8E., & SECS. 1 & 2, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.

EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN UNIT NO. 1

H - 78

122:01

1" equals 500'



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA Assessor's Office. Dimensions and acreages are not guaranteed. Users should verify them with a dimension and acreage.


Adjacent Maps: Pages 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

Rev. July 12, 2008

Assessor's Map Blk. 122 - Pg. 01
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SECS. 26 & 35, T.10N., R.3E., M.D.M.

121:19



Acres are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Grey Tone
Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. Aug. 26, 2010

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 19
County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Any construction or other use of this map is at the user's risk. Check records for details such as dimensions and bearings.

POR. SECS. 25, 26, 35, & 36, T.10N., R.8E., & SECS 1 & 2, T.9N., R.8., M.D.M.
 EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN UNIT NO. 1

H - 78

121:21

1" equals 400'




Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado County Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on information provided by the applicant. Users should verify items such as acreages and the status of the property.

Rev. June 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk 121 - Pg. 21
 County of El Dorado, CA



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. and does not constitute a warranty of accuracy. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray Tone

Rev. Jan. 20, 2005


Assessor's Map Bk. 121, Index
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SEC. 26, T.10N, R.8E., & SEC. 35, T.10N, R.8E., &
SEC. 2, T.9N, R.8E., & POR. SEC. 11, T.9N, R.8E., M.D.M.
INDEX BOOK 121

Book 121

1" equals 1,200'





POR SECS. 1 & 2, T9N., R8E., M.D.M.
 VILLAGE D2, EL DORADO HILLS, UNIT NO. 1
 1 - 26

121:12

Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray Tone
 Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Red
 Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Black

Rev. March 11, 2009

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 12
 County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office. The boundaries shown are not guaranteed. Users should verify them with dimensions and stakes.

IR 121 Pg 31

POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO - EL DORADO HILLS VILLAGE D2 UNIT NO. 2
I - 76



Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shows in Gray Text
Assessor's Block Numbers Show in Blue
Assessor's Parcel Numbers Show in Green



Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 33
County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and acreages are estimates. Users should verify facts and dimensions and acreage.

POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., & SEC. 35, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
 VILLAGE D EL DORADO HILLS UNIT NO. 1
 H - 105

121-06



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify facts such as dimensions and acreage.

Adjacent Tract Parcel Shown in Gray. Tract Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Ellipses. Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles.

Rev. May 24, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 06
 County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., & SEC. 35, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO - EL DORADO HILLS
LOT A - VILLAGE D1
H - 130

1" equals 100'



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations were made from the best available information. Owners should verify items such as dimensions and shapes.

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray Tone
Assessor's District Numbers Shown in Circles
Assessor's Section Numbers Shown in Squares

Rev. July 12, 2008

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 09
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., & SEC. 35, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.

VILLAGE D EL DORADO HILLS UNIT NO. 1

H - 105

121:05



Acreages Are Estimates


THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify items and dimensions and accuracy.

Adjacent Lot Paper Shows In Gray Text
 Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Dotted
 Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. June 12, 2006
 Blk. 121
 P. 10

Assessor's Map Blk. 121 - Pg. 05
 County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., & SEC. 35, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
 VILLAGE D EL DORADO HILLS UNIT NO. 1
 H - 105



Acreages Are Estimates

Special Map Paper Shows in Gray that Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Digits and Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. July 12, 2006


Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 07
 County of El Dorado, CA

121:07

THIS MAP IS FOR REFERENCE ONLY. It is prepared by the El Dorado County Assessor's Office for information purposes only. The Assessor's Office does not guarantee the accuracy of the information shown on this map. Users should verify parcel boundaries and dimensions with the Assessor's Office. Users should verify parcel boundaries and dimensions with the Assessor's Office.

POR. NW 1/4 SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.
VILLAGE D EL DORADO UNIT NO. 3
H - 131

121:10




Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA Assessor's Office. The Assessor's Office does not guarantee the accuracy of the information shown on this map. Users should verify facts such as dimensions and acreage.

Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 10
County of El Dorado, CA


POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO - EL DORADO HILLS VILLAGE D2 UNIT NO. 2



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and acreages are estimates. Users should verify terms and acreages with a professional surveyor.

Rev. July 12, 2005 Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 14
County of El Dorado, CA



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on the map as shown. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray. This Assessor's Book Numbers Shown in Black. Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circle.


July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 32
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SEC. 2, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO - EL DORADO HILLS VILLAGE D2 UNIT NO. 2
1 - 76

121:32

1" equals 100'



POR. SECS. 2 & 11, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.

121:16

1" equals 600'

Acreages Are Estimates

Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 121 - Pg. 16
 County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on the best available information. Users should verify from such as dimensions and acreage.

POR. SEC. 25 & 36, T.10N., R.8E., & SEC. 31, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.
EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN UNIT NO. 2

H - 81

123:03



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and calculations are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.



Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 123 - Pg. 03
County of El Dorado, CA

1" equals 400'

POR. SECS. 35 & 36, T.10N., R.8E., & POR. SECS. 1 & 2, T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.

SERRANO VILLAGE A
1 - 19



122:04

Acreages Are Estimates

Rev. May 30, 2006
Assessor's Map Bk. 122 - Pg. 04
County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and dimensions are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.


Order: 9 Comment:

Book Page 122.4 Page: 1 of 1

POR. SEC. 36, T.10N., R.8E., & POR. SEC. 1 T.9N., R.8E., M.D.M.
POR. SERRANO VILLAGE C1 UNITS 3 & 4
1 - 106 & 1 - 122

122.46

1" equals 200'



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado, CA Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on the map as shown. The Assessor's Office does not warrant the accuracy of the information shown on this map as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates


Adjacent Map Pages shown in Grey. Unit and Parcel Numbers Shown in Circle.

Rev. Aug. 15, 2011

Assessor's Map Bk. 122 - Pg. 46
County of El Dorado, CA

POR, SW 1/4 SEC. 36, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO VILLAGE C1 UNIT 3
I - 106

122:18



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on the information provided. Users should verify such as dimensions and acreages.

Adjacent Maps Page Shows in Grey Text
Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circle


Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 122 - Pg. 18
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. S 1/2 SEC. 36, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO VILLAGE C1 UNIT 5
I - 110

122:21

1" equals 200'



Acreages Are Estimates

Additional Maping Points Shown in Gray. Road Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Black.

Rev. Jan. 2, 2007

Assessor's Map Bk. 122 - Pg. 21
County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A WARRANTY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and line definitions are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and bearings.

POR. SEC. 31, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.
 SERRANO VILLAGE G
 J - 22

122:60

1" equals 200'



Acres/Acre Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray Text.
 Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Black.
 Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Gray.


Rev. Jan. 2, 2007

Assessor's Map Bk. 122 - Pg. 60
 County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and acreage estimates are based on the best available information and are not a substitute for a professional survey. Users should verify facts and a description of the map.

POR. SEC. 31 & 32, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.
EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN UNIT NO. 2
H - 81

123:04




Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Also calculations and measurements are for general information. Users should verify facts and dimensions with survey.

Rev. June 01, 2006
Assessor's Map Bk. 123 - Pg. 04
County of El Dorado, CA

1" equals 800'



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations such as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray Tone Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Ellipses Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. Dec. 31, 2008

Assessor's Map Bk. 087, Pg. 20 County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SECS. 5 THRU 9, T.9N., R.9E., M.D.M.

119:02



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office. It is based on the best available information and does not constitute a warranty of accuracy. The Assessor's Office is not responsible for errors or omissions. The Assessor's Office is not a surveying firm.


Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown as Gray Tint
Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Ellipse
Assessor's Tract Numbers Shown in Circle

Rev. July 27, 2011

Assessor's Map Bk. 119 - Pg. 02
County of El Dorado, CA

- Parcel Notes**
- ① - PM 22/80/A
 - ② - PM 22/80/B
 - ③ - PM 22/80/D
 - ④ - PM 22/80/C
 - ⑤ - PM 22/81/1
 - ⑥ - PM 22/81/2
 - ⑦ - PM 22/81/4
 - ⑧ - PM 22/81/3



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY, it is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office for the purpose of showing estimated acreages and subdivisions are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates



Rev. Dec. 31, 2007

Assessor's Map Bk. 119 - Pg. 03
County of El Dorado, CA

POR. SECS. 25, 26, 35, & 36, T.10N, R.8E., &
 POR. SECS. 30, & 31, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.
 INDEX BOOK 123

Book 123

1" equals 1,200'



Acreages Are Estimates

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado County Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.

Assessor's Map Book 123, Index
 County of El Dorado, CA

Rev. Aug. 2009



Assessor's Map Book 123, Index
 County of El Dorado, CA

**POR. SEC. 25, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
SERRANO VILLAGE M UNIT NO. 1**

J - 36

123.26

1" equals 300'



Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Lots Paired Shown in Grey Text
Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circle


Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 123 - Pg. 26
County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's Office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations were made using aerial photography. 1/4" = 100' scale. All bearings and distances are estimates.

**POR SEC. 25 & 26, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
 SERRANO VILLAGE M, UNIT NO. 1, J-36
 EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 2, H - 81**

123:02



Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent to Purple Shaded Area, Total Assessor's Book Numbers Shown in Order Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circle

Rev. Jan. 2, 2007


Assessor's Map Bk. 123 - Pg. 02
 County of El Dorado, CA

FOR SEC. 36, T.10N., R.8E., M.D.M.
 EL DORADO HILLS SPECIFIC PLAN UNIT NO. 1

H - 78

123:01

1" equals 200'



Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Gray
 Assessor's Book Numbers Shown in Ellipses
 Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. July 12, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 123 - Pg. 01
 County of El Dorado, CA

THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on the information provided. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.


THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado County Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. The boundaries and characteristics are not guaranteed. Users should verify items such as dimensions and acreage.

Acreages Are Estimates


Rev2, June 05, 2006

Assessor's Map Bk. 123 - Pg. 28
County of El Dorado, CA

**PORS, SECS. 30 & 31, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M.
SERRANO NORTH UPLANDS UNIT NO. 1
J - 18**



123:28




PORS. SECS. 25 & 36, T.10N., R.8E., & PORS. SEC. 30, & 31, T.10N., R.9E., M.D.M. SERRANO NORTH UPLANDS UNIT NO. 1

J - 18

123:27

1" equals 400'



THIS MAP IS NOT A SURVEY. It is prepared by the El Dorado Co. Assessor's office for assessment purposes only. Area calculations are based on the best available information. Users should verify areas and acreages as shown on the map.

Acreages Are Estimates

Adjacent Map Pages Shown in Grey Tint
Assessor's Block Numbers Shown in Boxes
Assessor's Parcel Numbers Shown in Circles

Rev. Dec. 31, 2007

Assessor's Map Bk. 123, Pg. 27
County of El Dorado, CA



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Public Scoping Comments

1 message

Kathleen Newell <knewell@live.com>

Mon, Jul 2, 2012 at 12:06 PM

To: tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us

Cc: bostwo@edcgov.us

Dear Shawna,

I'm requesting access to the letters submitted to the Planning Commission Public Scoping Workshop for the Draft Gen Plan/Zoning update held last Thursday, June 28th. Kim Kerr said there was one from Cal Trans. It was not available for view at the workshop.

Also, Kim Kerr said last week at the Planning Commission public scoping workshop that the first wave of scoping comments would be available to the Planning Commission Board and BOS this week (July 2). She said the public would have access to them as well.

It's imperative the public see those comments asap so we can be informed of the issues that will be discussed at the workshops later this month.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Newell
4576 Foothill Drive
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
[530-306-9371](tel:530-306-9371)



Fwd: Comments from Scoping meeting 6/28/2012

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Sat, Jun 30, 2012 at 6:08 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <colemccormack@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jun 28, 2012 at 4:29 PM
Subject: Comments from Scoping meeting 6/28/2012
To: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
Cc: chris.flores@edcgov.us

Regarding rezoning parcels to be rural or agricultural and the "opt out" option:

Our property (and our surrounding area) originally had been zoned as exclusive agriculture. The county sent a letter letting us know we would be re-zoned to rural and if we wanted to "opt out", we could become residential agriculture (RA-20). Exclusive agriculture status is no longer an option for anyone in our area.

If people don't respond to the "survey", then the county changes their ability to have farming rights by automatically zoning them rural. If a land owner does not respond to the survey, the zoning should stay as close as possible to what they currently have. There is always a percentage of people who do not respond to surveys (for many different reasons). This "survey" was conducted through only one form of communication. If the county is counting the results of a survey, the county should only count those who submit forms for an accurate assessment of land owners wants and needs.

While we attended the final scope meeting, the donut effect came up and let us know that if our neighbors do not either send the form in or opt for "rural", we would not be allowed to have our property zoned as residential agriculture. We have nine properties touching our property, and of those, only two have residents. How do we know the county has been successful contacting the neighbors who do not live on their property? The land owners chose to buy land knowing it is zoned for agriculture. They should at least have to choose to change it.

Solution: The "opt out" should be reversed, and instead give the land owner an "opt in" to change to rural because many people who own land do not reside on their land and do not know about the issues. If, in fact, the county wants to know what land owners want, the county must be clear in the wording of all communications including "surveys".

If you have any questions or would like further comments, please contact us at [530-886-0777](tel:530-886-0777)

Thank you,

John and Nicole McCormack

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

7/5/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Comments from Scoping meeting 6/28/2012

Thank .ou.



Meetings

1 message

Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>
To: jim@dillsandassociates.com
Bcc: tgpa-zou@edcgov.us

Mon, Jul 2, 2012 at 8:29 AM

Dear Mr. Dills:

This is a follow up to a voice mail I left for you earlier this morning.

On Saturday, June 30 you contacted the TGPA/ZOU e-mail inquiring about the details of upcoming meetings. The next round of meetings will be the zoning ordinance workshops to be held jointly by the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission. The meetings will be begin at 9:00 AM in the Board of Supervisors meeting room, 330 Fair Lane in Placerville, on the following dates:

- Monday July 16, 2012
 . Table of Contents, Article 8 – Glossary, and Articles 1 & 2
- Wednesday July 18, 2012
 – Article 3, 4, & 5, and continuing discussion of previously discussed Articles if needed
- Thursday July 19, 2012
 – Article 6, 7, 8 and County-wide zoning map component
- Friday July 20, 2012
 – Recommend final revisions to draft Articles 1-8 text and zoning map

If you have not done so already, please consider subscribing to the www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate website by clicking the "envelope" icon. You will receive an e-mail update when any new information or meeting dates are available.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any other questions.

Sincerely,

Mike Applegarth
Principal Analyst
Chief Administrative Office
El Dorado County
[\(530\) 621-5123](tel:(530)621-5123)

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Michael Mueller, RCDD

Address: 6696 Rhoads Ave,
Placerville CA 95667

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: mike.mue2@comcast.net

I have major concerns about the elimination of livestock on smaller parcels.

These changes would have a negative effect on:
Health of children, adults and animals. Food is Life!
Economy - Small farmers are the backbone of EDC.
Affordable and available food is critical.

Based on this and other issues. This project should be stopped. Do not proceed!

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110041



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Louis

Address: _____

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: _____

No adequate notification
Cameron Park had only 7 days
for scoping.
Housing Element is flawed.
Road width change - No
slope change - No.
Residential changed to higher - No

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED

JUN 28 AM 9:14

Please use reverse for additional comments

110042



Fwd: My contact info

1 . message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Wed, Jun 27, 2012 at 2:18 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 Date: Wed, Jun 27, 2012 at 2:04 PM
 Subject: Fwd: My contact info
 To: Greg Baiocchi <gnbaiocchi@gmail.com>

Hi Greg,

Per our conversation, please see the attached list of parcels with an AP zoning.

Let me know if you have any additional questions.

Shawna Purvines

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Greg Baiocchi <greg@baiocchiwines.com>
 Date: Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 11:19 AM
 Subject: Re: My contact info
 To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Hi Shawna,

I was speaking to Roger Trout about our issue and I'm not sure how to address it inside the scoping process. We had gone through the re-zone process from RE 10 to AP in 2006. Because we were developing a vineyard initially and wanted Williamson Act protection this seemed logical.

This meant going through the whole review and public hearing process, not fun. During this time the winery ordinance was under review, when that process shook itself out in 2007 the AP zoning was completely stripped of any right to's concerning wine production and marketing. (TIMING) became all CUP options...

Obviously, had we known that this was going to happen we would have zoned AE at the time. Now, I see this opt in for RE landowners and the right to ranch market in the PA zoning they would opt into and I am a bit frustrated...

Being converted to LA designation without any other options has again left us with only CUP options concerning Ranch Marketing, although a few more options are available with LA vs AP... We again get bit by (TIMING)...

I completely understand that PA is excluded from Williamson Act and we received our Williamson Act benefits for the last 5 years but I would like to have the conversation on how we may opt in or convert our zoning to PA and loose the Williamson Act or Re-assign to AE, without going through some formal public process.

Under the AP zoning, grapes or (grown product) is allowed for storage or sale. Would LA allow us to at least produce or store wine on site without a CUP. So, no tasting room but production and storage...

The other questions are probably more for Roger's Team, ie what is the CUP process involve?

Please feel free to email or call (530) 620 7066 for more detail or if I can be of any help in your overall program.

Regards

Greg

This is assuming that the RE- zoned owners are exempt from a public process with the opt in program.

On Wed, Jun 20, 2012 at 6:53 PM, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us> wrote:

Hi Greg

Let me know what I can help . ou with.

Shawna

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Cheers,
gb

www.baiocchiwines.com <http://twitter.com/#!/foothillwino>

<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Baiocchi-Wines/145389288840338>

FACE . OUR FEARS & LIVE YOUR DREAMS

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362

shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

AP Parcels.. Isx

 14K

<u>APN</u>	<u>Zone</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Ag Dist?</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Comments</u>
10510011	AP	RR	No	Matagrano	80.91	Lotus	
04671017	AP	RR	Yes	Prod Hon	46.53	Mt. Aukum	
04606137	AP	AL	Yes	Baiocchi	35.22	Fair Play	
09406016	AP	RR	Yes	Sklar	16.78	Fair Play	
09508056	AP	RR	Yes	Smith	20.81	Fair Play	
09318007	AP	RR	No	Cox	22.64	Somerset	
04682010	AP	AL	Yes	Gennis	43.5	Oak Hill	
08420017	AP	RR	No	Scharpf	10	Mosquito	In proposed Ag District expansion
08420013	AP	RR	Yes	Scharpf	10	Mosquito	
08422013	AP	RR	Yes	Scharpf	5	Mosquito	



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

RE: APAC/ EDAC matrix

1 message

Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>

Tue, Jun 26, 2012 at 8:01 AM

To: "Abraham, T" <tabraham@marshallmedical.org>, hidahl@aol.com, maargyres@comcast.net

Cc: tgpa-zou@edcgov.us, kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us, jeff.h@ix.netcom.com, wmwelty@gmail.com, rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net, jlb87@aol.com, gordon@the-helm.net, mranalli@aol.com

Jim/Mike

I have attached the APAC TGPA/ZOU matrix per our discussion at last night.s meeting. Let's us know when you would like to meet again and review your updated matrix.

Thanks

Norm



apac edac TGPA ZOU Analysis matrix6-26-12.doc

71K

EDHAPAC/EDAC Joint TGPA/ZOU Analyses Matrix

May 2012

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 and Table 2-1-Major Concern</p> <p>Multi-Family Use: Consider amending density from 24 units per acre to 30 units per acre to comply with California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) which requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. El Dorado County is located within the Sacramento MSA. Amend the Multi-Family land use to allow for commercial as part of a mixed use project. Amend the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot single family detached design without a requirement for a Planned Development.</p> <p>High Density Residential Use: Consider deleting the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more units per acre.</p>			<p>Amending the density from 24 to 30 units would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. This change would require that the infrastructure must be in place prior to development of the project.</p> <p>This may be appropriate for small developments on a single acre, but when creating more than 10 units in an area, a Planned Development is appropriate—especially if up to 8 units are on a single acre.</p>		

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p><i>Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2 and 2.2.5.4- Major Concern</i></p> <p>Consider amending the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of “improved open space” on site, set criteria for options in meeting a portion of the requirement off-site or by an in lieu fee option as deemed necessary.</p>			<p>This would allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues. The collection of in lieu fees would reduce open spaces which are highly desirable. Regardless of the “improvement” of the open space, a reduction from 30% open space will dramatically change the feel of an area. Even worse, allowing open space to be off-site completely removes the rural feel of an area that is being developed and again violates the fundamental principles of the county’s citizens.</p>		

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p>Policy 2.2.4.1-Major Concern Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance.</p>			<p>Density Bonus has encouraged developers to request higher density projects for increased profits instead of better projects. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density Residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and be evaluated on a case by case basis. Otherwise, a Density Bonus in these zones amounts to a change in land use and would significantly change the intention of the land use in the General Plan</p>		
<p>Policy 2.2.5.4-Major Concern Policy 2.2.5.4 All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High-Density Residential.</p> <p>Consider deleting policy.</p>			<p>The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our county that ensures preservation of open space as well as having infrastructure in-place prior to the development. It is too important to be moved from the most important planning document of the county, the General Plan.</p> <p>This is how to get rid of the 30% open space requirement. If a PD is not required, then I don't believe <u>any</u> open space is required to develop a property. Pack-um and stack-um! Could look like inner-city development on any parcels that are left to be developed.</p> <p>Question, can EDH CSD create more stringent requirements than the County? Maybe we have the CSD pass an overlay on all CC&Rs for the community region.</p>		

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p><i>New Policies-Major Concern</i> Consider setting criteria for and identify Infill sites and Opportunity areas that will provide incentives substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas</p>			<p>This could increase densities in infill areas without providing the required infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed language by staff for “Promote Infill Development” item d) should have the following words added at the end of the sentence “, <u>but only after all infrastructure is in place that will support such future development</u>”.</p>		
<p><i>Policy TC-1a, TC-1b, and Table TC-1-Major Concern</i> Consider revising policies, and table to bring objectives into conformance with policy TC-1p, TC-1r, TC-1t, TC-1u, Tc-1w, TC-4f, TC-4i, HO-1.3, HO-1.5, HO-1.8, HO-1.18, HO-5.1, and HO-5.2, to allow for narrower streets and road ways and to support the development of housing affordable to all income levels.</p>			<p>Road widths should not be set by housing issues, but for public safety issues.</p> <p>Allowing narrower streets sacrifices safety of our citizens in a significant way. To do this for financial gain is not appropriate. Highway standards should be based strictly on safety and if a road cannot meet the standards, that becomes what limits the use and development of a parcel—we should not let the use and development of a parcel dictate the safety level</p>		
<p><i>Policy TC-1m, TC-1n(B), TC-1w-Moderate Concern</i> Consider amending policies to clean up language including; TC-1m delete “of effort” TC-1n(B) replace accidents with crashes; and TC-1w, delete word maximum.</p>			<p>Why replace the word “accidents” with the word “crashes”? Are they considered the same? Is one more inclusive of incidents that the other? Why not include both “accidents and crashes”? Or, are all accidents a subset of crashes? We need to make sure that this change does not reduce the need for safety improvements on our roads</p>		Resolved.

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p>Policy 7.1.2.1-Major Concern Consider amending the restrictions for development on 30% slopes, and set standards in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.</p>			<p>Construction of homes on 30% grade would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion).</p> <p>The existing language in the General Plan seems appropriate. If there are additional exceptions that are appropriate but not currently included, then add them to the General Plan. Keeping this in the general plan allows a proper EIR to be performed.</p>		
<p>Policy 2.2.1.2 -Major Concern High Density Residential: Consider analyzing the effects of increasing High Density Residential Land use density from a maximum of 5 units per acre to 8 units per acre</p>			<p>Increasing the density to 8 units per acre would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>This amounts to giving away the Density Bonus without earning it! The analysis for this type of density should be done through the Density Bonus provision.</p>		
<p>Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1-Major Concern Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas</p>			<p>These areas should be identified before analysis to determine public support for the change. The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>		
<p>Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. <u>The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>			<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p>		
<p>Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which</p>			<p>Language should be added that stipulates that the number of APPROVED dwelling</p>		

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p>combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. The maximum residential density shall be 10 dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers <u>in identified</u> mixed use areas as defined in <u>the Zoning Ordinance</u>. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. <u>The maximum residential density of 10 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provide concurrent with development.</u></p>			<p>units will be dependent on approved traffic studies and the application of appropriate traffic mitigation measures concurrent with development.</p> <p>“Identified” mixed use areas must be disclosed in the Zoning Ordinance before an EIR is prepared.</p>		
<p><i>Policy TC-Xd, TC-Xe, and TC-Xf- Major Concern</i></p> <p>Consider revising the policies to clarify the definition of "worsen", what action or analysis is required if the threshold of "worsen" is met, clarification of the parameters of analysis (i.e. analysis period, analysis scenarios, methods), thresholds and timing of improvements.</p>			<p>This should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points must be established to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service.</p> <p>Is the term being revisited to dilute impacts of increased traffic caused by new developments?</p>		

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p>Policy 10.2.1.5- Major Concern Don't see any ROI language indicating a desire to analyze a change in this policy</p>	norm		<p>The way staff has proposed to change this policy violates another fundamental principle. The proposed word change from “shall” to “may” could result in existing citizens subsidizing developers for the cost of facilities, infrastructure, and services. All development applications for subdivision must require a Public Facilities and Services Financing Plan that assures cost burdens do not fall on existing residents.</p>		
<p>Table TC-2, TC-Xb and, TC-Xd- Moderate Concern Consider amending or deleting table TC-2 and maintain list outside of General Plan and amending any policies referring to Table TC-2.</p>			<p>Traffic is one of the two most observable items to people in the county. A list of these roads belongs in the General Plan. If they are removed, an EIR would have to be performed every time a new road segment was added to the list or the Maximum V/C ratio was changed. The EIR needs to know what to evaluate now and cannot anticipate future changes by the County.</p> <p>In addition, Policy TC-Xf should not have the item “<u>or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 10-year (or 20-year) CIP</u>”. This second item should be eliminated since the CIP changes frequently and is budget dependent. The improvements might never be constructed and then the citizens would have to live with unbearable traffic forever. Or, expecting citizens to tolerate traffic and safety problems for 10 or more years is unreasonable.</p>		

Issue	Sponsor	Why Included	EDH-APAC Position	EDAC Position	Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Disagree • Neutral
<p>Policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1- Moderate Concern</p> <p>Consider amending policies to increase flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when projects are located in a Community Region.</p>			<p>The proposal is to remove the word “<u>shall</u>” and replace with the word “<u>may</u>” in requirement of connecting to public water and public wastewater. This is not appropriate for a Community Region! The whole idea of a Community Region is that infrastructure is readily available. If a development cannot connect to both public water and public wastewater, it does not belong in the Community Region—especially for high-density residential and multifamily residential development. The use of the word “<u>may</u>” might be appropriate in the case of medium-density residential, commercial, industrial, and research and development projects.</p> <p>Also, the addition of the words “<u>if reasonably available</u>” should be replaced with “<u>if appropriate</u>”, otherwise if public water and public wastewater are not “reasonably available” an applicant could claim that they are allowed to develop using well water and/or septic by right.</p>		
<p>Zoning Ordinance: ROI 183-2011- ;- Major Concern</p> <p>6. Provide alternative means to any open space requirement as part of a planned development to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development and focus on recreation in Community Regions and Rural Centers</p>			<p>This will allow too many discretionary decisions by county policy makers on open space issues.</p> <p>The policy change must be clearly defined before an EIR can assess the impacts of this amendment.</p>		



Re: Caltrans Comments: El Dorado County Targeted GPA and Zoning Ordinance Update

message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 7:19 PM

To: Eric Fredericks <eric_fredericks@dot.ca.gov>

Cc: scott.morgan@opr.ca.gov, Susan Wilson <susan_wilson@dot.ca.gov>, Nieves Castro <nieves_castro@dot.ca.gov>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Thanks Eric,

I appreciate you getting us CalTrans comments.

Shawna

On Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 5:13 PM, Eric Fredericks <eric_fredericks@dot.ca.gov> wrote:

Hello Shawna,

I just wanted to clarify one point we made in our letter. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the scope of the TIS before the study begins.

Please let me or Susan know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Eric

Eric Fredericks
Chief, Office of Transportation Planning - South
Caltrans District 3
Sacramento Area Office
Desk (916) 274-0635
Email: eric_fredericks@dot.ca.gov

Susan
Wilson/D03/Caltrans/CAGov
06/25/2012 03:49 PM
To shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
cc Eric Fredericks/D03/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT, scott.morgan@opr.ca.gov
Subject Caltrans Comments: El Dorado County Targeted GPA and Zoning Ordinance Update

Hello Shawna,

Attached please find our comments on the Notice of Preparation for a Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update. We appreciate the opportunity to review the documents and provide comments to El Dorado County.

120089

A hard copy of this letter will be sent to you via U.S. Mail. We would appreciate it if you could please respond to this email to confirm receipt of the attachment below:

[attachment "Final Ltr.ED County.pdf" deleted by Eric Fredericks/D03/Caltrans/CAGov]

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact me at the phone number below, or Eric Fredericks at (916) 274-0635.

Thank you,

Susan Wilson
(916) 274-0639

Caltrans District 3
Division of Planning & Local Assistance
Office of Transportation Planning - South
2379 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 150, MS-19
Sacramento, CA 95833

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 3—SACRAMENTO AREA OFFICE

2379 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 150

SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

PHONE (916) 274-0635

FAX (916) 274-0602

TTY 711

www.dot.ca.gov

C. A. O.
EL DORADO COUNTY

2012 JUN 27 PM 12:02

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

June 25, 2012

032012ELD0008
03-ELD-Var

Ms. Shawna Purvines
Senior Planner
County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane, Building "C"
Placerville, CA 95667

Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update—Notice of Preparation

Dear Ms. Purvines:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The comments in this letter are based on the Notice of Preparation (NOP), and are offered for the purpose of assisting El Dorado County (County) in establishing the necessary scope for the transportation and circulation analysis of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). To this end, we request that the County contact us so that we may assist in establishing an appropriate scope for the traffic analysis associated with the project. As the lead agency, the County is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. The project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Project Understanding

The project involves changes to policies of the County General Plan and an update to the Zoning Ordinance. These changes will take effect county-wide in those areas that are under county jurisdiction. In addition, the County will consider amending the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region Boundary and Agricultural District Boundaries in the General Plan. The County proposes amendments to its General Plan policies and land use designations, with an update to the Zoning Ordinance. General Plan amendments are proposed for the Land Use Element, Transportation and Circulation Element, Public Services and Utilities Element, Public Health, Safety and Noise Element, Conservation and Open Space Element, and Agriculture and Forestry Element. General Plan amendments to be addressed in the EIR are primarily policy changes, although certain General Plan Land Use Designations are also identified for potential amendment.

Vehicle Trip Generation and Distribution Changes Resulting from Project

The land use changes proposed in the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update may pose potentially significant impacts to the State Highway System (SHS). Proposed changes include increasing densities for high density residential, multi-family uses (Policy 2.2.1.2), as well as commercial/mixed use (Policy 2.1.1.3) and could affect the number of projected generated trips and travel patterns throughout El Dorado County. Travel data regarding such land use changes should be included in the EIR and should be based upon the new County travel demand model which is currently being updated. Specifically, the EIR should identify the impacts that the increase in traffic will have on SHS segments, intersections, and interchanges, and any necessary mitigations to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Elimination of Special Use Permit Requirements

Policy 8.2.4.2 considers the elimination of requirements for special use permitting for all visitor serving uses, and instead establish standards, permitted uses, and requirements for permits, in the various zone districts in the Zoning Ordinance. Certain events or activities normally requiring a special use permit under the previous policy may entail traffic redirections or nonstandard uses of State highway facilities. Such uses would remain subject to Caltrans permitting requirements, and as such we request specific provisions be defined in the EIR to consult with Caltrans for any such activity or event prior to the County's approval.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Streamlining Provisions

Item #27 at the top of Page 5 of the NOP mentions provisions for CEQA streamlining opportunities for qualified projects. We would like to be notified early in the process regarding any plans the County may have to take advantage of the Sustainable Communities Strategy CEQA streamlining provisions for projects within two miles of any State highway facility.

Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

One of Caltrans' ongoing responsibilities is to collaborate with local agencies to avoid, eliminate, or reduce to insignificance potential adverse impacts by local development on State highways. We recommend using the Department's *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (TIS Guide)* for determining which scenarios and methodologies to use in the analysis. The *TIS Guide* is a starting point for collaboration between the lead agency and the Department in determining when a TIS is needed. The appropriate level of study is determined by the particulars of a project, the prevailing highway conditions, and the forecasted traffic. The *TIS Guide* is available at the following website address:

http://dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/igr_ceqa_files/tisguide.pdf

The TIS should include:

1. Location map clearly showing project area in relation to nearby State roadways. Ingress and egress for all project components should be clearly identified. The State right-of-way (ROW) should be clearly identified. The maps should also include project driveways if applicable, local roads and intersections, parking, and transit facilities.
2. Project-related trip generation, distribution, and assignment. The assumptions and methodologies used to develop this information should be detailed in the study, and should be supported with appropriate documentation.
3. Average Daily Traffic, AM and PM peak hour volumes and levels of service (LOS) on all roadways where potentially significant impacts may occur, including crossroads and controlled intersections for existing, existing plus project, cumulative and cumulative plus project scenarios. Calculation of cumulative traffic volumes should consider all traffic-generating developments, both existing and future, that would affect study area roadways and intersections. The analysis should clearly identify the project's contribution to area traffic and any degradation to existing and cumulative LOS.
4. Schematic illustration of traffic conditions including the project site and study area roadways, trip distribution percentages and volumes as well as intersection geometrics, i.e., lane configurations, for the scenarios described above.
5. The project site building potential as identified in the General Plan. The project's consistency with both the Circulation Element of the General Plan and the Congestion Management Agency's Congestion Management Plan should be evaluated.
6. Identification of mitigation for any roadway mainline section or intersection with insufficient capacity to maintain an acceptable LOS with the addition of project-related and/or cumulative traffic. As noted above, the project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should also be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Vehicle Trip Reduction

Caltrans encourages you to locate any needed housing, jobs and neighborhood services near major mass transit centers, with connecting streets configured to facilitate walking and biking, as a means of promoting mass transit use and reducing regional vehicle miles traveled and traffic impacts on the State highways.

Ms. Shawna Purvines/County of El Dorado
June 25, 2012
Page 4

We also encourage you to develop Travel Demand Management (TDM) policies to encourage usage of nearby public transit lines and reduce vehicle trips on the SHS. These policies could include lower parking ratios, car-sharing programs, bicycle parking and showers for employees, and providing transit passes to residents and employees, among others.

In addition, secondary impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists resulting from any traffic impact mitigation measures should be analyzed. The analysis should describe any pedestrian and bicycle mitigation measures and safety countermeasures that would in turn be needed as a means of maintaining and improving access to transit facilities and reducing vehicle trips and traffic impacts on State highways.

Please contact Susan Wilson, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for El Dorado County, at (916) 274-0639 or by email at Susan_Wilson@dot.ca.gov, with any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,



ERIC FREDERICKS, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning—South

c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Opt-in letter

1 message

Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 1:29 PM

To: chefluther@.ahoo.com

Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Dear Mr. Luther:

You should have received a letter from us back in March requesting your preference on whether to maintain your property (APN 087-300-45) as an agricultural zone or to allow it to default to a residential zone, as part of the comprehensive Zoning Ordinance update. We only wanted your decision if it was to request the "Opt-in" agricultural choice. In your case, you did not respond, so we propose to rezone it to the residential zone of Rural Lands, which is what you're confirming as wanting in your phone query.

Shortly, another letter will go out asking the same question. Please follow the directions for providing your proper response. If it doesn't require one for the default residential zone then do nothing, but keep the letter for your records.

Sincerely,

Lillian MacLeod, Senior Planner
El Dorado County Development Services Dept.
Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-6583

e-mail: lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: dam failure inundation zoning changes

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 12:12 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>
 Date: Wed, Jun 20, 2012 at 5:19 PM
 Subject: Fwd: dam failure inundation zoning changes
 To: kmulvany@gmail.com
 Cc: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Dear Ms. Mulvany:

In response to your concerns regarding the Targeted General Plan Amendment to Policy 6.4.1.4 that proposes to remove the prohibition on parcel splits within the Dam Failure Inundation (DFI) areas and the proposed consistency requirements in the draft DFI Combining Zone, I will start with some general information first.

Currently, we have no Dam Failure Inundation Zone, so staff reviews projects against the above General Plan policy, as well as Policy 6.4.2.2 prohibiting critical or high occupancy structures such as hospitals from being constructed in these areas. These policies were not a result of safety measures instituted by the state Office of Emergency Services, but of mitigation measures adopted under the 2004 General Plan. There are no safety measures restricting parcel maps from any of the Federal Energy Regulatory Agency's (FERC) regulated high hazard dams within this county. That would include those dams operated by EID, SMUD, PG&E, and GDPUD.

In drafting this combining zone, it was necessary to research the requirements under the county Office of Emergency Services (OES) Hazard Mitigation Plan. The recommendations were what you now find proposed in the draft DFI Combining Zone. The OES felt that the draft ordinance assured public safety due to their involvement with the state Dept. of Water Resources Emergency Action Planning exercise requirements promoting emergency preparedness, mitigation, and response as well as in their confidence that the specific dams are the well-run, well-maintained, and heavily regulated by FERC and the operators.

Thank you for your comments and I hope this helps in your understanding of the draft ordinance.

Sincerely,

Lillian MacLeod, Senior Planner
 El Dorado County Development Services Dept.
 Planning Services
 2850 Fairlane Court
 Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-6583

e-mail: lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 Date: Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 11:42 AM
 Subject: Re: dam failure inundation zoning changes
 To: Karen Mulvany <kmulvany@gmail.com>
 Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Hi Karen,

Thank you for following up on that item. The staff member that has the most knowledge about this is out today. I will follow-up with her tomorrow when she returns and get back to you.

Thank you again and it was nice to meet you last night.

Shawna Purvines

Shawna L Purvines

On Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 10:53 AM, Karen Mulvany <kmulvany@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Shawna,

It was a pleasure to speak to you last night at the Greenwood meeting, where we discussed the proposed changes in the county's existing dam failure inundation zone requirements, which now prohibit parcel splitting for parcels entirely within such zones, and would, if approved as proposed, newly allow parcel splits and additional development.

It appears that this change stems from a recommendation from the Office of Emergency Management, but I have not been able to locate any background documents online.

Would you be able to provide any publicly available documentation on their reasoning for relaxation of this safety measure? I will pass it on to several other property owners in our community who are interested.

Thank you,

Karen Mulvany

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

7/5/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: dam failure inundation zoning changes

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Re: FAX

1 me. sage

TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>
To: Linnea Marengo <ldmarengo@yahoo.com>
Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jun 25, 2012 at 12:12 PM

Thanks, Linnea

We did receive it.

On Fri, Jun 22, 2012 at 3:08 PM, Linnea Marengo <ldmarengo@yahoo.com> wrote:

I just faxed a comment form to the fax number for Ted Goppert. Please let me know if you did not receive it. Thanks.

--- On Fri, 6/22/12, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us> wrote:

From: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>
Subject: Re: FAX number for Comment Forms?
To: "Linnea Marengo" <ldmarengo@yahoo.com>
Date: Friday, June 22, 2012, 1:01 PM

Yes, [530-642-0508](tel:530-642-0508). I will add this to the form.

Thanks
Shawna

On Fri, Jun 22, 2012 at 6:58 AM, Linnea Marengo <ldmarengo@yahoo.com> wrote:

| Is there a FAX number for public comment forms to be returned to you?

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

RE: EDAC answer

1 me. sage

Abraham, T <tabraham@marshallmedical.org>

Fri, Jun 22, 2012 at 12:18 PM

To: hidahl@aol.com, maargyres@comcast.net

Cc: tgpa-zou@edcgov.us, kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us, jeff.h@ix.netcom.com, arowett@pacbell.net, wmwelty@gmail.com, rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net, jlb87@aol.com, gordon@the-helm.net, mranalli@aol.com

It is great to see us all getting up to speed and the patience and respect we are showing each other along the way. I find that encouraging, especially since we have people involved from every area of the County.

We're getting there.

T Abraham
Marshall Medical Center
[530.344.5429](tel:530.344.5429)

From: Hidahl@aol.com [mailto:Hidahl@aol.com]**Sen.:** Fri 6/22/2012 11:06 AM**To:** maargyres@comcast.net**Cc:** TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us; kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us; jeff.h@ix.netcom.com; arowett@pacbell.net; wmwelty@gmail.com; rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net; jlb87@aol.com; Abraham, T; gordon@the-helm.net; MRanalli@aol.com**Subject:** Re: EDAC answer

Hi Maryann,

Thank you for your response. After multiple meetings with representatives of EDAC (T. Abraham, Gordon Helm, Jim Brunello and Mike Ranalli) the EDHAPAC has a much better understanding and appreciation for EDAC's role in the TGPA/ZOU change process. As our collective 'working group' discussed Wednesday night, the proposed Dixon Ranch project off of Green Valley Road has been one of the primary drivers that has energized our community to actively re-engage in the County planning process. We have seen very little growth in EDH over the past three years (mostly commercial), which diminished our community involvement. If the Dixon Ranch project had been proposed two years ago, we would have invariably been more involved in EDAC's activities in the early stages. The evolution of EDAC from being focused on Economic Development to Regulatory Reform was not obvious to many of us.

We have had County staff attend some of our meetings, which has been very helpful, but its difficult to digest everything that has happened over a 2+ year period in a 2 hour discussion. Jim recently presented several slides to our group which really helped describe the EDAC process and some of the 'benchmark' documentation that is available amongst all of the EDAC and County records.

We have another working group meeting scheduled next Monday to further our dialogue and complete a modified version of our matrix.

Thanks for your volunteer service on behalf of all of the residents of El Dorado County.

Best Regards, John

In a message dated 6/21/2012 3:01:30 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, maargyres@comcast.net writes:



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

RE: EDAC answer

1 me. sage

Abraham, T <tabraham@marshallmedical.org>

Fri, Jun 22, 2012 at 12:18 PM

To: hidahl@aol.com, maargyres@comcast.net

Cc: tgpa-zou@edcgov.us, kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us, jeff.h@ix.netcom.com, arowett@pacbell.net, wmwelty@gmail.com, rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net, jlb87@aol.com, gordon@the-helm.net, mranalli@aol.com

It is great to see us all getting up to speed and the patience and respect we are showing each other along the way. I find that encouraging, especially since we have people involved from every area of the County.

We're getting there.

T Abraham
Marshall Medical Center
[530.344.5429](tel:530.344.5429)

From: Hidahl@aol.com [mailto:Hidahl@aol.com]**Sen.:** Fri 6/22/2012 11:06 AM**To:** maargyres@comcast.net**Cc:** TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us; kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us; jeff.h@ix.netcom.com; arowett@pacbell.net; wmwelty@gmail.com; rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net; jlb87@aol.com; Abraham, T; gordon@the-helm.net; MRanalli@aol.com**Subject:** Re: EDAC answer

Hi Maryann,

Thank you for your response. After multiple meetings with representatives of EDAC (T. Abraham, Gordon Helm, Jim Brunello and Mike Ranalli) the EDHAPAC has a much better understanding and appreciation for EDAC's role in the TGPA/ZOU change process. As our collective 'working group' discussed Wednesday night, the proposed Dixon Ranch project off of Green Valley Road has been one of the primary drivers that has energized our community to actively re-engage in the County planning process. We have seen very little growth in EDH over the past three years (mostly commercial), which diminished our community involvement. If the Dixon Ranch project had been proposed two years ago, we would have invariably been more involved in EDAC's activities in the early stages. The evolution of EDAC from being focused on Economic Development to Regulatory Reform was not obvious to many of us.

We have had County staff attend some of our meetings, which has been very helpful, but its difficult to digest everything that has happened over a 2+ year period in a 2 hour discussion. Jim recently presented several slides to our group which really helped describe the EDAC process and some of the 'benchmark' documentation that is available amongst all of the EDAC and County records.

We have another working group meeting scheduled next Monday to further our dialogue and complete a modified version of our matrix.

Thanks for your volunteer service on behalf of all of the residents of El Dorado County.

Best Regards, John

In a message dated 6/21/2012 3:01:30 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, maargyres@comcast.net writes:

J. ne 21, 2012

Mr. John Hidahl
Chairperson, APAC
El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee
hidahl@aol.com

Dear Mr. Hidahl,

I wanted to confirm with you that the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) has received your request to complete the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (EDHAPAC) Targeted General Plan and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update Analysis Matrix. There was a significant delay in this communication because I received it as a forwarded email much later than you originally sent it.

As stated in the matrix heading, many of the proposed Targeted General Plan Amendments and Zoning Ordinance Update revisions have come from multiple entities. EDAC believes the only official way to submit your request is to send it directly to the County. By doing this, it will ensure the response to your request is adequately addressed. This entire process is contingent upon communication with the County through the appropriate channels. EDAC is not that channel, merely a participant in the innumerable discussions.

The Economic Development Advisory Committee strongly supports community groups, organizations and individuals educating themselves on the issues that will impact them. For well over two years, this has been the format for all of our Regulatory Reform subcommittee work. We found that engaging as many people as possible ensured better and more well rounded results. All of our meetings also included County staff as part of the discussions.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you feel I can be of more assistance. EDAC commends you and your group for contributing your thoughts.

Maryann Argyres
EDAC Chairperson
maargyres@comcast.net



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

True July 90

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Jeanne Harper

Address: P.O. Box 291
Pollock Pines 95726

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: jmharp2@comcast.net

1. Camino/Pollock Pines - 3 communities? What are the 3 communities referred to in Camino, Cedar Grove, Pollock Pines

2. Pollock Pines does not want any traffic lights.

3. Planning dept. could decrease processing time if size of project had a direct correlation to steps to completion. Small signage projects should not require the same steps as a large building.

4. Assistance w/ abusive ADA compliance issues - infrastructure to include county assistance in unincorporated areas.

Please use reverse for additional comments

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

110039



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

RE: EDAC answer

1 me. sage

Abraham, T <tabraham@marshallmedical.org>

Fri, Jun 22, 2012 at 12:18 PM

To: hidahl@aol.com, maargyres@comcast.net

Cc: tgpa-zou@edcgov.us, kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us, jeff.h@ix.netcom.com, arowett@pacbell.net, wmwelty@gmail.com, rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net, jlb87@aol.com, gordon@the-helm.net, mranalli@aol.com

It is great to see us all getting up to speed and the patience and respect we are showing each other along the way. I find that encouraging, especially since we have people involved from every area of the County.

We're getting there.

T Abraham
Marshall Medical Center
[530.344.5429](tel:530.344.5429)

From: Hidahl@aol.com [mailto:Hidahl@aol.com]**Sen.:** Fri 6/22/2012 11:06 AM**To:** maargyres@comcast.net**Cc:** TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us; kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us; jeff.h@ix.netcom.com; arowett@pacbell.net; wmwelty@gmail.com; rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net; jlb87@aol.com; Abraham, T; gordon@the-helm.net; MRanalli@aol.com**Subject:** Re: EDAC answer

Hi Maryann,

Thank you for your response. After multiple meetings with representatives of EDAC (T. Abraham, Gordon Helm, Jim Brunello and Mike Ranalli) the EDHAPAC has a much better understanding and appreciation for EDAC's role in the TGPA/ZOU change process. As our collective 'working group' discussed Wednesday night, the proposed Dixon Ranch project off of Green Valley Road has been one of the primary drivers that has energized our community to actively re-engage in the County planning process. We have seen very little growth in EDH over the past three years (mostly commercial), which diminished our community involvement. If the Dixon Ranch project had been proposed two years ago, we would have invariably been more involved in EDAC's activities in the early stages. The evolution of EDAC from being focused on Economic Development to Regulatory Reform was not obvious to many of us.

We have had County staff attend some of our meetings, which has been very helpful, but its difficult to digest everything that has happened over a 2+ year period in a 2 hour discussion. Jim recently presented several slides to our group which really helped describe the EDAC process and some of the 'benchmark' documentation that is available amongst all of the EDAC and County records.

We have another working group meeting scheduled next Monday to further our dialogue and complete a modified version of our matrix.

Thanks for your volunteer service on behalf of all of the residents of El Dorado County.

Best Regards, John

In a message dated 6/21/2012 3:01:30 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, maargyres@comcast.net writes:

J. ne 21, 2012

Mr. John Hidahl
Chairperson, APAC
El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee
hidahl@aol.com

Dear Mr. Hidahl,

I wanted to confirm with you that the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) has received your request to complete the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (EDHAPAC) Targeted General Plan and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update Analysis Matrix. There was a significant delay in this communication because I received it as a forwarded email much later than you originally sent it.

As stated in the matrix heading, many of the proposed Targeted General Plan Amendments and Zoning Ordinance Update revisions have come from multiple entities. EDAC believes the only official way to submit your request is to send it directly to the County. By doing this, it will ensure the response to your request is adequately addressed. This entire process is contingent upon communication with the County through the appropriate channels. EDAC is not that channel, merely a participant in the innumerable discussions.

The Economic Development Advisory Committee strongly supports community groups, organizations and individuals educating themselves on the issues that will impact them. For well over two years, this has been the format for all of our Regulatory Reform subcommittee work. We found that engaging as many people as possible ensured better and more well rounded results. All of our meetings also included County staff as part of the discussions.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you feel I can be of more assistance. EDAC commends you and your group for contributing your thoughts.

Maryann Argyres
EDAC Chairperson
maargyres@comcast.net



12 JUN 27 AM 11:39
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DIAMOND SPRINGS AND EL DORADO
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Diamond Springs Fire Station
501 Main Street
Diamond Springs, CA 95916

June 21, 2012

Shawna Purvine
County of El Dorado,
Development Services Department, Planning Services,
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C,"
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: NOTICE OF PREPARATION for THE EL DORADO COUNTY TARGETED
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE

The Diamond Springs-El Dorado Advisory Committee takes strong exception with the implication in the NOP that the recreation issues in Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Region (DS-El Do CR) will somehow be corrected by future individual development projects and thus will not be addressed in the Targeted General Plan Amendment And Zoning Ordinance for which the EIR is being prepared. It is irresponsible for El Dorado County to expect individual developers to assume and fix the burden of years of neglecting the recreation needs of the Diamond Springs-El Dorado residents.

The 2012 El Dorado County Parks and Trails Master Plan identifies Diamond Springs-El Dorado community region, which currently has no parks, as needing four neighborhood parks to meet the needs of the existing population. The Plan says "The need for neighborhood parks in these areas is already significant". Another quote from the Master Plan:

"In addition, the El Dorado County General Plan Housing Element identifies the need to provide affordable housing with adequate amenities and facilities, including proximity to parks. Both the General Plan Land Use and Housing Elements have designated the Diamond Springs and El Dorado areas as locations to absorb a significant portion of the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for moderate and below moderate incomes. These areas also have the greatest impact on overutilization of parks in the City of Placerville."

Since the General Plan was approved in 2004, numerous developments have been approved or are well into their planning phase, and there has been no progress on providing the parks the residents need. On May 1, 2012, El Dorado County approved a

120688

circulation map for a portion of the (DS-El Do CR) that will accommodate the transportation needs of approximately 7 new subdivisions with 1,112 new lots and 85 apartments; where are the maps showing the location of the parks for the existing population and the parks for all these future residents?

The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update should clarify the requirement for new development projects to provide and maintain improved ("turn-key") park sites to serve new residents if impact fees and/or annexation to a recreation service district/provider is not possible.


If new development is allowed to proceed without providing the parks needed to serve the new population this serious problem will be exacerbated.

The existing General Plan requires the following:

- Policy 9.2.2.2 - New development projects creating community or neighborhood parks shall provide mechanisms (e.g., homeowners associations, or benefit assessment districts) for the ongoing development, operation, and maintenance needs of these facilities if annexation to an existing parks and recreation service district/provider is not possible.
- Policy 9.2.2.5 - The County shall establish a development fee program applicable to all new development to fund park and recreation improvements and acquisition of parklands such that minimum neighborhood, community, and regional park standards are achieved. This fee is in addition to Quimby Act requirements that address parkland acquisition only. The fee will be adjusted periodically to fully fund the improvements identified in the Parks and Capital Improvement Program concurrent with development over a five-year period.

There is no Community Service District or Recreation District to serve the needs of the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community region. For budget reasons, the County eliminated its Parks and Recreation Department and currently there is no entity addressing recreation needs for the area.

The current need for parks in the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Region is called "significant" in the Parks and Trails Master Plan. At a minimum, the scope of the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance needs to be expanded to address the current and future recreation needs in the Diamond Springs-El Dorado Community Region, and potentially the other underserved areas identified in the Master Plan.



Robert A. Smart, Jr.
Chairperson

Hill Ranch input
Ranch Marketing Ord.

6-21-12
Camino

B.4 Concurrency. We sell lots of ag products not grown in the county as do most the farms. Nuts, Dried fruits, special olives etc. I'm curious what harm does that do that makes you want to make it illegal, it helps the farmer pay bills when he gets froze out.
"throw this one out"

B.5 What is this? Max Ranch marketing!
On a 10 acre parcel we're already limited to 5 acres of Ranch marketing because you must have 5 acres of planted crop. once you get over 10 acres and certainly when you have over 20 acres a limit is stupid.

We have between 9 & 10 acres of what the county describes as Ranch Marketing, on over 31 acres. Are we gonna have to spend hundreds of thousands on a S.U.P or bulldoze half our operation?

Jerry Visman

644. 2950

110040

D.

D.L.C

Why the limit of 100 sq Ft of indoor seating, business increases a little every year, the time will come when many of us will need to expand. High Hill needs more seating now, but if we have to spend tens of thousands of dollars on a S.U.P in addition to some of the highest building permit fees in the universe we can't do it. Remember we're only open 3 or 4 months a year, and spend what money we make digging out of the hole a crop loss puts us in. Two years ago it rained on 5 or 6 of the big weekends we lost money that year, so it's not just frost that gets us. I've read the whole ordinance I can't find one thing that's good for us. Remember - chapter 17.36 #17.36.010 Purpose - it states promote and encourage ag to increase the economic viability, this new ordinance does just the opposite. Apple Hill generates more tourism dollars than just about any thing else in the county and whoever's writing the ordinance wants to put it out of business.

D.2 Handicrafts

D.2.b Aq commissioner review - Why?
on a 10 acre parcel you have
5 acre of aq, your house with yard,
a sales building, an aq building
a parking lot, any area left for
crafters would be small, it's a
self limiting situation.

besides Crafters are usually the
older generation and were losing
them. El Dorado orchards can only
fill half their spaces, High Hill has
open spots too. The county doesn't
need to run these people out
of business mother nature will do
it for you!

D.2.c Crafter limits - who comes up with
this and based on what.

We've tried to get more crafters
so has El Dorado orchards they've
ain't that many out there. Once
you get over 20 acres you have
Room for what ever you want.
"throw this one out"

D.3

Family oriented activities - Hayrides, Haymazes, Pony rides, tractor rides etc are allowed, but grandpa taking the grandkids fishing is illegal. I get the feeling this is more of a personal attack on High Hill by who ever's written this. Would you drive 2 or 3 hours with the whole family grandpa included just to buy a bag of apples probably not. Part of the draw of apple hill is that's its fun for the whole family grandpa included. So lets ruin it with this ordinance.

D.4

Why the 500 foot limit on Retail sales, that's a tiny building once you put in shelves and displays and allow for your A.D.A access it doesn't work, 1000 foot limit for over 20 acre parcels or better yet no limit, what's the reason for a limit, more sales more sales tax, government needs money right.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT

E

100 foot limit on indoor seating.

E.1.

Why this 100 Foot limit? when it rains if you don't have a place for the customer to get out of the weather they go home.

think about it 100 sq Foot add in tables and chairs that doesn't leave much room for people. It's stupid throw it out, it seems as if this ordinance is being written just to generate massive spending by the poor farmer on S.U.P.

E.S

Visitor Servicing Uses. what is this? why the attack on fishing, its just another family activitie, one of the more popular ones "throw it out"

I think you already have an ord. that deals with camping and R.V, any way

G.1

Conditional Use Permit.

Its been my experience that when a administrative use permit was all that was needed it wasn't applied and that the much more expensive S.U.P. was demanded

G.2

at 100^o per hour and sometimes 250^o for a 2 minute conversation because of the 15 minute minimum charge, this complete addressing of all uses will quickly add up to tens of thousands of dollars. if a farmer wants to improve or add one single part to his operation that should be all thats looked at. there should be an agreed upon amount not this open check book the county wants us to leave them. Work one hour charge for 3

H.5.

Say for instance the county forces me to get a S.U.P for my little fishing pond, then a couple years later I need to add to my pie house or apple stand I'd have to spend thousands of dollars on a SUD revision even though Pie and apple buildings are allowed by right. why?

I

I.3

The Planning director should have to follow the Ag. Commission recommendations. the planning director's mission seems to be generate money with S.U.P's Don't leave it up to him.

my two cents!

Ask around when was the last time anybody put a decent apple orchard in. Grapes are what's getting planted. This ordinance is just another nail in Apple Hill's coffin. We lost money 2 of the last 3 year frost one year, rain on Sat & of the big weekends the next. We know what we need to survive not someone who sits behind a desk all day!



MIWOK
MAIDU

United Auburn Indian Community
of the Auburn Rancheria

David Keyser
Chairman

Kimberly DuBach
Vice Chair

Gene Whitehouse
Secretary

Brenda Adams
Treasurer

Calvin Moman
Council Member

12 JUN 29 PM 2:28

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

June 21, 2012

Shawna Purvines
Senior Planner
Development Services Department, Planning Services
2850 Fairlane Court

Subject: Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County

Dear Ms. Purvine,

Thank you for initiating formal consultations with the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria. The UAIC would like to consult on the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County. The UAIC is comprised of Miwok and Nisenan (Southern Maidu) people whose tribal lands are within Placer County and ancestral territory spans into Eldorado, Nevada, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yuba counties. The UAIC is concerned about development within its aboriginal territory that has potential to impact the lifeways, cultural sites, and landscapes that may be of sacred or ceremonial significance. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this and other projects in your jurisdiction.

We would like to make a few general points for consideration in developing the scope and content of the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County:


- The UAIC recommends that projects within the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County jurisdiction be designed to incorporate known cultural sites into open space or other protected areas;
- The UAIC is interested in holding conservation easements for culturally significant prehistoric sites;
- The UAIC would like the opportunity to provide Tribal representatives to monitor projects if excavation and data recovery are required for prehistoric cultural sites, or in cases where ground disturbance is proposed at or near sensitive cultural resources;
- The UAIC is interested in receiving cultural materials from prehistoric sites where excavation and data recovery has been performed;

120087

- The UAIC would like to receive copies of environmental notices and documents for projects within the jurisdiction of the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County;
- The UAIC would like to receive all confidential cultural and archaeological reports within the jurisdiction of the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), El Dorado County.

Thank you again for taking these matters into consideration, and for involving the UAIC early in the planning process. We look forward to reviewing the aforementioned documents as requested. Please contact Marcos Guerrero, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, at (530) 883-2364 or email at mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



David Keyser,
Chairman

CC: Marcos Guerrero, THPO



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Eileen Crim

Address: 5120 Clear Creek Rd.
Placerville, CA 95667

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: _____

Thank you for helping to
preserve the rural atmosphere of
El Dorado County. Eileen Crim

*Submitted w/ PV-014-SP Area Plan +
Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor
Master Plan

7-9-12
2:45pm

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

11008B

TABLE 4-6
 FUNDING UNCONSTRAINED SHORT AND LONG TERM(Cont'd)
 ROADWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS LIST

Roadway Units	Short Term		Long Term	
	Improvement	Cost	Improvement	Cost
US Highway 50'				
County Line/Latrobe Road	Widen to 12 lanes	\$10,300,000		
Latrobe Road/Bass Lake Road	Widen to 12 lanes	\$28,400,000		
Bass lake Road/Cambridge	Widen to 10 lanes	\$15,600,000		
Cambridge Road/Cameron Park	Widen to 10 lanes	\$14,500,000		
Cameron Park/Shingle Springs	Widen to 10 lanes	\$17,900,000		
Shingle Springs/E. Shingle Springs	Widen to 6 lanes	\$5,200,000		
E. Shingle Springs/Greenstone road	Widen to 6 lanes	\$5,700,000		
Greenstone Road/El Dorado Road	Widen to 6 lanes	\$5,500,000		
El Dorado Road/Missouri flat Road	Widen to 6 lanes	\$3,200,000		
Missouri Flat Road/Fairgrounds Road	Widen to 10 lanes	\$6,900,000		
Fairgrounds Road/W. Placerville Drive	Widen to 6 lanes	\$3,500,000		
W. Placerville Drive/End Freeway	Widen to 8 lanes(fwy)	\$1,600,000		
End Freeway/Begin Freeway	Downtown Phase I	\$35,000,000	Downtown Phase II	\$150,000,000
Begin Freeway/Shell School Road	Widen to 6 lanes	\$4,500,000		
Shell School Road/Academy Interchange	Widen to 6 lanes	\$5,300,000		
End Freeway/Camino	Widen to 4 lanes(fwy)	\$800,000		
Camino/Begin Freeway	Widen to 4 lanes(fwy)	\$800,000		
End Freeway/Ice House Road	Widen to 4 lanes(fwy)	\$5,700,000		
Ice House Road/Echo Lake Road	Widen to 4 lanes(div)	\$69,800,000		
Latrobe Road/El Dorado Hills Boulevard	Modify interchange	\$8,000,000		
Silva Valley	New interchange	\$17,000,000		
Bass Lake Road	Modify interchange	\$12,000,000		
Russel Ranch	Modify interchange	\$15,000,000		
S. Shingle Springs/Ponderosa	Modify interchange	\$15,000,000		
Missouri Flat Road	Modify interchange	\$11,000,000		

ATTACHED

This is scary! Eileen Crim

HEART OF THE CITY

People, Places, Open Spaces

The Green leadership of Portland, Oregon, is built on these three fundamental elements.


IN PORTLAND, Oregon, we eat inconvenient truths for lunch. And that would be a lunch of wild-caught salmon and locally grown greens in nonsmoking restaurants.

At the very least, we dip those truths in our fresh-brewed, shade-grown coffee and snack on them with our microbrews.

It's hard not to be smug here. From my vantage point up on Council Crest, Portland's tallest peak at 1,073 feet, I watch thin wisps of cloud streak a perfectly delicious sky. I have a crystalline 360-degree view—of mounts Rainier, St. Helens, Hood, Jefferson and Adams, all tall peaks in the rugged Cascade range to the east; the Willamette River that divides Portland into east and west; the Coast Range mountains, that jaggy hump to the west that separates us from the Oregon coast; and south into the Willamette Valley's lush farmland.

Below me, Portland seems to be basking in its near-mythic reputation as one of America's most livable cities. The Rose City has been infused and inspired for decades by forward-thinking leadership; Oregon, especially Portland, was Green before Green became an attitude and a mandate.

I can make out light-rail cars and the tracks that grid the city from downtown to the airport, with more to come. I see well-used bike lanes and curbside recycling



containers, and if I squint, I can just make out Portland's Office of Sustainable Development, the METRO recycling station that turns old paint into new paint, and the tremendous strides we've made in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. (In 1993, Portland became the first U.S. city to adopt a strategy to reduce those heat-trapping gas emissions that Al Gore and many scientists say are responsible for global warming.)

Here, it seems, everybody can eloquently and liberally toss in their two cents about land-use planning, urban growth boundaries, our 5-cent beverage-container deposit, clean air, clean water, sustainability and all things Green.

OUR GREEN MENTOR

Mention Oregon's history of sustainability (or what we used to call "ecology" in junior high), and one name always percolates to the top: Gov. Tom McCall. Elected to the post in 1966, he built a career doing the right

HEART OF THE CITY




things for Oregon livability. He may be best known for his pithy admonition, ostensibly to Californians, "Come visit us again and again. This is a state of excitement. But for heaven's sake, don't move here to live."

McCall's legacy includes landmark legislation to make public and regulate all of Oregon's vast coastline; House Bill 1036, Oregon's first-in-the-nation "Bottle Bill" requiring a deposit on all bottles and cans; and several major land-use protection bills that helped strike a balance between economic development, on which he was tremendously bullish, and Oregon's land, of which he was tremendously proud and protective.

The man's livability ethic has infused everything we've done since, and Portland, bless its heart, has continued to lead the way on a variety of fronts, such as turning downtown in the 1970s into the pedestrian-friendly and vibrant hub it is today, curbside recycling (which we started in 1983), and creating a detailed and far-reaching plan to seriously reduce carbon emissions by 2010.

ONLY THE BEST

There's no way to spare you the litany of Portland's recent "bests." In the last three years, for example, *Grist* magazine called us the second-Greenest city in the world, while MSN.com's City Guides puts us among the 10 Greenest cities in America. OK, we'll have to try a little harder. But we grabbed the No. 1 spot on SustainLane.com's 2006 list of America's most sustainable big cities, *Men's Journal* called



us the best place to live in the United States, *Prevention* (and the American Podiatric Medical Association) in 2006 called us the best walking town in America, and *Bicycling* says we're the best cycling city in America. I could go on. OK, I will. *Outside* magazine ranks us as one of the 10 perfect towns that have it all. No less an authority than *Reader's Digest* says we're America's cleanest city. And Frommer's Guidebooks listed us as one of the world's top travel destinations for 2007.

Below me, Portland seems to be basking in its near-mythic reputation as one of America's most livable cities.

We got there for a reason. People here pay attention and take action. The city of Portland boasts its own 40-person Office of Sustainable Development, created in 2000. Its mission is to "provide leadership and contribute practical solutions to ensure a prosperous community where people and nature thrive, now and in the future."

Our tri-county regional governing body, METRO, with its "People. Places. Open Spaces" motto, oversees ambitious sustainability programs and goals, protects open spaces, cares for parks, undertakes rigorous land-use planning, and manages garbage disposal and ambitious recycling efforts (including reclaiming and recycling the aforementioned old paint).

Even the Oregon Zoo, which falls under the purview of METRO, brags about its Green Team and its ongoing sustainability programs, including water conservation, energy efficiency, recycling, herbivore-influenced composting, waste reduction (like cornstarch beverage cups that are 100 percent compostable) and solar-powered trash compactors.

Oregon's only *Fortune* 500 company, Nike, in nearby Beaverton, has become a major player in sustainability, earning U.S. Green Building Council LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Gold and Silver certifications. Nike is committed to recycling efforts (including its successful Reuse-A-Shoe program), use of organic cotton, elimination of all PVC from its products, and on and on.

BUT WHAT'S AHEAD?

We didn't get where we are by resting on our rose-petaled laurels. And we face challenges that will require diligence, vigilance and an eye to the future. Statewide, voters recently passed Measure 37, undoing much of Oregon's land-use planning clout. (Measure 49 was passed in 2007 to amend it.) Wind-power giant Vestas Americas, a division of Vestas Wind Systems, has parked its new North American headquarters in Portland, but up the Columbia River (protected since 1986 by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act), UPC Wind Partners is exploring the erection of 40 or so 112-foot-tall windmills. These would generate power, but residents are complaining that they would also damage the view, make unnecessary noise and put native birds at risk.

Funding for light rail grows ever more expensive and elusive; the need for buildable land essential for economic expansion pushes Portland's boundaries out into what's historically been some of the most verdant farmland anywhere. And our Willamette River isn't quite as clean as it used to be.

But up here at Council Crest, I can't help cracking a grin as I look around. Somewhere, I'm pretty sure, Gov. McCall is doing the same. It really is Green down there.—Don Campbell

PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED

The United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service,
El Dorado County - Linden Brooks, Conservationist

Consulting Soils Scientist and Remote Sensing Specialist - Charles Goudey

Consulting Geologist - George Wheeldon

El Dorado Irrigation District - Harry Dunlop, Manager

Gold Oak Union Elementary School - Harvey Hall, Principal

Pleasant Valley Fire Department - John Williamson, Fire Chief

El Dorado County Planning Department

Kenneth Milam - Planning Director

James Ingram - Principal Planner

Doug Noble - Senior Environmental Planner

Wendy Reid - Senior Planner

Ross Hutchinson - Associate Planner

Arlan Nickel - Associate Planner

Sam Gillion - Associate Planner

El Dorado County Health Department - Dr. Curtiss Weidmer, Director

Division of Environmental Health - Steve Walker, Director

Intern Environmental Geologist - Joe Norton

Department of Public Works - Art Cort, Director

Assistant Director - Steve Jackson

Associate Engineer - Ken Purcell

Local Transportation Commission and Local Agency Formation Commission
(LAFCO) - Kenneth Milam, Director

The Ad Hoc Citizens Planning Committee for the Pleasant Valley-Oak Hill-
Sly Park Area:

Mrs. Eileen Crim -

Mr. George Peabody -

Mrs. Beverly Herzog -

Mrs. Mary Jane Battaglia -

Mr. Roger Bartlett -

Mr. Milton Mulligan -

Mr. Cecil Thompson -

WHAT I VALUE IN EL DORADO COUNTY
(Would like to see preserved)

El Dorado Trail

Participatory Government

Individuality of our communities

Rural Atmosphere

Natural Resources

Tree covered two lane roads

Open Space

Opportunities to walk and ride bicycles and safely walk dog

Clean Air

Health and safe place to raise children

Quiet neighborhoods

Good schools

Colleen Crim
7/9/12



Re: Comments Regarding TGPA-ZOU

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: taani1@aol.com
Cc: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

Wed, Jun 20, 2012 at 3:29 PM

Hi Taani,

Your e-mail has been added to the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update notification list.

Thank . ou,
Shawna Purvines

On Wed, Jun 20, 2012 at 2:30 PM, <taani1@aol.com> wrote:

M. name is Taani Story and I would like to be on the Administrative Record for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update. Please consider this as a part of the Notice of Preparation Public Comments.

*Name: Taani Story
Address: 5100 Metate Trail
Placerville, CA 95667*

I would like to receive e-mail updates on this project: Yes

It is very important to me to provide my clients with my business model available outside my residential structure and on my property which is zoned RE-10. I am certified in EAGALA, an equine assisted counseling, growth, and learning organization, and this work must be conducted outside.

I appreciate your attention to this request. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 530-409-7016.

Sincerely,

Taani Story

taani1@aol.com

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone: (530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

7/9/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Comments Regarding TGPA-ZOU

solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: EDAC - Reg. Reform - Weekly Meeting Announcement

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 11:35 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <MRanalli@aol.com>

Date: Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 10:48 AM

Subject: Re: EDAC - Reg. Reform - Weekly Meeting Announcement

To: paul.raveling@sierrafoot.org, gordon@the-helm.net

Cc: rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, mike.applegarth@edcgov.us, jlb87@aol.com

Paul,

Item #1: Horrifically Bad Communications....

As I indicated before, within the email notification is the ability to add yourself and others. I have personally added you and Rich to the distribution list so you both should be receiving the EDAC/RR email notifications automatically. Confirmed again this morning 6/19.

Also as I mentioned in the meeting last Friday, our distribution records indicate that John HidaHL has been on the distribution list for years (2011 & 2012). So the repeated assertion that APAC was unaware of these proceedings does not square with my understanding. While I understand that the do_ens of Planning Commission public hearings and Board of Supervisors hearings went completely undetected by APAC until January of 2012 still bothers me.

I accept that the numerous local newspapers who have been covering these proceedings was also somehow missed by the seemingly large number of people in your community whom are gravely concerned about the TGPA/ZOU (LUPPU). We have participants in this process from all reaches of our county, yet APAC was unaware. This responsibility IS NOT solely on the LUPPPU program participants and so repeated assertions that no one notified APAC also bothers me and seems unfair and untrue, thus weakening ongoing dialog and trust.

Item #2: 6/20 Wed traffic mtg @ normal 3:30pm. 6/27 special meeting at 10am.

As the weekly notification (below in this thread) clearly indicates, our typical alternate Wednesday traffic meeting starts at 3:30 pm. On June 27, at the request of DOT, there will be a special meeting at 10am, with agenda as indicated.

Item #3: Your remarks are not complete.

While it was mentioned by someone in the meeting that the county has disbanded many of the original area planning committees, it was also clarified by Art (our historian), that APAC was NOT one that was disbanded. So if you are looking for that conformation you will not likely find it as your effort has indicated.

This leads me back to Item #1 (Horrifically Bad Communications....)

During the Friday meeting discussion about SOME disbanded committees where three high ranking county officials. In the room was Director Roger Trout, and two Senior Planners (Shawna & Lillian). So, why in the world would you go elsewhere to verify your understanding on this matter.

A discussion with a clerk from the CAO's office or calls to newspaper reporters seem to be another misguided communication resulting in horrible delays in getting your questions answered.

I have repeatedly expressed my great disappointment that reasonable questions are not being directed to the appropriate county department or individuals. The communication seem directed to the BOS or the Press, FIRST, causing further delays.

Very unproductive and ineffective as the progress toward mutual understanding has shown...

Michael

(530) 559-4691

In a message dated 6/18/2012 11:58:48 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, paul.raveling@sierrafoot.org writes:

Thanks Mike,

It looks like I'm not on the distribution list for these announcements, and appreciate the copies that you're forwarding manually. Do I need to do something else to be added to the list? See item 1 above.

The Friday morning meetings of the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee are now on my iPhone calendar as a weekly-repeating

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: EDAC - Reg. Reform - Weekly Meeting Announcement
mee.ing. The email announcements are good to supplement that, especially because they include an agenda.

Is Wednesday's Traffic & Engineering meeting at 10:00? Last week I'd understood it to be at 3 p.m. [See item #2 above.](#)

I've been trying to track down any record of the County having shut down all APACs and so far have totally struck out. It's not turning up in web searches, it's not in BOS minutes going back to early April, and asking by phone hasn't produced a result yet. The last step in the phone chain was that the clerk in the CAO's office said they'd have a planner call me. In trying an alternate source, I left voicemail for Mike Rafaty but he's out of town for some number of days. Then I left voicemail for Noel Stack, but also haven't heard back from her -- not surprising on a Monday, since VL has a print deadline on Tuesdays. [See item #3 above.](#)

-- Paul

On 6/18/2012 2:44 PM, MRanalli@aol.com wrote:

You both should be on this distribution list.
Just making sure you are aware of the upcoming meetings.
FYI..M

From: gordon@the-helm.net
To: mranalli@aol.com
Sent: 6/18/2012 12:05:14 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: EDAC - Reg. Reform - Weekly Meeting Announcement

Having trouble viewing this email? [Click here](#)



El Dorado Economic Advisor. Committee
Regulation Reform

EDAC Regulatory Reform Sub-Committee

A stakeholders forum with a notification list of approximately 200 recipients and growing. All members of the public are welcome to attend meetings scheduled at a time to allow the participation of key staff necessary to coordinate County Regulatory Reform using a programmatic approach.

Interested individuals are welcome to participate in working group research and recommendations and are encouraged to get involved with specific functional working groups.

Get Involved!



[Click here for more info.](#)



This Week's Meeting

THIS WEEK'S MEETING Summar.



- Traffic & Engineering Meeting
Wednesda. : 3:30 - 5:30PM
Room 248, (Upstairs, Building C)
EDC Dept. of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Ct., Placerville
(Meetings held alternate Wednesdays)
- Weekl. Reg Reform Subcommittee
Friday: 8:00 - 10:00AM
TAC Room
(Downstairs, Building C)
EDC Dept. of Planning
2850 Fairlane Ct., Placerville

 [Send to a Colleague](#)

 [Join Our Mailing List](#)

[Like us on Facebook](#) 

Reminder(s):

Board of Supervisors on Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 TAZ map and criteria for comment/direction.

Wednesday June 27th at 10 a.m,
Special Traffic & Engineering Subcommittee and
TIM Fee Working Group to discuss TAZ maps and
criteria. Kimley-Horn and Associates will be
available to answer questions.

Scoping Begins for General Plan and Zoning
Update: [Click Here](#)

5/25/2012 Notice of Preparation:
<http://www.edcgov.us/landuseupdate/>

Click here to view:
[EDC Board of Supervisor's Meeting Calendar](#)

Reference Document(s):

Measure Y & Related Traffic Issues
[TrafficReport.2008.pdf](#)

Business Alliance...Update
(Master Catalog - 6/15/12)
[BA.Newsletter_Master.Catalog.June15_12.pdf](#)

Traffic Sub-Committee

Location: Room 248, (Upstairs, Building C)
EDC Dept. of Transportation
2850 Fairlane Ct., Placerville

When: Wednesday, June 20 at 3:30PM

Topics:

- Roadway Network, GIS Map, Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) Map to update
- Future meeting topics

Contact: Michael Ranalli - MRanalli@aol.com

Reg. Reform S. b- Committee

Location: TAC Room
(Downstairs, Building C)
EDC Dept. of Planning
2850 Fairlane Ct., Placerville

When: Friday, June 22 at 8:00AM

Agenda:

- As needed introductions & process overview (10 min)
- CAO Coordination team update/reports (10 min)
- EDAC update/reports (10 min)
- Work Groups updates/reports: (30 min)
 - Agriculture, Natural Resources, Rural Lands
 - Low Density Residential
 - Industrial, Commercial & MUD
 - CEQA & General State Compliance
 - Engineering, Traffic & Fire
 - Community ID
- Continued documentation review & public scoping (60 min)
- Future meeting topics (5 min)

Contact: Michael Ranalli - MRanalli@aol.com
or Gordon Helm - Gordon@helmtech.com

Forward this email



This email was sent to mranalli@aol.com by gordon@the-helm.net |
[Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe](#). | [Privacy Policy](#).

Helm Technical Services | 5050 Robert J Mathews Parkway | El Dorado Hills | CA | 95762

Paul Raveling
Paul.Raveling@sierafoot.org
Web site: <http://www.sierafoot.org>

7/3/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: EDAC - Reg. Reform - Weekly Meeting Announcement

(916) 933-5826 Home
(916) 849-5826 Cell phone

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Notification of El Dorado County Targeted General Plan Amendment & Comprehensive Zoning Code Update

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 2:29 PM

To: paulmerriam@sbcglobal.net

Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Hi Paul,

I received your voice mail. I have signed you up to receive notification on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update. You should start to receive these soon.

Please take a look at the project website at <http://www.edcgov.us/landuseupdate/> It contains all the information on the project, including both current and historical/background information.

The most recent information posted for the Targeted General Plan Amendment & Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update is the Notice of Preparation with exhibits including the Environmental Checklist. At this time the County is seeking comments on the Notice of Preparation.

The website includes a public comment form should you wish to submit your comments electronically.

Please let me know that you have received this e-mail. I want to confirm I have your e-mail listed correctly. Should you have any trouble with the website or have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,
Shawna Purvines

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone: (530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: dam failure inundation zoning changes

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Thu, Jun 21, 2012 at 9:32 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Lillian Macleod <lillian.macleod@edcgov.us>
 Date: Wed, Jun 20, 2012 at 5:19 PM
 Subject: Fwd: dam failure inundation zoning changes
 To: kmulvany@gmail.com
 Cc: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Dear Ms. Mulvany:

In response to your concerns regarding the Targeted General Plan Amendment to Policy 6.4.1.4 that proposes to remove the prohibition on parcel splits within the Dam Failure Inundation (DFI) areas and the proposed consistency requirements in the draft DFI Combining Zone, I will start with some general information first.

Currently, we have no Dam Failure Inundation Zone, so staff reviews projects against the above General Plan policy, as well as Policy 6.4.2.2 prohibiting critical or high occupancy structures such as hospitals from being constructed in these areas. These policies were not a result of safety measures instituted by the state Office of Emergency Services, but of mitigation measures adopted under the 2004 General Plan. There are no safety measures restricting parcel maps from any of the Federal Energy Regulatory Agency's (FERC) regulated high hazard dams within this county. That would include those dams operated by EID, SMUD, PG&E, and GDPUD.

In drafting this combining zone, it was necessary to research the requirements under the county Office of Emergency Services (OES) Hazard Mitigation Plan. The recommendations were what you now find proposed in the draft DFI Combining Zone. The OES felt that the draft ordinance assured public safety due to their involvement with the state Dept. of Water Resources Emergency Action Planning exercise requirements promoting emergency preparedness, mitigation, and response as well as in their confidence that the specific dams are the well-run, well-maintained, and heavily regulated by FERC and the operators.

Thank you for your comments and I hope this helps in your understanding of the draft ordinance.

Sincerely,

Lillian MacLeod, Senior Planner
 El Dorado County Development Services Dept.
 Planning Services
 2850 Fairlane Court
 Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-6583

e-mail: lillian.macleod@edcgov.us

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
 Date: Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 11:42 AM
 Subject: Re: dam failure inundation zoning changes
 To: Karen Mulvany <kmulvany@gmail.com>
 Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Hi Karen,

Thank you for following up on that item. The staff member that has the most knowledge about this is out today. I will follow-up with her tomorrow when she returns and get back to you.

Thank you again and it was nice to meet you last night.

Shawna Purvines

Shawna L Purvines

On Tue, Jun 19, 2012 at 10:53 AM, Karen Mulvany <kmulvany@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Shawna,

It was a pleasure to speak to you last night at the Greenwood meeting, where we discussed the proposed changes in the county's existing dam failure inundation zone requirements, which now prohibit parcel splitting for parcels entirely within such zones, and would, if approved as proposed, newly allow parcel splits and additional development.

It appears that this change stems from a recommendation from the Office of Emergency Management, but I have not been able to locate any background documents online.

Would you be able to provide any publicly available documentation on their reasoning for relaxation of this safety measure? I will pass it on to several other property owners in our community who are interested.

Thank you,

Karen Mulvany

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

7/3/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: dam failure inundation zoning changes

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

Name: W CASSEN
Address: 5180 SILENT MEADOW LN
COVINGTON CA 95639

- El Dorado, May 30
- El Dorado Hills, June 7
- Greenwood, June 18
- Somerset, June 20
- Camino, June 21
- South Lake Tahoe, June 25
- Cameron Park, June 27
- Placerville, June 28

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: _____

[Signature]
PROVIDE FOR HOME OCCUPATION ORDINANCE
outside & with clients

12 JUL - 2 AM 8:11
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110035



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Eleanor Streets

Address: PO Box 268
Pilot Hill, CA 95664

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: _____

Good start but with the huge diversity of interests & concerns a more specialized topic break down would be helpful eg. trails, animal keeping, school environments

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110021



Response to Business Alliance June 15 Newsletter

1. message

Paul Sayegh <paul@sayegh.me>

Mon, Jun 18, 2012 at 9:07 AM

To: Kathy Russell <kathyrussell@sbcglobal.net>, Pierre Rivas <pierre.rivas@edcgov.us>, ron@gotmik.com, Cheryl McDougal <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Cc: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us, Bill Welty <wmwelty@gmail.com>, "claire_labeaux@yahoo.com" <claire_labeaux@yahoo.com>, cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com, "bugginu@sbcglobal.net" <bugginu@sbcglobal.net>, Jeff Haberman <jeff.h@ix.netcom.com>, Rich Stewart <rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net>, Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>, bjjan@sbcglobal.net, Paul Raveling <paul.raveling@sierrafoot.org>, Dave and Susan Comstock <dandscomstock@comcast.net>, aerumsey@sbcglobal.net, alabeaux@yahoo.com, psgratt@aol.com, soldbytami@gmail.com, varshney@saclink.csus.edu, "Hidahl, John W (IS)" <John.Hidahl@ngc.com>, "dkbarton@pacbell.net" <dkbarton@pacbell.net>, Tammy <tccronin66@yahoo.com>, Kala & Growri Kowtha <kkowtha@yahoo.com>, Lori & Tony Giannini <giannini6884@sbcglobal.net>, Mary & Ollie Bollman <mbohlman@sbcglobal.net>, Robin Weinberger <robin@weinbergerlaw.net>, Michele Elliston <readyssetgo@pacbell.net>, james@jamesfanshier.com, Linda & Geaorge West <west.lindam@sbcglobal.net>, Lynellen & Kong lee <lynelledlee@yahoo.com>, Lyssa & Shawn Eastman <lyssa.eastman@intel.com>, Lisa & Jim Tomaino <ltomaino@sbcglobal.net>, Marcia & Ray Lenci <marcia@dizguise.com>, Ann & Jeppesen <ann@automall.com>, Kitty & Rich Stewart <kitty_and_rich@sbcglobal.net>, Carole Terrazas <caroleterrazas@sbcglobal.net>, Phyllis Ikemoto <bpikemoto@yahoo.com>, Dee Dee <driley@golygon.com>, Desiree Cherry <dsccherry@aol.com>, Jaclyn Weise <jaclynweise@hotmail.com>, Karen Schriefer <karen90mph@hotmail.com>, Lorrie Stern <lstern@covad.net>, Lucy Gorman <lucygorman@sbcglobal.net>, Heidi Davinroy <mommyhide@aol.com>, Tammy Cronin <tammy.cronin@sun.com>, Mandy Kennedy <unleashmk@comcast.net>, Jennifer Clarke <greenbull@sbcglobal.net>, Janet Cote <janet@cote.org>, David Drahmman <david.drahmann@gmail.com>, "ron@gotmik.com" <ron@gotmik.com>, CAROL AND ERNIE LOUIS <carollouis4re@sbcglobal.net>

The Business Alliance members consist of the very groups pushing for easier and higher density with less rules, more freedom, and MORE PROFIT. Lets call a spade a spade!

You should know and relay to your organizers that the reason you are witnessing an emotional group is simple.

The BOS has had deaf ears and has received some bad advice from the legal staff consistently over the years.

Individuals have been helpless to fight the County as the BOS approved whatever they wanted despite public opposition. How do I know this? I was one of those people, only I decided to sue the county for violating CEQA guidelines, not looking at cumulative effects, not using current data for analysis, not following the existing General Plan, piece mealing projects and other things. It took a suit to get them to listen and more will follow if they continue the practice. John Knight getting tossed out is a good example of where the community is at. The people have had enough of this arrogance.

Zoning changes to an area without taking into consideration the impacts of surrounding existing neighborhoods is the biggest issue. Traffic, noise, views etc are the things we lose for the profit of high density growth. We are NOT anti growth, we just appose the constant change to high density zoning without adequate planning and a refusal to look at cumulative effects.

In my case I live on 5 acre zoning. I built here because the surrounding bare land was zoned 5 acre but the county approved a PD and a density bonus right next to me and now I have less than 1 acre lots instead of 5 next to my life time home dream. The PD was gated so we couldn't use the open space and the open space was the unbuildable and totally unusable area anyway and the developer was happy to off-load the crappy unbuildable land to get the density bonus. It was a win win for them and a lose lose for us. Of course nobody will want to take care of that open space so hearing that open space doesn't get maintained is no surprise and it's almost laughable. Proper planning would solve this.

O. r experience is everything is geared to help the developer squeeze out more lots and nobody cares what happens to the surrounding home owners who are impacted. How many times have we heard "The developers have a right to develop"

Until policies are adopted for sensible growth, sensible policies with regards to surrounding home owners, compassionate Supervisors who don't play "God", the county will continue to receive stiff opposition to policies that lean to developers profit margins instead of sensible development for El Dorado County.

While your opposition may consist of emotional, uneducated and uninformed people as you put it....These people are the ones that have been impacted by past policies and HAVE HAD ENOUGH! It's a complex process that takes time to learn. The very people you criticize for disrupting your goals will get educated, will get up to speed, will learn the process and will have an effect on the outcome of this. Board members who fail to pay attention to the public outcry will follow the door like John Knight did. Trust me....There are plenty of smart people in the group who understand all of this. Compassion for home enjoyment is stronger than money.

The old policies certainly don't work. The County has loss several law suits now (Oak Mitigation comes to mind)

You might try getting a public meeting together to discuss all of this and hear it first hand from the very people who have been negatively impacted from EXISTING policies that your group would choose to loosen even further. Once you understand WHY people are so upset instead of insulting them, you can then adapt better policies. I found your letter rather insulting as it tries to discredit those who are compassionate and who want to be involved.

Regards,

Paul Sayegh



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Ted Goppert

Address: 5021 Cougar Lane
Georgetown, Ca. 95634

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: tgoppert@gmail.com

I support a home occupation ordinance that is (1) allows me to meet with clients on my property outside. (2) I support keeping permit costs and fees to a minimum for small business.

12 JUN 22 PM 3:03
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110038

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

Name:

STEVE HANSEN

Address:

4561 IMPERIAL CREEK ROAD

GARDEN VALLEY CA 95637

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project?

Yes

No

Your E-mail

Address:

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

I Support a Home occupation ordinance that allows residents to work outside of their residential structures and have household, clients and employees come onto the property. I would also like to see the county keep fees reasonable.

12 JUN 26 AM 7:56
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110036



June 1, 2012

Kim Kerr
Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Potential zoning changes for Divide and Pilot Hill

Dear Kim

Pilot Hill is one of the county's smaller communities located between Coloma and Cool. It is 17 miles from El Dorado Hills via Salmon Falls Road. According to the U.S. Post Office delivery, there are about 600 homes and 1,200 people in our zip code. Most residents live on larger rural parcels of greater than 5-acres.

In addition to a post office, the only viable business is a restaurant and bar, the Hindquarter and a feed store. A few years back we had a general store and gas station but new state air quality regulation for gas pumps made it uneconomical to perform the mandatory upgrades and the general store was forced to close.

The Pilot Hill Peninsula Campground at Folsom Lake is a vacation and boating destination for out of area campers. It is located at the end of Rattlesnake Bar Road, nine miles from Highway 49. The state park maintains two boat ramps, 100 camping sites and miles of hiking and bike trails.

Cronan Ranch Regional Trails Park is located in Pilot Hill. The Park contains over 15 miles of trails for hiking, biking, horseback riding, fishing, bird watching and other passive recreation. The borders of the Park follow the South Fork American River and Highway 49. The Park is open daily from sunrise to sunset year round.

With a small rural population and limited infrastructure, it would be natural not to consider any commercial zoning for the area. That would be a mistake.

Divide Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 34, Garden Valley, CA 95633
The Voice of Business

110024

Although economic circumstances today may not warrant any allocation of commercial zoning, it would be short-sighted not to include some commercial zoning for Pilot Hill. The northwest intersection at Highway 49 and Rattlesnake Bar has ample vacant acreage for future commercial growth. Here's why.

The land is currently zoned high density residential and will likely be changed anyway to comply with the lower density General Plan. It is serviced by a fire station. There is public water and electric available. Commercial zoning is already present at the southwest corner of that intersection. It has the highest daily traffic count in the area. In addition to the four corner location, Salmon Falls Road ends at the property.

To lock up all the land in Pilot Hill as rural low density residential or Ag. prevents trade and commerce from eventually returning to Pilot Hill. Many years ago Pilot Hill had an active rodeo grounds and arena and before the construction of Folsom Dam mining flourished. Today, interest continues to grow in recreational tourism including boating, camping, hiking, biking, white water rafting and equestrian activities.

Every community needs to set aside land for future designated uses including where trade and commerce may visibly engage. The future residents of Pilot Hill deserve the same consideration of having a legacy designation which will accommodate future business opportunities.

Attached is an aerial photo and survey of a vacant land parcel, Parcel 2 that is ideally located for a portion of it to be designated as commercial. The owners are receptive to the change from R1A to commercial.

On behalf of the Divide Chamber of Commerce we urge an allocation of land be set aside in Pilot Hill for future small business.

Sincerely,

Ken Calhoon
President Divide Chamber of Commerce

Support increased uses for ag land to include recreation, home occupation rural commercial.

If the county will not allow rural residential developments or partial splits without costly mitigation, large land owners need to have an opportunity to use their resource productively.

Support mixed use and created flexibility on land use.

Folks will figure out good alternative uses for their land if they have the opportunity.

Support residential and recreational uses on Timber Production Land.

If we can't harvest timber perhaps we can have a cabin or a Boy Scout camp

Support alternatives to the 30 percent open space requirement on Planned Developments.

Better to have 10 percent useable open space than 30 percent unusable.

Support rezone of ag. land to residential if the ag use is not consistent with the surrounding property and not conducive to ag uses

Support re-zone of residential to ag.

Support commercial uses in rural regions.

My neighbor Fred builds cabinets on his 40-acre property

Support deleting the policy requiring a Special Use Permit for ag support services and visitor services.

The Special Use Permit system is a political quagmire. Establish the guidelines by ordinance not favoritism.

Support ranch marketing activities on Grazing land

Currently we can't even have a rodeo unless the land is zoned commercial.

Support creation of a Rural Commercial Zone would be permitted with rural regions.

Support a small designation of commercial land in Pilot Hill

W. C. C.
President
Board *Chamber of Commerce*



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: - Jacqueline Morgan

Address: 2942 Church St.

 Georgetown, CA.

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes

No

Your E-mail Address: jmarchitect@wsbcglobal.net

One side of church st is multi-family - All
are old historic houses on miniscule lots -
w/ septic. How can these be multi-family?
Whereas behind these houses are large
parcels 2-3 acres zoned single family
residential which would be better zoned
multi-family.

What about parcels for co-housing?
Georgetown Advisory Committee does have
design guidelines to preserve the rural
"historic" nature of our town.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110022



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Name:

Sandra Herke

Address:

*PO Box 453
Garden Vly 95633*

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project?

Yes

No

Your E-mail

Address:

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

I support county fees & permits at annual cost so we survive.

JUN 28 AM 7:57
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110037

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Dave Bisher

Address: Box 40

Garden Valley

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: dave@theceramicstop.com

Current

I am a 25 year resident. We raise livestock for consumption we process and slaughter our livestock. currently this general plan does not allow for this or rather does not permit this Must Be changed. An obvious oversight I live in Garden Valley... Should not be any changes with regard to the way of life we adopted, ie we're allowed to target shoot, raise, process, and slaughter livestock. There is already a high enough population density. Also, eliminating the 30% slope rule is irresponsible. I Am Also concerned that the zoning changes suggested will impact our quiet Mountain community mentality... ie. trying to turn G.V. into a city. This meeting as well as the ones in the future

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110023

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

don't allow for people to fully digest
and make informed comments. At the end
of the day, this General Plan (Revised in 2005) takes
people's rights. The Amendments seem to be covering
the bases that '05 missed.

"Good Job for the county" should mean the
people of this county...

If you did not finish
your comments at the time of the
meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Dixon Ranch Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Catherine Taylor - *CT*
Address: 3804 Amer Court 061812
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: _____

Dixon Ranch NOP
1 Additional cars/trucks that will use Aberdeen way and green valley will have an impact to us residents due to more noise.
2 would violate the current zoning codes from low density to high density.
3 more people = more problems. EDH is not a city therefore not enough public safety services provided - i.e. police, fire depts. etc.
4 What about stirring up the Asbestos problem?!

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

RECEIVED

12 JUN 18 PM 1:08

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate

110025



Public Comments to the TGPA & ZOU Notice of Preparation

1 me. sage

Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

Sat, Jun 16, 2012 at 11:59 AM

To: TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us

Cc: Bill Welty <wmwelty@gmail.com>, "claire_labeaux@yahoo.com" <claire_labeaux@yahoo.com>, "bugginu@sbcglobal.net" <bugginu@sbcglobal.net>, Jeff Haberman <jeff.h@ix.netcom.com>, Rich Stewart <rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net>, Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>, bjjan@sbcglobal.net, Paul Raveling <paul.raveling@sierrafoot.org>, Dave and Susan Comstock <dandscomstock@comcast.net>, aerumsey@sbcglobal.net, alabeaux@yahoo.com, psgratt@aol.com, "Hidahl, John W (IS)" <John.Hidahl@ngc.com>, "dkbarton@pacbell.net" <dkbarton@pacbell.net>, Paul Sayegh <paul@sayegh.me>, Tammy <tccronin66@yahoo.com>, Kala & Growri Kowtha <kkowtha@yahoo.com>, Lori & Tony Giannini <giannini6884@sbcglobal.net>, Mary & Ollie Bollman <mbohlman@sbcglobal.net>, Robin Weinberger <robin@weinbergerlaw.net>, Paul Sayegh <paul@sayegh.org>, Cheryl McDougal <cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com>, Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>, Michele Elliston <readyssetgo@pacbell.net>, james@jamesfanshier.com, Linda & George West <west.lindam@sbcglobal.net>, Lynellen & Kong lee <lynelledlee@yahoo.com>, Lyssa & Shawn Eastman <lyssa.eastman@intel.com>, Lisa & Jim Tomaino <ltomaino@sbcglobal.net>, Marcia & Ray Lenci <marcia@dizguise.com>, Ann & Jeppesen <ann@automall.com>, Kitty & Rich Stewart <kitty_and_rich@sbcglobal.net>, Carole Terrazas <caroleterrazas@sbcglobal.net>, Phyllis Ikemoto <bpikemoto@yahoo.com>, Dee Dee <driley@golygon.com>, Desiree Cherry <dsccherry@aol.com>, Jaclyn Weise <jaclynweise@hotmail.com>, Karen Schriefer <karen90mph@hotmail.com>, Lorrie Stern <lstern@covad.net>, Lucy Gorman <lucygorman@sbcglobal.net>, Heidi Davinroy <mommyhide@aol.com>, Tammy Cronin <tammy.cronin@sun.com>, Mandy Kennedy <unleashmk@comcast.net>, Jennifer Clarke <greenbull@sbcglobal.net>, Janet Cote <janet@cote.org>, David Drahmman <david.drahmman@gmail.com>, Sanjay Varshney <varshney@saclink.csus.edu>, Tami Teshima <soldbytami@gmail.com>, "ron@gotmik.com" <ron@gotmik.com>, CAROL AND ERNIE LOUIS <carollouis4re@sbcglobal.net>

RE: Public Comment Period for the Land Use Policy Programmatic Update, TGPA and Zoning Ordinance Update Notice of Preparation, NOP.

Comment #1 Changes to Land Use Manual and Improvements Standards must be part of the process of the TGPA & ZOU. Not a separate process they are interdependent.

June 16, 2012

The changes being proposed to the Land Use Development Manual and Improvement Standards can not be a separate process they are directly related to the Land Use Policy Programmatic Update. If the County is making changes to these without public input and without direct analysis to the Tentative General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update that would be significantly flawed and would be disingenuous to the public. The zoning changes that are being proposed in the Zoning Ordinance Update can not be valid with some of the existing current Standards and existing policy in the Land Use Development Manual that now exist. They could only be valid if Standards and Land Use Manual were changed this is obvious and apparent to many who have been following the TGPA & ZOU. The NOP should identify and analyze the changes to the Design Standards and The Land Use Development Manual alongside the zoning change proposals. The transparency of what changes are being made to the Land Use Development Manual and Improvement Standards is critical as they will have significant effects on the ability to direct zoning where in the past it was incompatible or

acked the infrastructure. I request this email be submitted into public record as my first comment to the Draft NOP

C. mment #2: Time Extention for adaaquate Public Review and Comment on the NOP.
June 16, 2012

The NOP should be extended for a reasonable time of 6 -12 months to allow for adequate review and comments on the TGPA, ZOU, Housing Element Update and Travel Demand Model. The short time frame is not adequate for even professionals that are in the industry to be able to do a review and comment. More scoping meetings need to be given to the public. This is a significant process that has huge ramifications on vested areas and needs to be reviewed thoroughly. One year is a reasonable request based on the enormity and scope of the TGPA and associated changes in public policy and standards beign proposed. The County should have on going scoping meetings and smaller group focused meetings on such areas as the Community Regions and Rural Regions. As we have seen by recent public opinion EDAC's proposals are not cross sectional and representative of a large portion of El Dorado County residents. We need a clear and transparent process and this will require time to define and quantify the proposals and give the public the oportunity to adaaquately review and comment.

Tara Mccann

Comments submitted 6/16/2012

TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us

planning@edcgov.us



Fwd: May 15th Comments to Board of Supervisors - A starting point

1 me. sage

TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Wed, Jun 13, 2012 at 11:45 AM

To: Steve Kooyman <steve.kooyman@edcgov.us>, Natalie Porter <natalie.porter@edcgov.us>, Claudia Wade <claudia.wade@edcgov.us>, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>

Per discussion at today's meeting, here is Tara McCann's e-mail presented to the BOS on May 15th.

Thanks
Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Date: Tue, May 22, 2012 at 2:26 PM

Subject: Fwd: May 15th Comments to Board of Supervisors - A starting point

To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Thu, May 17, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Subject: May 15th Comments to Board of Supervisors - A starting point

To: bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, Steve Kooyman <Steve.Kooyman@edcgov.us>, Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, Terri Daly <theresa.daly@edcgov.us>, Kathy Matranga-Cooper <kathy.matranga-cooper@edcgov.us>, Maryann Argyres <maargyres@comcast.net>, Teri.daly@edcgov.us, Bill Welty <wmwelty@gmail.com>, "claire_labeaux@yahoo.com" <claire_labeaux@yahoo.com>, cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com, "bugginu@sbcglobal.net" <bugginu@sbcglobal.net>, Jeff Haberman <jeff.h@ix.netcom.com>, Rich Stewart <rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net>, Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>, bjjan@sbcglobal.net, Paul Raveling <paul.raveling@sierrafoot.org>, Dave and Susan Comstock <dandscomstock@comcast.net>, aerumsey@sbcglobal.net, alabeaux@yahoo.com, sonda damron <sonradamron@att.net>, Robin Fine-Weinberger <Robin@weinbergerlaw.net>, "mollyoser@gmail.com" <mollyoser@gmail.com>, psgratt@aol.com, soldbytami@gmail.com, varshney@saclink.csus.edu, woody_champion@yahoo.com, "Hidahl, John W (IS)" <John.Hidahl@ngc.com>, "golden59@pacbell.net" <golden59@pacbell.net>, "dkbarton@pacbell.net" <dkbarton@pacbell.net>, Paul Sayegh <paul@sayegh.me>, Tammy <tccronin66@yahoo.com>, Kala & Growri Kowtha <kkowtha@yahoo.com>, Lori & Tony Giannini <giannini6884@sbcglobal.net>, Mary & Ollie Bollman <mbohlman@sbcglobal.net>, Sharon Scheidegger <sharonschei@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: Comments for Board of Supervisors Meeting Ma. 15th, 2012 edited.

To The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors:

I am asking that the Board not approve the Chief Administrative Officers recommendations and to not release the Notice of Preparation without further inclusion of analysis as description of scope:

The public should understand more fully the logic and motivation behind these proposed GP Amendment changes and Zoning Ordinance changes. The ROI adopted by the Board back in Nov. 2011 and used as the framework of the scope for the TGPA & ZOU is heavily developer skewed and has not provided for public input regarding a balanced scope to be analyzed.

There has not been any public scoping workshop meetings yet in El Dorado Hills as we've formally asked for and as the Board directed staff to do back in Feb. BOS Meeting. Only a initial outreach meeting held at the El Dorado Hills CDD March 5th, 2012 identifying the TGPA & ZOU process we were told by Shawna Purvines and Kim Kerr of the CAO's office that El Dorado Hills would get a public scoping meeting in April. It didn't happen. They did come to an APAC meeting but it was not the official public scoping meeting before the approval to move ahead with an NOP as promised. The last two BOS meetings we have made clear we want to have input on scope before approved to go to an EIR. The recommendation by the CAO to have the scoping meeting after the approval and moving forward with analysis of the limited scope is rushed and flawed and is starting to raise public scrutiny as to why it is being rushed and why more cross sectional input is not being included in the NOP. This makes no sense and is not fair to the people.

This being an election year and I would think it would be so important to show balance and inclusion especially when a focused group of residents looking to protect the interests of existing residents are so heavily involved and asking for transparency, fairness and representation. The CAO's office wants the Board to approve this description for the scope of the EIR of the TGPA on May 15th. This should not be hurried to the Board for approval before a more transparent and inclusive scope is included for analysis to achieve a

. would not be turned to the board for approval before a more transparent and inclusive scope is included for analysis to achieve a more representative and balanced TGPA & ZOU in a thorough NOP. It will only create the need to go back and do it again and spend tax payers money.

There are many people voicing a concern that the CAO's office is rushing ahead with the process to put in place policies that will take away or lessen transportation requirements for developers of large projects in the Community Regions such as El Dorado Hills and as a way of encouraging them the County is looking for ways to reduce their costs by reduction in standards, reducing the requirement for when offsite traffic improvements are required, or not requiring any transportation off site improvements at all at occupancy, pushing out long term improvements from the 10 year CIP to 20 years to name a few. These are requests put forth by EDAC that will be analyzed in the TGPA & ZOU process . We also want our fair representation of the following to be included in the scope for analysis in the EIR of the TGPA & ZOU.

1. A Community Overlay of El Dorado Hills inclusive of some localized Historic overlay/s. The El Dorado Hills Overlay to analyze zoning structure and proposed changes to zoning classifications, compatibility's, required traffic safety improvements tied to discretionary projects that are site specific for Community Region needs as a result of the more dense community region corridors. For example site specific corridors of impact needing analysis for additional discretionary projects of cumulative impacts in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills being Green Valley Road and White Rock Road. The CIP is not realistic for the growth planned and the time line of the CIP improvements. Triggers need to be quantified.
2. Analyze worsen conditions - Develop specific policy for mitigation's that are realistic and timely when approved for projects. For example in the Traffic Impact Analysis reports done for discretionary projects when a response is given as Mitigation for a Significant Impact that worsens conditions done for discretionary projects there should be clear and specific engineering substantiation and reasoning not the general comment often given in the projects we've been reviewing such as signal timing can be reallocated or a turn lane and receiving lane can be added to an intersection that is operating at LOS F without Engineering Analysis showing quantifiable numerical data to support this. (See my attachment of comments of WIN Project Review as an exhibit)
3. Analyze densities in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills that still retain the character of Community Identity and Compatibility of existing Land Uses so that we don't end up with 8 houses per acre right along side the rural region or 5 acre parcels. Analyze Community Region specific Transportation Circulation Elements as a mechanism for determining when offsite improvements are warranted or needed for public safety such as left turn lanes and two way turn lanes in the middle between two lane of opposing traffic. Or even a method employed in certain cases of an outside shoulder widening for traffic as an escape lane when traffic is at a dead stop making a left turn movement.
4. Design Standards overlay of El Dorado Hills due to urban and rural criteria differences. The State has different criteria for conventional highway and more Urban Access control the County should have different criteria for urban vs rural.
5. Planned Development Policies to keep character of El Dorado Hills and Open Space requirement of 30% for all Planned Developments and not eliminating Planned Developments in the Community Regions. No in lue of fees. More open space for higher densities.
6. Analyze protection of ridgelines and no build on ridge lines and slopes over x%.
7. Analyze no unilateral zoning changes just because they are not consistent with the General Plan. The law states The General Plan and Zoning ordinance shall be consistent it does not state the Zoning Ordinance has to be consistent with a General Plan that was expanded with the sole intent of forcing existing zoning to be non consistent so that the law could be exploited to forcibly change zoning that is in compliance with codes and policies at the time but in order to bring it into consistency with the newly expanded Land Use Designation they now have to change the codes and policies. There is a legal word for this I will provide at a future time.
8. All Transportation Element changes, deletions, and reductions to be clearly identified as to why this benefits the impacted regions and who authored such change. (i.e. was it a Design Firm who also is doing the Engineering and or acting as an Owners Agent for a large multi family Planned Development that would stand to benefit from such reductions in elements and standards.)
9. Add to page 19 of the Zoning Ordinance El Dorado Hills Community Plan Zones as is done with Meyers Community Plan Zones.
10. Design standards in final form (not Draft) before General Plan is approved and not move elements or policy's into any Draft documents.
11. Analyze expanding Research & Development opportunity develop-able sites in areas throughout the County. A large Industrial and R&D would be well suited for the Meyers area. Tahoe's economy would greatly benefit from this and the Demographics are perfect. If they could just get the convention center built this would be a really great opportunity economically for the County. Would the Fed's have a program to stimulate a local economy with refinancing and sponsoring a construction project that could be sold back to the locals over time. This seems to be a perfect project to qualify for stimulus or Federal assistance. It would greatly help the economic viability not only of the Tahoe basin but the whole County. Has the County entertained taking over this project and making it a County for profit project. I admit I am not completely knowledgeable of resources or avenues for that but in this economic climate it seems like there is a huge opportunity here for the County to make a very significant economic benefit in seeing that the South Lake Tahoe Convention Center gets built.
12. We are not in agreement with #1 of the Draft Zoning Ordinance's pg 54 17.24.010 definition to further the implementation of the General Plan Community Region by distributing the residential growth in to this area. This vague sentence meaning El Dorado Hills. We want a clearer definition and an equitable distribution. We now have HOV lanes to Placerville there is no reason not to distribute High Density throughout the County. Placerville is 12 miles away from the County line.

12. How does pg 54 17.24.010 hold consistent for imposing the Communit. Regions with the highest intensity clustered densities ? That is inconsistent with doing away with planned development, open space, reduced riparian setbacks, removal wildlife corridor protections not to mention one of the biggest issue of how is the County funding and adequately assuring the transportation improvements are being met especially safety improvements at occupancy.

13. Pg 73 Draft ZO 17.27.010 It is the intent of this Chapter to protect historic building and areas, enhance tourism and the economy of the county by preserving the scenic resources along specified routes and define and maintain a sense of community identity. This is our basis for EDH historic overlay to be incorporated in the EL Dorado Hills Community Overlay.

14. Design Review Community - provide for individual DRC to develop design review standards for the protection, enhancement and use of places, sites buildings and structures in order to ensure sense of community. We should start putting in place now concurrently with a General Plan process. EDAC could spearhead this effort. This would be a great opportunity for Reg Reform to show that they are truly a cross section of the County with all interests inclusive and problem solving for each individual geographical area allocated to an EDAC committee.

15. Provide project review procedures which by its character or location requires special site design to minimize aesthetic impacts on adjacent properties. El Dorado County is unique in many ways and sets it self apart from many County's in Calif. in that we have many areas that are site specific that need to have special consideration in planning, review and approval due to either a significant geographic landmark involved, significantly historic structure or area involved in the project, or a significant environmental resource involved. These can not be lumped into a general standard or general review process. There are many resources in El Dorado County that will be lost forever if not reviewed and handled in the discretionary process correctly and sensitively and that would be a great loss for this County's history and identity. Because there is no other County in the World with our individual Identity.
Thank You for Service and I look forward to working with you on this very important General Plan Amendment Process,
Tara Mccann

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: meeting follow up

1 . message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Sat, Jun 9, 2012 at 6:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>
Date: Tue, Jun 5, 2012 at 8:20 AM
Subject: Fwd: meeting follow up
To: Shawna L Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

FYI only.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>
Date: Tue, Jun 5, 2012 at 8:20 AM
Subject: Re: meeting follow up
To: Samuelzolltheis <samuelzolltheis@gmail.com>

The County Departments are trying to consolidate information on one webpage:

<http://edcgov.us/landuseupdate/>

The proposed changes to the General Plan are in a "strike-out/underline" format if you look at "What's New" and click on the the sixth bulleted item unc the 5/25/12 Notice of Preparation.

You can "subscribe" and get notification of updates.

Thanks (and let me know if you find something you want to discuss).

On Mon, Jun 4, 2012 at 7:29 PM, Samuelzolltheis <samuelzolltheis@gmail.com> wrote:

You're on! We're picking up a copy tomorrow.

Would you mind providing us with the specific link for the proposed changes, if one exists? I heard that the strike-out, and re-write format was not be used anymore. How would you know what changes are being considered?? Or how can we obtain a copy with all the revisions to date?

Thank you very much for your reply. We'll stay in touch!

Best Regards,
Samuel and Kim

Sent from my iPhone

On May 31, 2012, at 10:45 PM, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us> wrote:

Samuel,

Thank you for your conversation and understanding. What I need to do is forward your email to Shawna and she makes this part of the Notice of Preparation (of an Environmental Impact Report) and starts to set the stage for how the County Board of Supervisors decides to move forward on the update of its General Plan and Zoning Ordinances. I truly appreciate your opinions and simply request that you familiarize yourself with the adopted County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as well as the proposed changes. All of this is on our County website and I can help you if you have a slow connection or just want to talk.

So this is the deal: I review your recommended information, but you review the County's as well. Information and open lines of communication are always productive. We strive to have a win-win scenario. Please stay in touch. Thank you.

On Thu, May 31, 2012 at 4:57 PM, Samuel Zolltheis <samuelzolltheis@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Trout,

I am following up on our conversation last evening. Thank you for your time and concern for our input.

To make a comment on what I would like to see with regards to the General Plan, would require . our understanding of my viewpoint, which would be best understood by spending some time looking into ICLEI, NGO's, COG's, and in general, U.N. Agenda 21.

I've found the best website is Michael Shaw's FreedomAdvocates.org. Please go to the videos in the right hand column and watch the video recorded in Fresno, CA.

My wish for implementation of the General Plan is for there to be NO LINKS OR ASSOCIATIONS with ICLEI, NGO's, or COG's (Agenda 21). If we do, we are giving our local, CONSTITUTIONAL, ELECTED, free government, of any by the people, to United Nations control.

What we call Law, is often at odds with our Creator, by which true liberty is granted.

Kind Regards,
Samuel Zolltheis

--

Roger Trout
Director Development Services Department
El Dorado County

[\(530\) 621-5369](tel:(530)621-5369)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

--

Roger Trout
Director Development Services Department
El Dorado County

[\(530\) 621-5369](tel:(530)621-5369)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

--

Roger Trout
Director Development Services Department
El Dorado County

[\(530\) 621-5369](tel:(530)621-5369)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.



Re: Thanks..

1 . message

Bill Welty <wmwelty@gmail.com>
 To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>
 Cc: Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jun 11, 2012 at 2:53 PM

Thanks Shawna!

I guess at the heart of all of this is that the community doesn't trust the BOS to do the "right" thing, per their world view.

As a result, the argument is that the BOS's options via the NOP/EIR process should be limited from the start. The argument is that given the choice of increasing density or not, if the BOS is given the option to allow greater density, it will. Ergo, the the community believes that the ROI, NOP and EIR shouldn't even offer the option, for all the reasons why, as articulated in all the emails, documents and other filings with the BOS during the ROI, NOP and EIR processes.

Having just finished the ROI exercise with zero impact on the wording of the ROI, and resultant with the release of the NOP which has the same tone and language, there is anxiety that increased density is a fait accompli, notwithstanding serious concerns about traffic and public safety, and that the "process" is a mere exercise to appease CEQA. That is, the fix is in.

This is why Kim gets beat up at the various community meetings where the focus is on process, and not content. No one now believes in the process; that the community can have any impact on it; that it will ultimately, at the end of the day, result in anything but what the BOS/EDAC believe is best for the county (or specific business interests), regardless of the protests from the various local area communities.

So my question was about how to effect change early on in the process to where it at least appears that local communities can have some impact. If the EDH APAC submits a thoughtful document, "the process" at the end of the ROI phase should have resulted in a letter to the APAC indicating that yes, the points were valid and reflective changes would be made BEFORE the NOP was released.....Or, no, the points were valid, but there are overriding issues that require that the ROI/NOP language not be changed.

We got zero. Nada. No response. The community asks, so what is APAC? It does not appear to have the respect of the county; or any ability to make a difference. So why does it exist? And a serious protocol resource is undermined.

And now we're going into the NOP phase, which, except for a change in the acronym, seems to be moving along exactly as the ROI. We'll submit the same arguments, they'll be recorded, attached to the file. But in the end, the original vision of EDAC/BOS for the county will continue as before, like a train heading for Chicago; and no way to stop it but lay down on the tracks.

Which is why communities then go out and employ their own development/environmental attorneys: to stop the process; to try to make it more responsive to community concerns.

Hate to say it, but I think the last BOS election is reflective of a bunch of folk laying down on the the tracks. For better or worse, I don't have an opinion, but, the community did get a sense that there is a political process that works for them.

Thanks Shawna..... I know you guys kill yourselves for the public, for the county. Your good works are revealed in the presentations, in your emails, in the thoroughness of the website, and in your overtime hours. I was employed at the Air Resources Board for about 20 years.... not a pleasant place to be at times, for the same reasons cited above. It can be hell when political, economic and community agendas collide.

- Bill.

On Mon, Jun 11, 2012 at 2:01 PM, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us> wrote:

Hi Bill,

Kim is out of the office today. She asked that I respond to your questions below.

The question, as posed, is really about the content of the proposed TGPA and ZOU, not the EIR. If the Board decides to revise the proposed TGPA and ZOU after the workshops, then the participants will be able to see that change in the proposed TGPA and ZOU. The EIR will then take that language into account when analyzing the potential environmental impacts of the revised, proposed TGPA and ZOU.

That is the short answer. Here is a bit longer version that might help too.

The Board will decide on what to include in the proposed TGPA and ZOU. This may include more than one option for a given proposed regulation. The ROI is essentially adopted for the purpose of advising the public that the Board intends to update the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance -- it isn't the TGPA or the ZOU itself. If revisions are made following the workshops, a second NOP will reflect any revisions made to the proposed TGPA and ZOU by the Board.

Citizen.s comments are not "adopted" as part of the EIR. Comments on the content of the proposed TGPA and ZOU don't necessarily get into the EIR, at least not as far as being analyzed as part of the "project." The EIR is analyzing the potential impacts of the proposed TPGA and ZOU, it isn't adopting any regulations or approving the TGPA and ZOU. The Final EIR will include a copy of each comment submitted during the review period on the Draft EIR and a written response to the comments. During its deliberations on the TGPA and ZOU, the Board will consider those comments as part of the Final EIR.

Keep in mind that this is the proposed TGPA and ZOU, it has not been approved by the Board. In fact, the Board will not take final action until after the Final EIR is completed and they (and the Planning Commission) hold their public hearings and deliberations on the proposal.

The EIR does not approve or deny the TGPA or ZOU and the Board (or even the Planning Commission) can certainly add or delete items to the TGPA and ZOU at its discretion during its deliberations. Of course, if it wishes to add or delete something that would change the conclusions in the EIR, particularly if the change would result in a new or worsened significant environmental impact, then the EIR may need to be revised and recirculated for public review before the Board can take their final action.

I hope this explanation is helpful. It covers a lot of ground. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks

Shawna Purvines

On Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 3:37 PM, Kimberl. Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us> wrote:

Thanks Bill. Let make sure I have the correct answer before I respond to your question, but we will get back to you.

Kim Kerr
Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Interim Department of Transportation Director

Contact Chief Administrative Office/Risk
County of El Dorado
Chief Administrative Office
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
[\(530\) 621-7695](tel:(530)621-7695)

Contact DOT Director:
County of El Dorado
Transportation Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
[\(530\) 621-7533](tel:(530)621-7533)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

On Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 10:20 AM, Bill Welty <wmwelty@gmail.com> wrote:

Hey Kim,

Thanks for taking all the heat last night. I'm sure that's why you make the big bucks, albeit, I'm not sure they pay you enough for that responsibility. Brutal, eh?

The only lingering question: if the APAC resends it's ROI comments for the NOP, how do the comments (like asking that the definition of "worsen" not be softened, or that densities not be changed) get into the EIR. Or if the comments are resubmitted for the EIR, how do the comments get into, or be reflected in the EIR?

At what point do the comments manifest themselves into a change in the discourse about "worsen" or densities? When the BOS votes at the end? If 6 out of 10 people ask for it? If I get 1,000 names on a petition? How is the decision made and by whom to adopt a citizen(s) comments into a document, the ROI, the NOP, the EIR, the Amendment or Zone documents themselves?

Thanks Kim....

You did well last night; held your own. Democracy in action..... or inaction. :)

| - B.I.I.

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Re: Draft Minutes 5-17-12; Host NOP conversation?

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 10:57 AM

To: Robert Smart <rsmart41@comcast.net>

Cc: Kimberl. Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>, Terri Knowlton <terri.knowlton@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Hi Bob,

As you know I am always happy to attend the DS/ED CAC meeting especially when you feel I can assist in providing additional information or providing some clarity to the process around the County programs.

Unfortunately we have scheduled a scoping meeting in Camino/Pollock Pines the evening of June 21st. Might there be another time I could attend a meeting with your group?

Shawna

On Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 10:18 AM, Robert Smart <rsmart41@comcast.net> wrote:

Attached are our draft minutes for 5-17-12 that we will need to approve at our June 21 meeting. In addition we are close to sending a letter to Mel and Roger that summarizes the Diamond- Dorado discussion. I will forward it on everyone when it is complete.

For our June 21 meeting I am thinking we ought to be hosting a discussion about the targeted general plan amendment. Go to <http://www.edcgov.us/landuseupdate/> for details. The County is hosting quite a few meetings about the topic, but the process they are using does not provide for any interaction by attendees. Kathy and I attended the 5/30 meeting at UMHS. At that meeting, Mary Donkhe?(sp) said that she really needed to hear what her neighbors were thinking. I agree with Mary and am advocating we provide a forum for our neighbors and us. Individually we ought to be thinking of submitting letters, but there may be some common areas that would be appropriate for our committee to comment. I am interested in your thoughts, but am going ahead with an early heads up to Shawana we would like her to attend our meeting. There was a lot of frustration and anger at the UMHS meeting, but I remain optimistic that if we just talk to folks respectfully as neighbors, we can work our way through some touchy topics. Bob

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: Question Regarding Housing Element Update

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Sat, Jun 9, 2012 at 6:34 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Larry Keenan <lobbythis@comcast.net>
Date: Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 3:37 PM
Subject: Re: Question Regarding Housing Element Update
To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Shawna,

Thanks for . our quick answer to my questions. You were very helpful.

Larry

----- Original Message -----

From: [Shawna Purvines](#)
To: [Larry Keenan](#)
Cc: [TGPA-ZOU ZOU](#)
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2012 3:01 PM
Subject: Re: Question Regarding Housing Element Update

Hi Larry,

The range of densities are discussed in the County's adopted 2004 General Plan in the Land Use Element under Policy 2.2.1.2 (page 15 of the Land Use Element). You can review this at:http://www.edcgov.us/Government/Planning/Adopted_General_Plan.aspx

If you scroll down the page you will find under the "Element" section Land Use. Click on the title and it will take you to a PDF document of this element.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or have problems locating the information you are looking for. You are welcome to give me a call at [530-621-5362](tel:530-621-5362).

Thanks
Shawna Purvines

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?ui=2&ik=1386fa587f&view=pt&cat=Scann...>

7/3/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Question Regarding Housing Element Update

entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Re: Fwd: Scoping Meeting/County Process Feedback

1 message

Cheryl McDougal <cher.l_mcdougal@yahoo.com> Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 3:39 PM
Reply-To: Cheryl McDougal <cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com>
To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
Cc: Theresa Daly <theresa.daly@edcgov.us>, Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, Roger P Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, John Knight <john.knight@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Shawna,

Thanks for .our standard response. It demonstrates in what I communicated to as to a broken process. You receive input, but based on this response, you and other members of the County are not really listening to the feedback and content of the message and appear not to care.

Cheryl McDougal

From: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: cheryl_mcdougal@yahoo.com
Cc: Theresa Daly <theresa.daly@edcgov.us>; Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>; Roger P Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>; John Knight <john.knight@edcgov.us>; TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2012 3:14 PM
Subject: Fwd: Scoping Meeting/County Process Feedback

Hi Cher. l,

I wanted to confirm with you that you comments have been received and will be considered as part of the process. We understand that most residents are interested in learning more about the project and particularly how it might impact them and their neighborhood. If you have not already had the chance to do so,you may want to review the 12 page Notice of Preparation (NOP) at <http://www.edcgov.us/landuseupdate/>

The NOP provides a concise description of the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update project. Should you wish to learn more, the NOP includes 9 attachments that provide detailed information of the changes proposed for analysis in the Environmental Impact Report.

If you have specific questions about any of the items listed in the NOP or the attachments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

We very much appreciate your comments and will take them into consideration as we prepare for the remaining community scoping meeting scheduled throughout the County.

Thank you again,
Shawna Purvines

----- Forwarded message -----

From: T. e BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
Date: Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 2:53 PM
Subject: Fwd: Scoping Meeting/County Process Feedback
To: Theresa Daly <theresa.daly@edcgov.us>, Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>, John Knight <john.knight@edcgov.us>

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Cher. I McDougal <cher.1_mcdougal@yahoo.com>

Date: Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 2:00 PM

Subject: Scoping Meeting/County Process Feedback

To: "bosone@edcgv.us" <bosone@edcgv.us>, "bostwo@edcgv.us" <bostwo@edcgv.us>, "bostthree@edcgv.us" <bostthree@edcgv.us>, "bosfour@edcgv.us" <bosfour@edcgv.us>, "bosfive@edcgv.us" <bosfive@edcgv.us>

Ikiat et gnos gntem tsal tgin da tfele datsurf ton gnivk gnitya eon tuda taw et segac ea ni et detsja laere Pal treolen da gnro seradit setap . Wih saw tresp saw a iBo tlio fo et sstap ". For Ms. kie 'syan esp iBo tlio , Diluc ykciu dier ro yn no a iBo tlio da emc ct etoisilroc tat et ylio straw su ct des nirettiw mof mo snere .

Wti et kalc gnikit dact et 45yal rcf et enio finiafer , I rael 'twok fi Ieah nerec sa reitremcol fo et TGPA, ZOUda ROI's ea yev delitel da ot yan sepp rcf a lapiyt El oho ynuoc rezitic ct dier datsesu sa ct taw esst segac ea . Itsaj beiver et oolv mof et Ma 15tginah fo hchw daitta , da ti saw dats tat et nimpu gnos sntem eev yuatropo rcf et cilop ct nael eon tuda taw ea ni esst ispop segac os tat ew dluc refi trejlleri daitcurec tupi . Elyetinifel did ton regah mon saw ti ree dresap ct eb tat . It sakenner yo yan ni et gntem tsal tgin da mof reho sntem tat et ylio ffats et et degac despop seti da nielms sagal yftriel yhw ti si gniob degac , da mof taw ti si yatt ct taw si gniob despop .

It sh reb dsape laees snt ni et tsap nigraah sntem tat Ieah daitta tat esst si akal fo tsut htw et ylio , da tat et oho sh reth atega . By ton gniob et cilop datsesu yhw esst segac ea gniob despop da taw et segac ea snt ct et tsutim tat syhada tu esst . Mra fo su eah okrov htw et ylio ni et tsap da drael datsif tat uy den ct ol moy nolrasser ditetop flesny . I sawoloni ni et rena trejop rehw drael tat et ylio delaf egelvoka tat yet yleria dhn tsiglob tger rcf Ne yo ker dyfibe tat ti sawlamep ylsuiep delvop yo et La adra trejop) , da ero ew dahn da dap rcf et eas tsiglob tger ta mo esape fo reo \$1,000, et ylio

okol ct etepolevel , ylio LeRke , sa ct fi silt sawlaman . Teh ylio trew htw et plevel esuper tat ti saw ton laietan rehw ni taf , et eldw dal yisrel snto notaludac did ton kov rehw gilet ni et taf tat Ne yo ker saw laimep reats . Wedap sraut fosalkol fo lagel eradig ditetop salesno mof et ylio ctense tat et ylio obolf yilp .

set eah dats ralinis seirts . Bih , ti streapa sa ct yhw esst si akal fo tsut . I na ens tat esst easusap tat uy eaf tat ew ea ton eava fo . reho gikow reitagt dailoc da yreho si et yro yaw ct plh ecter tsut ni El oho ylio tremeroy .

Tengnos gntem tsal tgin yro deth ct et kal fo tsut , da did ton erach noselwok fo taw esst segac ea . dth sntem ea atsaw fo xt repp salkol sa yet ea gniob dth .

slape ,

Wih Mdojo
Aredke fo El oho sili
kpa rehu 126-241-04-100 (I rael 'twok fi uy den silt tub eroms tsal tgin das tat et ylio seel ton tpeca erodiparoc sehu uyerefer moy leap rehun)

NOTICE: Bih ehan da ya selif datsat htw ti yan nirec lairelifoc
i da ea datsri vialre rcf et ea fo dthantichi raitre ct

7/3/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Fwd: Scoping Meeting/County Process Feedback

information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

.

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name:

Bill Willman

Address:

2196 Loch Way
El Dorado Hills

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project?

Yes
No

Your E-mail Address:

WGWILLMAN@YAHOO.COM

HAVE MAJOR CONCERNS ABOUT
TRAFFIC FROM DIXON RANCH
GOING THROUGH HIGHLANDS VIAL. THE
SAFETY OF OUR CHILDREN WILL BE MAJORLY
IMPACTED -

RECOMMEND DIXON HOUSING NUMBER
BE LOWERED FROM THE 714 TO
SOMETHY AROUND 200 HOMES AND
NO EXIT THROUGH HIGHLAND VIEW

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110013



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

Name: Victoria Summers
 Address: 2335 Loch Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: Victoria95762@yahoo.com

- El Dorado, May 30
- El Dorado Hills, June 7
- Greenwood, June 18
- Somerset, June 20
- Camino, June 21
- South Lake Tahoe, June 25
- Cameron Park, June 27
- Placerville, June 28

* Please let me know about any Dixon Ranch issues, Wilson Estates

Concerns:

1. Infrastructure
2. NOA - naturally occurring asbestos
Dust mitigation measures
3. traffic issues
4. Density issues - Wilson Estates
- Dixon Ranch
5. concern of level of service - Roads

* Don't make changes to zoning code



Change location for - to a larger venue

Please use reverse for additional comments

June 27 - Dixon Ranch meeting

110019

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
 Development Services Department
 2850 Fairlane Court
 Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Katharine Czarnicki

Address: 4172 Kilt Cir
EOH, CA

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: Kczarne@aol.com

mitigation needs to be publicized + changed to accommodate more angry EdH citizens

Listen to the community - who wants high density housing off Green Valley (Dixon Ranch Project)? Developers who don't live here. If no one within the community wants this, why is it being considered? This will impact our community negatively in the following ways -

- traffic congestion / dangerous road conditions
- water usage
- aesthetic - it is surrounded by rural properties + homes on 14 acres
- crime - we just recovered from a year of home break-ins.
- has anyone considered asbestos from all the construction?

Stop this process or we will sue to make it stop.

Johanne Guin
Extend Scoping Deadlines

Please use reverse for additional comments

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

110018



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: JANNA BUWALDA

Address: 1940 Harlan Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: jabuwalda@sbcglobal.net

The General Plan should be changed to ensure the area North of Green Valley Road stays rural and does not include high density residences. This is required to ensure the quality of life, transportation and water issues are not worsened by heavy development anywhere along Malcom Dixon.

The wording related to shifting costs for infrastructure (like road paving) from developers to tax payers in any TGA or zoning update should not

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgo.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110017



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

The Board of Supervisors or whoever else is responsible should ensure the 30 or 45 days for comment does not start until a complete list of the current wording, proposed change and why for each element/change is available to the public. Ms Kerr confirmed it is currently ~~is~~ piecemeal and defensively referred to the # of meetings already held on this. Meetings can not convey the specifics that the public deserves to read.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Natalie + Catherine Stoppioni

Address: 1723 Dormity Rd
Rescue, CA 95672

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: cesrescue@yahoo.com
swissgirldrivesatruck@gmail.com

Do not change the zoning of the GreenValley
Major Zones area until it has been
compared to the 2004 General Plan -
High Density in this area is unacceptable
The infrastructure cannot handle it.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110016



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Re: Comments Regarding TGPA-ZOU

1 . message

TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 11:57 AM

To: Jim Stommel <jim@lehrauto.com>

Cc: Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, Pierre Rivas <pierre.rivas@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>, Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>

Hi Jim,

Thank you for your comments below. We apologize for any confusion there might have been between the El Dorado Hills scoping meetings for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance and the project specific scoping meeting for Dixon Ranch Development. I am cc'ing: Pierre Rivas who is managing the Dixon Ranch Project. He is available to answer any questions you may have.

Also, your comments below will be added to those received on behalf of the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update Notice of Preparation.

Please contact me should you have any questions regarding the environmental review process for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update at Shawna Purvines [530-621-5632](tel:530-621-5632).

Thank you again,
Shawna Purvines

On Thu, Jun 7, 2012 at 7:33 PM, Jim Stommel <jim@lehrauto.com> wrote:

I just returned from a meeting (6/7) which we were all lead to believe was to discuss the Dixon Ranch Proposal. All 150 of us were wrong. Yes 150 people showed up to oppose the project!! All from Highlands View, Sterlingshire, Green Spring Ranch & West. That is probably close to 50% turn out. Now my concern. I live in Highland View, why would anyone even consider forcing so much traffic is the neighbor let alone a street (Aberdeen) that is such a risky street to travel on (Steep), a street with no sidewalks for children, no street lights for visibility. This is going to be a major disaster waiting to happen if you join 700+ houses next to our small neighborhood. People in Dixon ranch will travel through our neighborhood if they have children going to schools off Silva Valley, etc. Why is it so important to have such density, low income housing next to large lot, acreage communities? Why do all the notices have to be in such verbiage the normal person does not understand any of it. Why does the County spend years to create/adopt a plan and only allow people 30 days for comment?

Thank you,

Jim S.ommel

Ph. [916.646.6626](tel:916.646.6626)

Fax [916.646.6656](tel:916.646.6656)

Cell [916.825.8390](tel:916.825.8390)

Jim@LehrAuto.com

[. www.lehrauto.com](http://www.lehrauto.com)



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Kelley & John Garcia

Address: 515 Alta Vista Ct.
EDH, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: bugginu@sbcglobal.net

Letter to follow: Ina nutshell

- Where land usage and zoning inconsistencies exist why are the proposals recommending HIGHER DENSITIES versus lower densities more consistent with adjoining neighborhoods? Higher densities will significantly impact traffic, public safety, greenhouse gasses.

There is no \$ to widen roads, no County employees to enforce codes or violations of mitigated items.

* i.e. Safeway was supposed to make improvements to intersection of Green Valley Road & Salmon Falls.

No one has followed up and ENFORCED them to make the improvements.

Residents are left with the traffic, safety concerns, and lack of enforcement.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110006 over

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

* Measure B had to be voted on -

These changes being proposed should be
voted on by the public before passed.

If you did not finish
your comments at the time of the
meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Roberta Justyn

Address: 2101 Loch Way
EDH

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: _____

I don't want the zoning to be changed from Low Density to High Density in the Dixon Ranch Project or the Wilson Project. Both projects will have a very bad affect on Green Valley road and the infrastructure would ruin the rural areas. The fact that the (BOS) changed the zoning from agricultural to Low Density and for example that would allow 208 homes on the Dixon Ranch versus 718 homes with High Density computes to an increase of 3X the amount of people using the roads. We have been here in El Dorado County twenty years and never

Please use reverse for additional comments

110012

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

expected that areas of 5 to 10 acres would ever be connected with High Density backyards. Like zoning to like zoning is acceptable and we are not asking for no development but maintaining the correct zoning on behalf of all the people who bought into this community and expect rural areas to be maintained open areas. For a long time there were no additional water meters to be had in this area and now it seems that water is plentiful. When did this change? We are mostly professional intelligent people with valid concerns and would like the respect by being addressed with specifics about projects without having to go through 400 pages of zoning requirements to get answers. Rhetoric is just rhetoric and most of these meetings are atrocities represented to confuse and frustrate the public.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Bill Jeppesen

Address: 2550 Aberdeen Lane
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: bill@automall.com

I wrote my comments on the reverse side.

OVER PLEASE

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110011

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Bill Jeppesen

RE: DIXON RANCH E.I.R.:

How much additional traffic will the project create:
- overall?

- During commute hours?

- in addition to existing Green Valley traffic?

- that will cut through Highland View?

- Also what percentage is expected to cut
through Highland View?

How much construction traffic will the project create:

- overall?

- How much will cut through Highland View?

- How will this be managed/controlled?

Re: Highland View as it relates to Dixon Ranch:

How much traffic currently exits/enters Highland View
via Appien or via Koch?

- How much will enter/exit via Lima through
Dixon Ranch?

Bill Jeppesen
2550 Aberdeen Lane
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
916-941-7553
bill@automall.com

If you did not finish
your comments at the time of the
meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name:

Jennifer Clarke

Address:

2770 Aberdeen Lane
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project?

Yes
No

Your E-mail

Address:

greenbull@sbcglobal.net

I believe there was an initiative passed that ~~required development~~ required developers to pay for any improvements that need to be incurred to the roads/traffic. Are you trying to change that with this scoping project?

I am concerned about the Dixon Ranch development and the environmental impact of traffic through Highland View and Green Valley. It should remain with the parcel size currently approved

Thank you,

Jenny Clarke

Please use reverse for additional comments

110010

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: _____

Address: _____

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: _____

_____ *over* _____

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110009



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

water - the water table seems to be shrinking
& our wells could suffer as a result of
Dixon Ranch Development.

wild life - per Sacramento Bee Apr. 8, 2012 (front page)
"State deer numbers drop
Habitat loss biggest reason for decline."
By putting such high density housing
in an area where the deer now roam.

traffic - making a left turn from
West Green Springs Rd. onto
Green Valley Rd. is difficult during
peak times. Just widening Green
Valley Rd. would not make this
any easier.

quality of life - We moved on our property in
1977 because we wanted to live in a rural area.
We have had goats, rabbits, & a horse. We love the
wild flowers & the wildlife.

Barbara Jensen
3163 Verde Valle Ln.
El Dorado Hills, CA

If you did not finish
your comments at the time of the
meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

110009



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

Name: Martin J. Hoffman, M.D.

Address: 4114 Morningview Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: martin.hoffman@va.gov

- El Dorado, May 30
- El Dorado Hills, June 7
- Greenwood, June 18
- Somerset, June 20
- Camino, June 21
- South Lake Tahoe, June 25
- Cameron Park, June 27
- Placerville, June 28

Regarding the Dixon Ranch proposal:

1. It should be relatively easy to estimate the increase in traffic through Highland View that would result from the proposed Dixon Ranch subdivision. What are the accepted criteria? Has this analysis been performed? What are the results?

2. Why is there no alternative beyond the Greenvalley and the Highland View entrance/exit to/from Dixon Ranch

(over)

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110008

TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

3. Why would existing homeowners be responsible for costs associated with upgrading Greenvalley Road when the developer is the one who stands to gain the most from this development?

4. Is there really a need for so many high density new residences in El Dorado Hills?

5. I was disappointed that this meeting was not an opportunity to address the questions above. When will I have that opportunity? Do our comments really matter?

6. If our comments matter, then I would like it noted that I believe the proposed Dixon Ranch subdivision will result in unsafe roadways in Highland View. Without sidewalks and general use of subdivision roads by children, this is a real concern.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "M.D.", written over a horizontal line.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

Name:

Bob Hblitzel

Address:

1500 Lake Vista Lane
El Dorado Hills, CA 95162

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project?

Yes
No

Your E-mail Address:

bhblitzel@stcglobal.net

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Provide a clear document to comment on that shows existing GP THEN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND ONE THAT SHOWS THE EXISTING ZONING THEN PROPOSED ZONING SO THAT THE CHANGES ARE CLEAR AND WE CAN COMMENT WITH ALL THE INFORMATION NOT PART OF THE INFORMATION.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgo.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110007



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

~~6/7/12~~

~~Provide a chart to
show the original~~

If you did not finish
your comments at the time of the
meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: LOMA ALAMEDA

Address: 2001 Green Valley Rd
EL DORADO HILLS - CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: LOMA@SBC GLOBAL.net

My comments are directed to the Dixon Ranch development in EDH. Since I live across the street and have for 4 years seeing/hearing the cattle from that Ranch, it is why I moved here to be in the country.

1) High density housing planned is not conducive to what's around it. 3 sides are homes on acreage, the 4th is very large lots.

2) WATER ---- Always an issue. Where will it come from? And what happens in a drought year?

3) NO TOPO map. The current map looks like an overlay from "another project". What happens to all the oak trees?

4) Traffic on Green Valley Rd. It's awful now. Green Springs Ranch

Please use reverse for additional comments →

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

110033



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

and SterlingShire both need stoplights, so would Dixon Ranch project. What happens to me and my access?

5) Growth/housing in El Dorado County doesn't need high density developments. That's not what El Dorado County is. It's County, vineyards, orchards, ranches and homes with space to breathe!!

6) Finally - - - Crime. With growth comes crime. Who wants that? I feel safe now, don't ruin a good thing

Shawna O'Connell

19 JUN 22 AM 11:21
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Michael J + JANICE R. FREIRE

Address: 401 Reem Ct.
~~El Dorado Hills~~ El Dorado Hills CA 95702

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: mikefreire@msn.com

~~TS~~
Please see the Reverse side.

12 JUN 19 AM 11:30
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

12 JUN 19 AM 11:30
RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Mail

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110020



Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments to Scoping Meeting 6-7-2012

I am opposed to the changes proposed to the General Plan including zoning changes to implement the Dixon Ranch Residential Project for the following reasons:

Traffic in the Highland View Residential area and Green Valley Road would be more than those roads could handle safely. Increased traffic in the Highland View Residential area would be dangerous since most homes on Aberdeen have children and no sidewalks are present. Autos and children would occupy the same space!

Most homeowners moved to this area to get away from high density living. With high density comes higher crime activity.

This proposal would put a great strain on the resources necessary to support this project! Existing Police, Fire and Medical resources would be put under extreme pressure.

With higher density comes more pollution to the environment! In addition, a forest of oaks will be destroyed to make way for these homes.

A proposal with much less density (similar to Highland View) would be difficult to deal with, but this proposal is beyond extreme.

Michael and Janice Freire

401 Reem Ct.
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Ken Reynolds

Address: 3804 Amer Court
El Dorado Hills CA

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: Sloweyde @AOL.COM

Regarding The Dixon Ranch Project. Although growth happens IN THIS CASE I AM OPPOSED FOR MANY REASONS. #1 ENVIREMENT. IF ONE CAR ADDITIONAL TRAVELS OUR ROADS IT IS CHANGED. WE HAVE ENOUGH TROUBLE WITH THE CURRENT HOME OWNERS RESPECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOOD SPEED LAWS LET ALONE PEOPLE WHO DON'T FIVE IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND WOULD HAVE NO REASON TO RESPECT OUR NEIGHBORHOOD TO GET TO THEIRS. # NOISE FROM THIS NEW TRAFFIC. POSSIBLY 1400 MORE CARS ON OUR SAME ROADS - REALLY? (HOW MANY MORE TRIPS WOULD THAT BE PER DAY?)

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110034



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

3 IF THIS PROJECT IS TO HAPPEN
~~THE~~ IN ANY FORM THE TRAFFIC
SHOULD NOT GO THROUGH ANY
OF HIGHLAND HILLS, ~~OR~~ HIGHLAND VIEW
OR STERLINGSHIRE. 4. ADDITIONAL
NOISE, POLLUTION OF ALL SORTS, SHOULD
NOT ~~BECOME~~ GROW FOR CURRENT
RESIDENCES + THEIR RESIDENTS

LASTLY ZONING SHOULD NOT
BE CHANGED TO ACCOMMODATE
THIS PROPOSED PROJECT, CURRENT
RESIDENTS MOVED HERE BECAUSE
OF HOW OUR TOWN WAS ORIGINALLY
STRUCTURED. IE LOW DENSITY

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JUN 21 AM 11:37
mailed in

If you did not finish
your comments at the time of the
meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: Shawna.purvines@edcgov.us



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: John + Judy Kellebrew

Address: _____

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: _____

We moved here over twenty years ago for a rural lifestyle. We do not want the zoning to be changed from low density to high density in the Wilson or Dixon Ranch projects. There are enough traffic crashes on Green Valley Rd at present.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110014



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: FRANK PAZOURECK

Address: 1076 UPLANDS DRIVE

EDH, CA 95762

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: F_PAZ@PACBELL.NET

The single 2-lane narrow road of Malcolm-Dixon cannot be widened and is not capable of adding traffic beyond current rates without serious traffic consequences.

Turning onto Malcolm-Dixon from Uplands Drive is already a dangerous proposition due to the blind, uphill curve to the East.

I have had several near rear-end issues due to the fact traffic while attempting the turning maneuver stated above.

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110015



Fwd: Meeting June 7 re Dixon Ranch

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 2:47 PM

To: mbohlman@sbcglobal.net

Cc: Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>, Roger P Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>

Hi Mary,

I also wanted to let you know that we did receive your e-mail with comments regarding the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update.

Your comments will be provided to each of the County Board of Supervisors and considered within the environmental review process.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at Shawna Purvines [530-621-5362](tel:530-621-5362) or at this e-mail should you have any questions.

Thank you again,
Shawna Purvines

----- Forwarded message -----

From: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>

Date: Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Subject: Meeting June 7 re Dixon Ranch

To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

FYI

Loretta Featherston

Assistant to Supervisor John R. Knight

District 1

Board of Supervisors, Count. of El Dorado

Phone: [\(530\)621-5650](tel:5306215650)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mary Bohlman <mbohlman@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Thu, Jun 7, 2012 at 2:52 PM

Subject: Meeting June 7 re Dixon Ranch

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Cc: Bub <bohlmano@saccounty.net>

Dear Supervisors,

I neglected in my previous e-mail to specifically list some proposed changes to which we are vigorously opposed. I would urge you to deny them.

Amend density from 24 units to 30 unit per acre. This amendment would have a significant impact on site specific projects designated as multi-family use. Also, there is no corresponding requirement that there must be any necessary infrastructure in place to support the project prior to development (roads, sewer, water, etc.)

Delete the requirement for a Planned Development application on projects of 3 or more per acre. Planned Development designation along with the current requirements are currently in place for a reason. Why delete the oversight on larger projects when the oversight is even more important.

Amend the 30% open space requirement inside of Community Regions and Rural Centers to allow lesser area of "improved open

space". A reduction in the requirement of open space will dramatically change the rural and community feel of which many residents based their decision to move to El Dorado Hills and the County.

Amend the Density Bonus policy which allows higher density than the current zoning designates for that land parcel through setting aside open space as part of a residential project. It is not appropriate to have a Density Bonus in Medium Density and Low Density residential land use areas. Instead, an owner should apply for a change in land use designation and then be evaluated based on merit of the project.

Delete the requirement that all development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the planned Development Development combining zone districts.

The requirement for a Planned Development belongs in the the General Plan as it is one of the fundamental principles of our County to ensure preservation of open spaces as well have having infrastructure in place prior to development.

A public facilities and services financing plan that assures that costs burdens and civic, public, and community facilities, infrastructure, ongoing services, including operations and maintenance necessitated by a development proposal, as defined below, are adequately financed to assure no net cost burden to existing residents shall be required is being proposed to change to read "may be submitted". Thus, the cost for new developments can and very likely will be transferred and born by existing residents rather than by the developer.

Allow for narrower streets and road ways to support the development of housing affordable to low income levels. Allowing narrower streets can significantly sacrifice the safety of our citizens.

Amend the restrictions for the development on 30% slopes. Construction of homes on 30% grades would cause additional environmental impacts on the area (grading, water runoff, and erosion). (Think of the mudslides in Southern California during the rainy season).

Increase high density residential land use from a maximum of 5 units per acres to 8 unites per acre. This would put a tremendous load on the supporting infrastructure (which is already in need of improvement - think of Green Valley Road and Salmon Falls Road) and give the land developer the density bonus without earning it and not necessarily based on the merits of the project.

Add, amend or delete existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas. These areas should be identified and analyzed to determine public support for this change as this could be very significant. That is what El Dorado County is curently known for - community regions and a rural feel.

Modify the term worsen and the corresponding policies that are affected. The term worsen should be a scientific term that has a measurable value and infrastructure trigger points to prevent reduction of traffic circulation and degrading of service. We need to be sure that the term worsen is not "lessened in meaning" to avoid the current barriers to mass development that are currently in place to protect us.

Allow alternative means to any open space requirement to provide more flexibility and incentives for infill development. This will allow too many discretionary decisions by County policy makers on open space issues.

Thank you. I appreciate your denying all of the above proposed changes.

Mary and Oliver Bohlman

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-.ou@edcgov.us>

Fwd: FW: Chapter 17.40.350 El DoradoEDAC_TPZ.docx

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Wed, Jun 27, 2012 at 4:11 PM

To: Cedric Twight <CTwight@spi-ind.com>

Cc: Kimberly Kerr <kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us>, edc.cob@edcgov.us, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <TGPA-ZOU@edcgov.us>

Hi Cedric,

Both the Planning Commission and the Board will receive a copy of all comment letters prior to the Zoning Ordinance Workshop scheduled for the week of July 16th.

Thank you for sending in your comments.

Shawna

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Cedric Twight <CTwight@spi-ind.com>

Date: Wed, Jun 27, 2012 at 3:57 PM

Subject: RE: FW: Chapter 17.40.350 El DoradoEDAC_TPZ.docx

To: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Cc: kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Shawna,

Attached please find the Natural Resource Working Group (NRWG) comment letter on the PRD Zone Ordinance. If you require any additional information feel free to contact me directly. Also I would like copies of this letter to be distributed to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. I have sent a copy to the Clerk of the Board so the Board members will receive a copy of the letter, but I am not sure who distributes this kind of correspondence to the Planning Commission. Can you get the Planning Commissioners a copy?

Sincerely,

Cedric Twight

530-378-8127

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



NRWG comment letter PRD Zone Ordinance.pdf
6216K

-- ...

Cedric Twight
EDAC Regulatory Reform Sub-Committee
Natural Resources Working Group
P.O. Box 496014
Redding, CA 96049-6014
June 26, 2012

El Dorado Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Board Members:

The following is intended to inform El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, Planning Commissioners and the Planning staff regarding how the Public Release Draft (PRD) Zone Ordinance dated 5-25-2012 does not adequately address the Board of Supervisors Resolution of Intention 184-2011. The following excerpts are from the PRD Zone Ordinance dated 5-25-2012; suggested changes include strikeouts (~~deletions~~) and alternate language (underlined red letters). The suggested changes are modifications that will bring consistency between the various sections of the PRD Zone Ordinance and ROI 184-2011. Natural Resource Working Group comments on the individual sections and their applicability to meeting the intent of ROI 184-2011 are made in *italics* and precede each section of the PRD Zone Ordinance excerpts in which edits are suggested. The Items are listed in the numerical order of the Sections in which they appear.

Please incorporate all of the suggested language changes as an alternative to the PRD Zone Ordinance dated 5-25-2012, so that it can be studied in the Environmental Impact Report for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update.

Item 1)

The Natural Resource Working Group (NRWG) envisions more potential opportunities for lodging, outdoor recreation and retreat accommodations within timber production zone land than were proposed in the PRD Zone Ordinance. The Use Matrix below has been edited to reflect the opportunities that the NRWG believe are consistent with the Purpose of Sections 17.040.170 and Section 17.040.210 found in the PRD Zone Ordinance dated 5-25-2011 and the Board of Supervisors ROI 184-2011. Note: A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is discretionary and requires a full CEQA evaluation.

17.21.020 Matrix of Permitted Uses

Uses are permitted in the following zones subject to the requirements of this Title as designated in Table 17.21.020 below:

Table 17.21.020 Agricultural and Resource Zone Districts Use Matrix

USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
Agricultural							
Animal Keeping	P	P	P	P	P	P	17.40.080
Barn; Stable, private; Storage structure	P	P	P	P	P	CUP ³	17.40.030
Cropland	P	P	P	P	P	—	
Grazing	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Livestock, high density	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	—	—	
Nursery, plants: Wholesale	P	P	P	P	A/CUP ¹	A/CUP ¹	
Orchards and Vineyards	P	P	P	P	P	—	
Packing: On site products	P	P	P	P	P	CUP	
Off site products	P/ CUP	P/ CUP	P/ CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Processing, on site products	P	P	P	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Produce Sales	P/MUP	P/MUP	P/MUP	P/MUP	P/MUP	—	17.40.240
Timber	P	P	P	P	P	P	17.40.350
Residential							
Child Day Care Home: Small family day care home	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.110
Large family day care home	CUP	A	A	A	A	—	
Community Care Facility: Small (serving 6 or fewer)	—	—	—	P	—	—	
Large (serving 7 or more)	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Dwelling: Single-unit, detached	P	P	P	P	P	A/MUP ⁴	17.40.350
Temporary during construction	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.190
Employee Housing: Agricultural	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/ CUP	—	17.40.120
Construction	—	—	A	A	A	—	17.40.190
Seasonal Worker	—	—	P/A/CUP	P/A/CUP	P/A/CU P	—	17.40.120
Guest House	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.150
Hardship Mobile Home	TMA	TMA	TMA	TMA	TMA	—	17.40.190

USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
LA: Limited Agricultural	P Permitted use (Article 4)						
PA: Planned Agricultural	A Administrative permit required (17.52.010)						
AG: Agricultural Grazing	T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070)						
RL: Rural Lands	CUP/ Conditional use permit required/						
FR: Forest Resource	MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020)						
TPZ: Timber Production Zone	TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060)						
	— Use not allowed in zone						
Kennel, private²	P/CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	—	17.40.080
Room Rental: One bedroom, only	P	P	P	P	P	—	
Secondary Dwelling	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.060, 17.40.300
Commercial							
Agricultural Support Services	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.070
Animal Sales and Service: Veterinary Clinic	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Contractor's Office: Off site	—	—	—	TUP	TUP	—	17.40.190
Home Occupation	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	P/A/ M/CUP	—	17.40.160
Kennel, commercial	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.070
Lodging Facilities: Agricultural Homestay	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	—	—	17.40.170
*Agricultural and Timber Resource Lodging	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	
Bed and Breakfast Inn	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	
Dude Ranch	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	
Health Resort and Retreat Center	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	
Vacation Home Rental	A	A	A	A	A	—	17.40.370
Nursery, plants: Retail	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Outdoor Retail Sales: Garage Sales	P	P	P	P	P	—	17.40.220
Temporary Outdoor	A/T	A/T	A/T	A/T	—	—	
Ranch Marketing	CUP	P/A/ CUP	P/A/CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.260
Wineries	CUP	P/CUP	P/CUP	CUP	—	—	17.40.400
Industrial							
Mineral Exploration	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	A/CUP	Chapter 17.29
Mineral Production	—	—	—	CUP	—	A/ CUP	
Mining	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	A/ CUP	
Slaughterhouse	—	CUP	CUP	—	—	—	
Storage Yard: Equipment and Material Permanent	—	—	—	—	—	P/ CUP	17.40.320
Temporary	T	T	T	T	T	T	

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Recreation and Open Space							
Campground	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	17.40.100
Camping, Temporary	—	—	—	—	—	P	
Golf Course	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Hiking and Equestrian Trail	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Hunting/Fishing Club, Farm, or Facility	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	
Marina: Non-motorized Craft	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area	—	—	—	—	CUP	CUP ³	
Park, day use	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.210
Picnic Area	CUP	P	P	P	P	P	
Resource Protection and Restoration	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Ski Area	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.210
Snow Play Area	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	
Special Events, temporary	T	T	T	T	T	—	
Stable, commercial	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	17.40.210
Trail Head Parking or Staging Area	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP ³	
Civic Uses							
Cemetery	—	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	—	
Churches and Community Assembly	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	
Community Services: Cultural centers, living history facilities	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Intensive	—	—	—	CUP	CUP	—	
Schools: College and University	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	17.40.230
Elementary and Secondary, Private	—	—	—	CUP	—	—	
Transportation							
Airports, Airstrips, and Heliports	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	17.40.070
Utility and Communication							
Communication Facilities	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	A/ CUP	CUP	17.40.130
Public Utility Service Facilities: Intensive	—	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	17.40.250
Minor	P	P	P	P	P	P	

LA: Limited Agricultural PA: Planned Agricultural AG: Agricultural Grazing RL: Rural Lands FR: Forest Resource TPZ: Timber Production Zone	P Permitted use (Article 4) A Administrative permit required (17.52.010) T Temporary use permit required (17.52.070) CUP/ Conditional use permit required/ MUP Minor use permit required (17.52.020) TMA Temporary mobile home permit (17.52.060) — Use not allowed in zone						
USE TYPE	LA	PA	AG	RL	FR	TPZ	Specific Use Reg.
Wind Energy Conversion System	See Table 17.40.390.1 (WECS Use Matrix)						17.40.390
NOTES:							
¹ Administrative permit when plant material grown for restocking purposes; all other purposes require Conditional Use Permit.							
² Dogs used for herding or guardian purposes in ranching or browsing operations are allowed by right subject to licensing requirements of Animal Control in compliance with Title 6.							
³ <u>Restricted to Parcels 160 acres and larger.</u>							
⁴ <u>Administrative Permit on Parcels 160 acres and larger. Minor Use permit on existing legal parcels <160 acres.</u>							

Item 2)

*ROI 184-2011 requires provisions be made to provide opportunities for residential and recreation uses on TPZ that are compatible with timber management and harvesting. The Purpose of Section 17.40.170, as written in the PRD Zone Ordinance is consistent with ROI 184-2011. The edits to the other sections of 17.40.170 that follow are intended to reflect the Purpose of Section 17.40.170 by providing Lodging Facilities to “further the development of agriculture tourism and recreation economies” which is also consistent with ROI 184-2011. Timber Production is a form of agriculture and some parcels **may** hold opportunities to help meet the Purpose of Section 17.40.170, subject to a CUP and approval by the Board of Supervisors.*

*The Natural Resource Working Group (NRWG) envisions the potential opportunity for a Dude Ranch or Health Resort and Retreat Center being compatible with timber production, where it occurs on a small scale (see edit to Item 4 “H” below). Lodging might be part of such a business and therefore the following edits maintain consistency between the proposed 17.21.020 Agricultural and Resource Zone Districts Use Matrix and section 17.40.170 Lodging Facilities. The NRWG recognizes that a Dude Ranch, Retreat Center or Health Resort may only make sense on a **select few** TPZ parcels, that is why the NRWG suggests that compatible uses such as these be evaluated using the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process (See 17.21.020) and not as a use by right.*

The CUP process requires a complete CEQA analysis, which would identify, discuss and mitigate issues relating to the proposal. Through the CEQA process El Dorado planning staff, the

Agricultural Commission, Planning Commission and ultimately the Board of Supervisors would then evaluate the legitimacy of the proposal and condition it appropriately, or deny the proposal. The proposed Natural Resources Working Group zone ordinance edits incorporate the involvement of a Registered Professional Forester (RPF). The RPFs role will be to evaluate the project to ensure its compatibility with continued timber production from the parcel and provide an evaluation using a timber management plan to detail and describe how the proposed project is integrated into the continuing timber production from the parcel. A Registered Professional Forester is licensed by the California State Board of Forestry and is the only professional qualified to make determinations relating to the practice of Forestry (14 CCR § 1602) and thus the compatibility of a project proposal necessitates the involvement of an RPF. Item 4 “H” further on in this letter shows edits to Section 17.40.350 Criteria for Other Compatible Uses in TPZ, which incorporate the expertise of a RPF.

17.40.170 Lodging Facilities

A. Purpose. The purpose of this Section is to further the development of the agricultural and timber resource tourism and recreational economies of the County, while providing adequate health and safety standards for the guests of such lodging facilities, developing standards to preserve the residential character of neighborhoods, and protecting the public health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding areas.

C. General Standards. Lodging facilities shall be subject to the general standards below. In addition, the specific use standards under Subsections D-G shall apply.

1. Lodging facilities proposed within Agricultural Districts or Timber Production Zone (TPZ), as identified on the General Plan land use and Zone maps, or adjacent to land zoned Planned Agriculture (PA), Limited Agriculture (LA), Agricultural Grazing (AG), Forest Resource (FR), or Timber Production (TPZ) must be reviewed by the Agricultural Commission for compatibility with surrounding agricultural land uses prior to action by the review authority.

G. Dude Ranch.

1. Minimum lot size – 20 acres.
2. The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Agricultural Department that the site meets the minimum qualifications for agricultural/grazing use as set forth under the minimum criteria for a Williamson Act Contract, whether the property is under contract or not.
3. Meals may be served to registered day use or overnight guests, only. There are no limitations ~~on the number of meals or the times at which they are served.~~

4. Dude Ranch in TPZ shall be subject to Subsection 17.40.350.H.

H. Health Resort and Retreat Center.

1. Health resorts and retreat centers shall be considered an expanded home occupation in those zones allowing residential uses and a compatible use in Commercial and Special Purpose zones.
2. Meals may be served to registered day use or overnight guests, only. There are no limitations on the number of meals or the times at which they are served.

3. Health Resort and Retreat Center in TPZ shall be subject to Subsection 17.40.350.H.

Item 3)

Section 17.40.210 is adequately drafted. The NRWG envisions the potential opportunity for Outdoor Recreational Facilities being compatible with timber production, where it occurs on a small scale (see 17.40.350 H below). The proposed 17.21.020 Agricultural and Resource Zone Districts Use Matrix above considers the Purpose statement found in Section 17.40.210 below and through the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process provides a broader list of potential Outdoor Recreation project opportunities to consider on TPZ. A CUP makes sense for Outdoor Recreation projects on TPZ since each situation will have its own set of unique issues, therefore considering each proposal on a case-by-case basis is prudent. The CUP process provides the owner the opportunity to bring an idea forward while giving the County and public an appropriate level of analysis under CEQA, such that a project may be approved or disapproved on its own individual merits. Involving an RPF in the analysis of the project ensures timber production on the parcel is protected as a primary use.

17.40.210 Outdoor Recreational Facilities

A. Purpose. The purpose of this Section is to ensure that adequate outdoor recreational facilities are available to the residents of the County while providing standards for the development of said facilities in order to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

Item 4)

The PRD Zone Ordinance section G, Criteria for Residential Use in TPZ is not consistent with the El Dorado General Plan. The PRD Zone Ordinance requires a different set of criteria for evaluating a discretionary residential use than is required by General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1. The General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 states:

General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1. The County Agricultural Commission shall evaluate all discretionary development applications involving identified timber production lands which are designated Natural Resource or lands zoned Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) or lands adjacent to the same and shall make recommendations to the approving authority. Prior to granting an approval, the approving authority shall make the following findings:

- A. The proposed use will not be detrimental to that parcel or to adjacent parcels for long-term forest resource production value or conflict with forest resource production in that general area;
- B. The proposed use will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent proposed uses and timber production and harvesting activities;
- C. The proposed use will not create an island effect wherein timber production lands located between the project site and other non-timber production lands are negatively affected;
- D. The proposed use will not hinder timber production and harvesting access to water and public roads or otherwise conflict with the continuation or development of timber production harvesting; and
- E. The proposed use will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to timber production lands.

The proposed NRWG draft language utilizes an incremental approach to satisfy General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 in a manner that is consistent with ROI 184-2011. The NRWG zone ordinance language also enlists the necessary professional skills of a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) for ensuring that a landowner satisfies General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1. Involving a RPF is an important addition to the ordinance because satisfying General Plan 8.4.2.1 will require an evaluation of a forested landscape and would involve making judgments relative to forestry practices and timber operations. The California Foresters Law (14 CCR § 1602) compels this kind of evaluation be done by an RPF. A RPF is uniquely qualified to perform the evaluation of a project relative to General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 (A-E), since RPFs are trained in among other things; the California Forest Practice Rules, forest ecology, soil site classifications, timber harvest engineering, fire prevention, fuels management, timber growth and can evaluate and mitigate for forestry related watershed and biological impacts.

The proposed zone ordinance language does not allow a residential use by right, but instead utilizes an Administrative Permit for a residential use on a parcel greater than 160 acres in size. The NRWG believes that the Administrative permit process, which includes the services of a Registered Professional Forester (RPF), is a fair opportunity for a landowner to explore in a simple and efficient manner a means to secure a reasonable use of his/her private property. It also provides the Director of Development Services with the information to make a sound determination as to whether the productivity of the parcel for growing and harvesting timber is or is not compromised. The Administrative Permit process would use a certification letter by the RPF to the Director for the purpose of securing the Administrative permit (See Item 5, 17.52.010 (c) 1 below). The certification letter would include a narrative of how the proposed residential use satisfies General Plan 8.4.2.1 (A-E). The proposed alternative language therefore keeps the zone ordinance language consistent with General Plan 8.4.2.1 and eliminates the criteria, found in the PRD Zone Ordinance, which are not consistent with the existing General Plan, while not requiring a full CEQA analysis for a cabin on parcel 160 acres or larger.

~~Legal parcels less than 160 acres will not be prohibited outright from having a dwelling either, however the issue of timber production compatibility will require a higher level of analysis due to the size of the parcel. The higher standard of analysis will again use the expertise of a RPF, however instead of an Administrative Permit the application would be processed as a Minor Use Permit (MUP). Supporting documentation necessary for processing the MUP will include a Timber Management Plan. The Timber Management Plan will include a~~

discussion of the soil resources, watershed resources, wildlife resources, vegetation conditions, timber inventory, fire risk & prevention, and management strategies. The Timber Management Plan will demonstrate that the dwelling will not significantly detract from timber production on the parcel and General Plan 8.4.2.1 is satisfied.

Other compatible uses indicated in the Land Use Matrix 17.21.020 will require the highest level of analysis. Other compatible uses such as Outdoor Recreation, a Dude Ranch, Campground or Retreat Center; as indicated in the Land Use Matrix 17.21.020, will only be allowed on parcels 160 acres or larger. These project proposals will be analyzed through the Conditional Use Permit process and will also include a Timber Management Plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester. The foot print of building improvements for other compatible uses will also be restricted to less than 3 acres. Restricting the size of the foot print of building improvements keeps the compatible use consistent with the California Forest Practice Rules. The California Forest Practice rules require a conversion permit for activities that convert forestland (see 14CCR § 1104). There is however exemptions from the conversion permit process. One such exemption is for a less than 3 acre conversion for a bona fide alternate use of the land. It is the NRWG's opinion that by limiting other compatible uses to a foot print for building improvements to less than 3 acres, the concept of compatibility remains congruent with the State Forest Practice rules and will limit the scale of a project appropriately for the Timber Production Zone. A foot print for building improvements that is less than 3 acres would be less than 2% of a 160 acre parcel, the smallest sized parcel considered for other compatible uses under Section 17.40.170 in El Dorado County. If a project required a foot print for building improvements larger than 3 acres than a zone change to Forest Resource should be considered.

The following proposed edits utilizes excerpts from relevant portions of the PRD Zone Ordinance dated 5-25-2012, which is in (black text). The suggested NRWG deletions are shown as ~~strikeouts~~ while new text is shown as underlined **red letters**. The proposed edits provide consistency between General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1, as required by State Planning Law G.C.65860, and are also consistent with ROI 184-2011.

17.40.350 Timber Production Zone: Criteria, Regulations, and Zone Change Requirements

G. Criteria for Residential Use in TPZ. The County finds that residential use within the TPZ ~~may be~~ **is a compatible use**, consistent with growing and harvesting timber ~~in certain circumstances~~. However, it is recognized that in certain situations there may be a conflict with such a use. The review authority may grant a ~~Conditional~~ **Administrative** Use Permit or Minor Use Permit in compliance with Section 17.52.010 or **Section 17.52.010 respectively**, for construction of one owner- or caretaker-occupied dwelling subject to the following findings:

- i. The Agricultural Commission finds that such use is **in compliance with General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1.**
- ii. **An Administrative Use Permit is applicable for a TPZ parcel 160 acres or larger.**
- iii. **For existing legal parcels less than 160 acres a Minor Use Permit will be required, including a timber management plan prepared by a Registered Professional Forester.**

- ~~1. that there has been three consecutive years of management of intensive timber production on the subject property. The following criteria will aid the Agricultural Commission in determining what constitutes intensive management and must be considered before granting a Conditional Use Permit for a dwelling:~~

- ~~a. A timber inventory of the stand has been prepared;~~
- ~~b. Commercial harvesting operations have been previously conducted;~~
- ~~c. Legal and physical access to the property exists to support both the residential use and the timber operations;~~
- ~~d. The boundaries of the property have been located and the property owner has attempted to protect the property against trespass;~~
- ~~e. Disease or insect control work has been conducted;~~
- ~~f. Thinning, slash disposal, pruning, and other appropriate silvicultural work has been performed;~~
- ~~g. A fire protection system or a functioning fire protection plan has been developed;~~
- ~~h. Erosion control has been provided on existing roads and skid trails, and existing roads are maintained;~~
- ~~i. A significant portion of the understocked area of the lot has been planted.~~

- ~~2. The property owner has either demonstrated a need for full time residency on the subject lot to protect against theft or vandalism, or full time management of the stand is necessary for its continued productivity.~~

H. Required Findings to Support Compatible Recreational and Other Non-Timber Uses. When approving a Conditional Use Permit, as permitted in Table 17.21.020 (Agriculture and Resource Zone Districts Use Matrix), for compatible, non-timber related uses, the review authority shall make the following findings:

1. The proposed use will not be detrimental to that parcel or to adjacent parcels for long-term forest resource production value or conflict with forest resource production in that general area;
2. The proposed use will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent proposed uses and timber production and harvesting activities;
3. The proposed use will not create an island effect wherein timber production lands located between the project site and other non-timber production lands are negatively affected;
4. The proposed use will not hinder timber production and harvesting access to water and public roads or otherwise conflict with the continuation or development of timber production harvesting; and the proposed use will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to timber production lands. The proposed use is compatible with and will not detract from the land's ability to produce timber;
- ~~5.~~ Fire protection and public safety concerns have been adequately met, including the ability to provide adequate public access, emergency ingress and egress, and sufficient water supply and sewage disposal facilities;
- ~~6.~~ The proposed use will not adversely impact the area's watershed, wildlife, and Specific other natural resources.
7. The foot print of building improvements does not exceed 3 acres in size.

8. A Timber Management Plan will be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester. The Timber Management Plan will provide sufficient information so that the reviewing authority can make a reasoned determination of the proposed uses' compatibility with continued timber production, including an evaluation of items 1-4 above and also including a discussion of the following resources:

Soils Resources, Watershed Resources, Wildlife Resources, Vegetation Conditions, Timber Inventory Fire Risk & Prevention, Applicable Regulatory Sections & Discussion, Timber Management Strategies, Governmental Review of Practices.

ii. Additional information may include: Road Access Map, Soils Map, Stream Assessment Map, Biological Resource Maps, Basal Area by Diameter Graph, Basal Area by Species Chart.

iii. A map approximating the size and location of the proposed building foot print(s).

Item 5)

The issuance of an Administrative Permit is an efficient and fair means of analyzing whether a dwelling on a TPZ parcel can satisfy General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1. The current language found in 17.52.010 A, B, & C is sufficient with one exception. Under item C of 17.52.010, the Findings of Approval should clarify the necessary size of the parcel which can qualify to be processed using the Administrative Permit process and that a Registered Professional Forester needs to certify to the Director of Development Services that the residential use is compatible with continued timber harvest and General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 is satisfied.

17.52.010 Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver

A. Purpose. The purpose of an Administrative Permit is to allow limited review of a proposed structure or use through the site plan review process to ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses and availability of public services and infrastructure. The Administrative Permit shall also be used for the processing of administrative relief requests in compliance with Subsection D or to establish the legal nonconforming status of a use or structure in compliance with Subsection E.

B. Review Authority, Procedure, and CEQA. The Director shall be the review authority of original jurisdiction for Administrative Permits. The procedure shall be staff-level without public notice except as provided under Subsection D, below. The issuance of an Administrative Permit shall be a ministerial project pursuant to CEQA.

C. Findings for Approval. When issuing an Administrative Permit, the Director must find that:

1. The structure(s) or use(s) are in compliance with the applicable zone provisions and any other applicable standards or requirements under this Title, or as adopted by the County through ordinance or resolution; and for TPZ parcels greater than or equal to 160 acres in size a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) will provide a letter certifying that the intended residential unit will not significantly detract from the growing and harvesting of timber and satisfies the criteria found in General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 A-E.
2. The structure(s) and use(s) are in compliance with all requirements and conditions of previously approved entitlements, such as Minor and Conditional Use Permits, or variances, if applicable.

Item 6)

Regarding the concern that allowing a residence on a large TPZ parcel may lead to a secondary dwelling, the NRWG has the following comments. It is the recommendation of the Natural Resource Working Group that a Secondary Dwelling be excluded from TPZ parcels as a use by right. The purpose of the residential use by Administrative Permit on TPZ is to allow an owner a reasonable mechanism to explore the compatibility of a single residence (cabin) without having to complete a full CEQA analysis. This provision to exclude a secondary residence will simplify the environmental analysis and should minimize any density related concerns. Please find the suggested edits to the PRD Zone Ordinance below.

17.40.300 Secondary Dwellings

- A. Purpose.** The purpose of this Section is to implement California Government Code Section 65852.150 et seq. regarding secondary dwellings, provide affordable housing alternatives, and protect the public health, safety, and welfare of residents of El Dorado County.
- B. Applicability.** In all zones that permit single-unit residential development, the expansion of the primary dwelling or the construction of a new structure for the purpose of creating a secondary dwelling may be permitted by right subject to the provisions of this Section. Second units are not allowed in the Timber Production (TPZ) zone.

Thank you for your time reviewing the Natural Resources Working Group comments on the proposed PRD Zone Ordinance language. I would be happy to meet with planning staff to clarify any questions you have regarding these comments.

Sincerely,



Cedric Twight
Register Professional Forester #2469
Chairperson for the Natural Resources Working Group



Fwd: Zoning Map

1 message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-. ou@edcgov.us>

Fri, Jun 1, 2012 at 1:26 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 4:39 PM
Subject: Re: Zoning Map
To: Kirk Bone <kbone@parkerdevco.com>
Cc: Andrea Howard <ahoward@parkerdevco.com>, Shawna L Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Please send any comments on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update to Shawna Purvines. You can copy me as well, just so I know what your concerns are.

Thank you,

On Thu, May 31, 2012 at 4:17 PM, Kirk Bone <kbone@parkerdevco.com> wrote:

| Andrea and I were just reviewing the draft map. Where do you want us to send our comments?

--

Roger Trout
Director Development Services Department
El Dorado County

[\(530\) 621-5369](tel:(530)621-5369)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

7/3/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Zoning Map

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Re: Regarding potential zoning changes for Divide

1 message

Kimberly Kerr <kimberl.kerr@edcgov.us>
To: Ken Calhoon <ken@kencalhoon.com>
Cc: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Fri, Jun 1, 2012 at 11:40 AM

Thanks Ken. I will send this over to the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update to include in the comments on the process.

Kim Kerr
Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Interim Department of Transportation Director

Contact Chief Administrative Office/Risk
County of El Dorado
Chief Administrative Office
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
[\(530\) 621-7695](tel:5306217695)

Contact DOT Director:
County of El Dorado
Transportation Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
[\(530\) 621-7533](tel:5306217533)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

On Fri, Jun 1, 2012 at 8:23 AM, Ken Calhoon <ken@kencalhoon.com> wrote:

Good Morning,

Not sure who this letter should go to but figured .ou would be able to pass it along to appropriate parties. Many of our small rural communities will never be able to open a home-town store front unless there is some land left with appropriate commercial zoning. Locking it all up in low density residential, insures that rural residents will need to drive long distances for all their shopping.

Thank you for your continued support of the business community.

Ken Calhoon
President Divide Chamber of Commerce
[530-885-9590](tel:5308859590)

www.dividechamber.com



7/3/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Re: Regarding potential zoning changes for Divide

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: General Plan comment

1 . message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

----- Forwarded message -----
From: The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 3:42 PM
Subject: Re: General Plan comment
To: "Neufeld, Glenn" <gneufeld@marshallmedical.org>
Cc: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Glenn,John,

Supervisor Nutting will make every effort to allow homeowners to continue to harvest their own livestock. He is also a rancher and understands the imp and is a firm supporter of our heritage.

At this time nothing has changed, but I am going to forward your email to Shawna Purvines who will explain it in further detail.

Feel free to call the Supervisor on his private cell at 306-9942 should you have further questions.

Thank . ou.

Kitty Miller for
Ray Nutting
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
530) 621-5651

----- Forwarded message -----
From: John & Jan Paur <johnjanpaur2@directcon.net>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 10:59 AM
Subject: Fw: Alert Urgent We must act
To: Ray Nutting <bostwo@edcgov.us>

Ray, Certianly on small acreage parcels, 5 acres and up and possibly as small as one acre, where fowl and farm animals (cattle and sheep) are rais animals should be allowed on the premises. I urge you to make every effort to defeat the attempt to disallow slaughtering these animals for personal please,

John Paur,
2929 Fallen Leaf Rd., Cameron Park

You are receiving this message because you provided your address.
Please see the bottom of this message to unsubscribe

Dear Patriot,

This is ver. very important and is a threat for you and me. As for me, I've been living for 12 . ears in Shingle Springs, on a 5.3 (chickens for my family. I teach my 3 and 4 years old grand-daughters the life cycle of chickens, how from the egg we go to a little chic food, and the respect for food and animals as well as plants. In other words our rural way of life.

ALL OF THIS WILL BE GONE UNDER THE NEW

General Plan Amendment and Zoning Update

"D - The slaughtering of fowl or domestic farm animals owned by the property owner or lessee in any residential zone, including R1, R1A, R2A, R3A, RE-5, and RE-10."

This will change your life, your family, your friends' life, your freedom FOR EVER.
PLEASE READ THIS, GO TO THE MEETINGS AND MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD.

Thank you.

Carole V. McNeill, Tea Party in the Hills Leadership

"This excerpt is from the Save Our County Website. I will be attending all meetings if I can. It is imperative you find out what they are going to do to our "rural way of life". The current board of supervisors is railroading this general amendment through. They bought comment by a month. If it becomes law, the new zoning won't let you have an orchard or vineyard if you are 3 acres or less. If you have zoning (residential) even RE10, you won't be able to slaughter even a chicken on your property for your own use. It allows operations in some of the Planned AG zones. It also makes areas along the transportation corridors high density housing for people. Not sustainable. Not for humans, not for animals. This "sustainable development" and "smart growth" plan is a lie. They are using us to promulgate a program that is not good. They should be looking at untying our hands, regulations wise, so that we can begin to be independent on jobs (most of them marginal at best) with their encouraging big box stores etc. We need to breathe life back into the lives of the citizens of El Dorado County.

If you have some type of Ag land, to be a farm you would now need a Conditional Use Permit. This is government control gone wild and you will suffer the consequences of this lost freedom.

Please come and find out and then act to protect our county.

Pattie Chelseth

Public Comment for General Plan Amendment and Zoning Update

Posted by [SOC Admin](#) on May 17, 2012 at 11:56am in [Save Our County](#)

[View Discussions](#)

UPDATE- MAY 26, 2012

This is very complicated, and SOC will be adding information to this page for the next couple weeks. SOC is currently collecting the land use changes and will post here, so you don't have to search for them.

The bottom line is-- whatever zoning you have now will more than likely change after the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Update changes will hugely impact your rural community. The current rural nature of the towns of El Dorado, Diamond Springs, Camino, Pollock Shingle Springs and El Dorado Hills will be adversely impacted to allow high density growth.

NOW is the time to check on what changes will occur to your property, and make written comments through the Scoping Process.

For all the links to the documents, go to the Land Use Policy Programmatic Update Page below and it will link you to the General Plan Zoning Update Draft documents. NOTE - THESE DRAFT DOCUMENTS ARE WRITTEN IN A NEW ARTICLE FORMAT, AND DO NOT HAVE ANY CHANGES OR ADDITIONS MADE. YOU WILL HAVE TO READ THROUGH THEM TO COMPARE THEM TO THE CURRENT ADOPTED 2004 GENERAL PLAN.

[LINK TO CURRENT 2004 GENERAL PLAN \(CLICK HERE\)](#)

[LINK TO CURRENT 2004 ZONING ORDINANCES \(CLICK HERE\)](#)

[Land Use Policy Programmatic Update Page](#)

Key changes under consideration:

§ Within Community Regions - 30% slope revision, 30% open space revision (offsite or elimination at the will of the board), loss of right to farm, streamlining CEQA for high density projects (you don't have to conform to CA environmental requirements if a density project is built), planned developments are not required...

§ Outside Community Regions - loss of right to slaughter farm animals on your residential (R1, R1A, R2A, R3A, RE-5, RE-10, RE-17.40.080), additional industrial and commercial use in Agricultural areas...

§ Other changes - allow mass pad grading without a project...

§ General Plan Amendment and Zoning Change Resolutions

§ General Plan Amendment and Zoning Change Resolutions-

§ [Res182-2011.pdf](#)

§ [Res183-2011.pdf](#)

§ [Res184-2011.pdf](#)



[VIDEO - BOS Meeting video May 15, 2012](#)

---TO MAKE A COMMENT---

Scoping Begins for General Plan and Zoning Update

MAY 16, 2012

CONTACT - SHAWNA PURVINES, EL DORADO COUNTY

[530-621-5362](tel:530-621-5362)

El Dorado County has scheduled a series of meetings to collect public comment on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance update. Environmental scoping meetings were announced following the Board of Supervisors approval of the Notice of Preparation for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance update on May 15.

The Notice of Preparation formally states the county's intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance update. The purpose of scoping meetings is to request public feedback on the range of environmental issues that should be included in the Environmental Impact Report. State law requires the scoping period to last 30 days, and a minimum of one daytime meeting for public comment on the project scope.

"There is a lot of interest in this project, so we are going above and beyond to collect feedback," said Assistant Chief Administrative Officer. The county has extended the comment period to 45 days, created an online comment form, and have scheduled an additional seven evening scoping meetings throughout the county."

The public is invited to attend the following meetings:

May 30, 2012

Union Mine High School Library

6530 Koki Lane

El Dorado, CA 95623

6PM to 7:30PM

June 7, 2012

El Dorado Hills CSD Pavilion

1021 Harvard Way

El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

6PM to 7:30PM

June 18, 2012

Greenwood Community Center

4401 Highway 193

Greenwood, CA 95635
6PM to 7:30PM

J. ne 20, 2012
Pioneer Park Community Center
6740 Fairplay Road

Somerset, CA 95684
6PM to 7:30PM

June 21, 2012
Camino School Old Gym
3060 Snows Road
Camino, CA 95709
6PM to 7:30PM

June 25, 2012
Lake Valley Fire Protection District Station 7
2211 Keetak Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA. 96150

[friend on Facebook](#) . [forward to a friend](#)

Copyright . 2012 Tea Party In The Hills, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you opted in at our meeting or website. If you don't want to receive our emails anymore, pleas click "unsubscribe". Thank you.

Our mailing address is:
Tea Party In The Hills
4701 Rock Barn Rd
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

[Add us to your address book](#)

[unsubscribe from this list](#) | [update subscription preferences](#)

N. virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2012.0.2171 / Virus Database: 2425/5034 - Release Date: 05/30/12

Supervisor Nutting will make every effort to allow homeowners to continue to harvest their own livestock. He is also a rancher and understands the impo and is a firm supporter of our heritage.

At this time nothing has changed, but I am going to forward your email to Shawna Purvines who will explain it in further detail.

Feel free to call the Supervisor on his private cell at 306-9942 should you have further questions.

Thank . ou.

7/5/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: General Plan comment

Kathy Miller for
Ra. Nutting
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
[530\) 621-5651](tel:5306215651)
Thank you.

Ray Nutting
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
[530\) 621-5651](tel:5306215651)

On Wed, May 30, 2012 at 12:32 PM, Neufeld, Glenn <gneufeld@marshallmedical.org> wrote:

Do I understand this correctly, the Board is considering a change to the General Plan that would make it illegal to harvest livestock on our personal property to raise our own meat and have it harvested on the property where it was raised. 4H, FFA and grange families routinely raise extra animals beyond what you come out strongly against this amendment. This is government intrusion and over regulation. This is a rural county with rich heritage in livestock. I have a large ranch to raise and harvest our own meat or grapes or garden ect. Please reply and let me know how you stand on this issue.

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado County
Phone: (530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



Fwd: Scoping session

1. message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

Thu, May 31, 2012 at 11:37 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 11:30 AM
Subject: Re: Scoping session
To: Chris Daley <cdaley@mtdemocrat.net>

Chris:

I'm sorry we didn't get a chance to talk last night. I got into a conversation and didn't realize it was time to go.

The background of this project is thick with prior public discussions, information and experiences dating back to the adoption of the 2004 General Plan and beyond. With such a rich history combined with the detailed environmental review process prescribed by state law, frustration is not surprising. As staff we expect to hear frustration, but also hope to serve as a conduit of information on the project and process, however complicated, so folks can be informed and involved. At the end of the day, it is the community's concerns that matter.

Along these lines, I was personally pleased with the turnout. More people attended last night than our initial March outreach meeting at Union Mine High School, and it was great to see a number of new faces in the crowd.

You are correct, we plan to cover the same information in each scoping meeting so everyone has access to consistent information.

Sincerely,

Mike Applegarth
Principal Analyst
Chief Administrative Office
El Dorado County
(530) 621-5123

On Thu, May 31, 2012 at 8:18 AM, Chris Daley <cdaley@mtdemocrat.net> wrote:

Hi Mike - Just wanted to get your thoughts on the scoping mtg last night. Any evaluation or review by your team after the session? Unfortunately, the people I talked to had quite negative reactions - not just the Agenda 21-ers. And I kind of agree with them. There was a definite sense of "them vs. us."

I assume the sessions are all planned to cover the same info in the same way so that everyone gets the same consistent access to the information - yes?

Thanks.
CD

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

--

Shawna L. Purvines
Sr. Planner
Development Services
El Dorado Count.
Phone:(530) 621-5362
shawna.purvines@edcgov.us
www.edcgov.us

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Melissa Jones

Address: 2161 Greensboro Rd
Placerville

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: mj2317@gmail.com

Please consider the aesthetic, air quality, & biological resources that will be affected by future development of residential, particularly low-density residential areas. Hill tops should be preserved as much as possible.

Agricultural uses have a less negative impact on the environment than residential or commercial expansion.

Please consider the importance of sustainable ~~LEED~~ gold dev. in mitigating negative environment effects.

↑ Make it a regulation!

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name:

Beth Jones

Address:

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project?

Yes
No

Your E-mail Address:

beth@lavacap.com

Please consider the aesthetics of preserving ridge tops so all enjoy hills rather than allowing housing developers to build strings of houses on each ridge.

The 'necklace' of homes on huge housing developments is poor planning. Thanks

Also thanks for expanding agric. wherever possible

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110002



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Allison Jones

Address: 2161 Greensboro Rd
Placerville

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: Allison.ainstey.jones@gmail.com

I like the expansion of aglands.
A source of economic prosperity
? ~~ag~~

EIR Environmental consideration
Please consider ① aesthetics
② air quality / GHG
③ landuse/planning

consider what will our next generation
have in terms of resources for oil,
the natural environment/resources

~~the~~ we need to use
infill policies w/ green
thinking for sustainable
growth
Please use reverse for additional comments

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Online comment form available at www.edcgov.us/LandUseUpdate

110004



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: Kim Shaw

Address: 1390 Broadway #B-343
Placerville, CA 95667

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes
No

Your E-mail Address: starlightkim@earthlink.net

Do not expect to "willie nillie" change zoning on personal property (i.e. to "rural" or agricultural zoning) without a fight. We are not blind, or stupid or powerless.

El Dorado County is waking up!

Do not try and take away our rights under the "guise" of saving the environment. We don't want Agenda 21 money!

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667
or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110005



Fwd: General Plan comment

1 . message

Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>
To: Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>, TGPA-ZOU ZOU <tgpa-zou@edcgov.us>

----- Forwarded message -----
From: The BOSTWO <bostwo@edcgov.us>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 3:42 PM
Subject: Re: General Plan comment
To: "Neufeld, Glenn" <gneufeld@marshallmedical.org>
Cc: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Glenn,John,

Supervisor Nutting will make every effort to allow homeowners to continue to harvest their own livestock. He is also a rancher and understands the imp and is a firm supporter of our heritage.

At this time nothing has changed, but I am going to forward your email to Shawna Purvines who will explain it in further detail.

Feel free to call the Supervisor on his private cell at 306-9942 should you have further questions.

Thank . ou.

Kitty Miller for
Ray Nutting
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
530) 621-5651

----- Forwarded message -----
From: John & Jan Paur <johnjanpaur2@directcon.net>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 10:59 AM
Subject: Fw: Alert Urgent We must act
To: Ray Nutting <bostwo@edcgov.us>

Ray, Certianly on small acreage parcels, 5 acres and up and possibly as small as one acre, where fowl and farm animals (cattle and sheep) are rais animals should be allowed on the premises. I urge you to make every effort to defeat the attempt to disallow slaughtering these animals for personal please,

John Paur,
2929 Fallen Leaf Rd., Cameron Park

You are receiving this message because you provided your address.
Please see the bottom of this message to unsubscribe

Dear Patriot,

This is ver. very important and is a threat for you and me. As for me, I've been living for 12 . ears in Shingle Springs, on a 5.3 (chickens for my family. I teach my 3 and 4 years old grand-daughters the life cycle of chickens, how from the egg we go to a little chic food, and the respect for food and animals as well as plants. In other words our rural way of life.



TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE

Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Comments should address the significant environmental issues and reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures which El Dorado County will need to have explored in the draft Environmental Impact Report on the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Please check the meeting you attended :

El Dorado, May 30

El Dorado Hills, June 7

Greenwood, June 18

Somerset, June 20

Camino, June 21

South Lake Tahoe, June 25

Cameron Park, June 27

Placerville, June 28

Name: _____

Address: _____

Would you like to receive e-mail updates on this project? Yes No

Your E-mail Address: _____

Please explain where a comment may be sent for a county-wide philosophy of preserving visual open space on hill tops vs allowing developers to build on all ridge tops (we had happened in EDH) (consider a recent trip to the Southern Bay Area where all ridge tops were left open for viewing & housing is all below).

Is this an EIR-type comment?
The Planning Commission needs to be forward thinking and save view tops -

If you did not finish your comments at the time of the meeting, please send them to:

Shawna Purvines, Senior Planner
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

or: shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Please use reverse for additional comments

110003



Re: News Paper Notification of Scoping Meetings

1 message

Mike Applegarth <mike.applegarth@edcgov.us>

Wed, Ma. 30, 2012 at 9:30 AM

To: Linnea Marengo <ldmarengo@yahoo.com>

Bcc: tgpa-zou@edcgov.us

Linnea:

Any help spreading the word is appreciated. I did send a press release out to the local newspapers. For the Divide, the list included the Georgetown Gazette, Mt. Democrat. Rebecca Murphy is the contact for the Gazette. I'm not sure KFOK provides news, but I sent a copy just in case. I also sent a copy to the Divide Chamber and posted a flyer at Holiday Market in Cool, the Recreation District office in Greenwood, and at the post offices in Garden Valley, Georgetown, Greenwood, and Cool. Let me know if you need anything.

Sincerely,

Mike Applegarth
Principal Analyst
Chief Administrative Office
El Dorado County
[\(530\) 621-5123](tel:(530)621-5123)

On Sat, May 26, 2012 at 5:19 PM, Linnea Marengo <ldmarengo@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi, Mike,

Have you sent pertinent information to the local news papers regarding the upcoming scoping meetings? If so, could you tell me the local Divide newspapers? Thanks. I'll help out if you wish.

Linnea

NOTICE: This e-mail and an. files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

Subject: Fw: TGPA, OZU

To The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors:

I am asking that the Board not approve the Chief Administrative Officers recommendations to:

- 1) Authorize staff to revise Attachment 4E, Draft Zoning Ordinance to include items identified on ERRATA Sheet #2 dated May 15, 2012;
- 2) Authorize staff to release the Notice of Preparation to inform of the County's intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15082) and solicit preliminary comments from the public and public agencies; and
- 3) Approve the following schedule for next steps in the process:
 - Weeks of June 18, 2012 and June 25, 2012 - Scoping Meetings within the Communities of; North County, South County, Myers, Camino/Pollock Pines, El Dorado/Diamond Springs, Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills.
 - June 28, 2012 Planning Commission workshop for Public Agency Comments.
 - Early July 2012 - Close Public Comment Period for NOP (45 days from release.)
 - Week of July 16, 2012 - Board Zoning Ordinance Workshop.
 - End of July 2012 - Board authorization to release project to consultant for preparation of final Project Description and draft Alternative.

(Refer 5/1/12, Item 38) (Est. Time: 90 Min.)

FUNDING: General Fund.

County

The public should understand more fully the logic and motivation behind these proposed GP Amendment changes and Zoning Ordinance changes. The ROI adopted by the Board back in Nov. 2011 and used as the framework of the scope for the TGPA & ZOU is heavily developer skewed and has not provided for public input regarding a balanced scope to be analyzed. There has not been any public scoping workshop meetings yet in El Dorado Hills as we've formally asked for and as the Board directed staff to do back in Feb. BOS Meeting. Only a initial outreach meeting held at the El Dorado Hills CDD March 5th, 2012 identifying the TGPA & ZOU process we were told by Shawna Purvines and Kim Kerr of the CAO's office that El Dorado Hills would get a public scoping meeting in April. It didn't happen. The last two BOS meetings we have made clear we want to have input on scope before approved to go to an EIR. The recommendation by the CAO have the scoping meeting after the approval and moving forward with analysis of the limited scope. This makes no sense and is not fair to the people. This being an election year and I would think it would be so important to show balance and inclusion especially when a focused group of residents looking to protect the interests of existing residents are so heavily involved and asking for transparency, fairness and representation. The CAO's office wants the Board to approve this description for the scope of the EIR of the TGPA on May 15th. This should not be hurried to the Board for approval before a more transparent and inclusive scope is included for analysis to achieve a more representative and balanced TGPA & ZOU.

There are many people voicing a concern that the CAO's office is rushing ahead with the process to put in place policies that will take away or lessen transportation requirements for developers of large projects in the Community Regions such as El Dorado Hills and as a way of encouraging them the County is looking for ways to reduce their costs by reduction in standards, reducing the requirement for when offsite traffic improvements are required, or not requiring any transportation off site improvements at all at occupancy, pushing out long term improvements from the 10 year CIP to 20 years to name a few. These are requests put forth by EDAC that will be analyzed in the TGPA & ZOU process. We also want our fair representation of the following to be included in the scope for analysis in the EIR of the TGPA & ZOU.

Submitted by Tara McBurn

at Board Hearing of 5-15-12
#20067.5N.1

110085

1. A Community Overlay of El Dorado Hills inclusive of some localized Historic overlay/s to analyze zoning structure, compatibility's, required traffic safety improvements tied to discretionary projects that are site specific for Community Region needs as a result of the more dense community region corridors. Analyze worsen conditions and develop specific policy for mitigation's that are realistic and timely when approved for projects. Analyze densities in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills that still retain the character of Community Identity and Compatibility of existing Land Uses so that we don't end up with 8 houses per acre right along side the rural region or 5 acre parcels. Analyze Community Region specific Transportation Circulation Elements as a mechanism for determining when offsite improvements are warranted or needed for public safety such as left turn lanes and two way turn lanes in the middle between two lane of opposing traffic.
2. Standards overlay of El Dorado Hills.
3. Planned Development Policies to keep character of El Dorado Hills
4. Open Space requirement of 30% for all Planned Developements and not 86ing planned developments in the Community Regions. And no in lue of fees. More open space for higher densities.
5. Analyze no build on ridgelines and slopes over x%.
6. Analyze no unilateral zoning changes just because they are not consistant with the General Plan. The law states The General Plan and Zoning ordinance shall be consistant it does not state the Zoning Ordinance has to be consistant with the General Plan. If zoning can not be changed to make General Plan valid due to incompatibility with existing land use or worsen conditions that can not be mitigated in a realistic time frame or are monetarily unrealistic then analyze a chnage in land use designation for the General Plan.
7. All Transportation Element changes, deletions, and reductions to be clearly identified as to why this benefits the impacted regions and who authored such change. (i.e. was it a Design Firm who also is doing the Engineermg and or acting as an Owners Agent for a large multi family Planned Development that would stand to benefit from such reductions in elements and standards.)
9. Add to page 19 of the Zoning Ordinance El Dorado Hills Community Plan Zones as is done with Meyers Community Plan Zones.
10. Recommend Design standards in final form (not Draft) before General Plan is approved and not move elements or policy's into any Draft documents.
11. Analyze economically by expanding Research & Development opportunity develop able sites in areas throughout the County. A large Industrial and R&D would be well suited for the Meyers area.
12. We are not in agreement with #1 of the Draft Zoning Ordinance's pg 54 17.24.010 definition to further the implimentation of the Gemeal Plan Community Region by distributing the residential growth in to this vague sentence they mean El Dorado Hills. We want a clearer definition and an equitable distribution. We now have HOV lanes to Placerville there is no reason not to distribute High Density. Placerville is 12 miles away.
14. How does pg 54 17.24.010 hold consistent for imposing the Community Regions with the highest intesity clustered densities ? That is inconsistant with doing away with planned developement, open space, reduced riparian setbacks, removal wildlife corridor protections not to mention one of the biggest issue of how are you funding and adaquately assuring the transportation improvements are being met especially safety improvements at occupancy.
15. Pg 73 Draft ZO 17.27.010 It is the intent of this Chapter to protect historic building and areas, enhance turism and the economy of the county by preserving the scenic resources along specified routes and define and maintain a sense of community identity. This is our basis for EDH historic overlay to be incorporated in the EL Dorado Hills COmmunity Overlay. .
16. Design Review Community - provide for individual DRC to develop design review standards for the protection, enhancement and use of places, sites buildings and structures in order to ensure sense of community.
17. Provide project review procedures which by its character or location requires special site design to minimize asthetic impacts on adjacent properties.

Tara Mccann

**TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT
AND
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE
UPDATE
PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM WEB FORM
FOR
THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NOTICE
OF PREPARATION**

MAY 25, 2012 THROUGH JULY 10, 2012

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ON JULY 12,
2012 FOR
REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION DURING THE 2012 ZONING ORDINANCE WORKSHOP
(WEEK OF JULY 16, 2012)

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Sunday, July 08, 2012

Karen De Guire
PO Box 816
Somerset
CA 95684

Private Citizen
karend1111@yahoo.com

PrimaryInterest: Zoning Ordinance Update

Comments

Here are my comments on the proposed Zoning Plan Amendments. I am very concerned that, although El Dorado County leaders profess their belief in keeping rural values alive; their actions and specifically these Zoning Amendments will have the opposite effect.

Specifically, adding high density housing will affect our water tables and traffic congestion in our county.

The agricultural amendments are specifically aimed at destroying small agriculture in El Dorado County. People on one acre or less can easily own a couple of chickens, rabbits and maybe a milk goat for their own use. Restricting ownership to parcels over 1 acre is more restrictive than Sacramento County where you can have backyard chickens on your city lots.

I don't see the purpose in restricting the harvesting of ones own animals. I want to know what I am eating and I can only do that if I raise my own animals for my own food.

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Sunday, July 08, 2012

Mr. & Mrs. Mueller, Family
6696 Rhodes Ave.
Placerville
CA 95667

mikemue2@comcast.net

PrimaryInterest: Both

Comments

We ask that this process be stopped at once, as it s unnecessary and a huge waste of money and resources!

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Friday, July 06, 2012

Sam Real
PO Box 245
Mt. Aukum
CA 95656

public
dnsr0401@yahoo.com

PrimaryInterest: Zoning Ordinance Update

Comments

'd like to receive updates on the Zoning Ordinance and where you are at present on the Review process Task ?

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Thursday, July 05, 2012

Greg Garrett
1681 Starbuck Rd
Rescue
CA 95672

gtgcorp@yahoo.com

PrimaryInterest: Zoning Ordinance Update

Comments

The proposed zoning map changes the land use designation for parcel 102-070-37-100 from LDR to RL or RR. Please correct and return to LDR. The mixup on this parcel's designation stems from the recording of a parcel map on the adjoining parcel (102-010-72-100). This map corrected a boundary line error. Prior to the recording of this map, parcel #102-070-37-100 was all zoned one designation for LDR (5 acres). The adjacent parcel was zoned for RR (10 acres). After the map was filed, the designation was not updated to reflect the correct boundary, leaving a 10-30 strip of land appearing to have the adjacent parcel's zoning. Parcel #102-070-37-100 was singularly zoned LDR (5 acres) and should remain as such. This is NOT a mixed zone parcel. Changing the designation would be changing the existing zoning on this parcel incorrectly. I request do not change the zoning from LDR to RR or RL. This parcel should be corrected to show LDR. Thank-you. Greg Garrett 916-806-8325.

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Loch Henson
PO Box 1514
Diamond Springs
CA 95619

lochhenson@gmail.com

PrimaryInterest: Targeted General Plan Amendments

Comments

I would like consideration to allow OUTSIDE THE STRUCTURES home business activities to be conducted on my property.

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Lloma Alameda
2001 Green Valley Rd
el dorado hills
CA 95762

Lloma@sbcglobal.net

PrimaryInterest: Both

Comments

Dixon Ranch proposal.

- 1) High density housing is not conducive to what surrounds this project. Homes w/acreage on 3 sides and large lots on the 4th.
- 2) Water----always an issue. Wheres it come from and what happens in drought years? Can't keep adding water consumers.
- 3)No TOPO map. Current map looks like a layover. What happens to all the Oaks?
- 4)Traffic on Green Valley Rd. Awful now. Green Springs Ranch n Sterlingshire need stop lights. So would this project. What happens to me, my access? I live across the street of proposed entrance.

No high density developments in El Dorado County. Thats not what our County is all about.

Notice of Preparation Public Comment Form

Sunday, June 17, 2012

Nancy Coffee

1196 Malcolm Dixon Road

El Dorado Hills

CA 95762

najava1@sbcglobal.net

PrimaryInterest: Both

Comments

It is my understanding that one of the proposed changes is to have current residents pay for any required infrastructure rather than the developers. This is outrageous and so wrong! We strongly object to this proposal. IN NO WAY SHOULD THIS EVER BE THE CASE for any development. Please do not incorporate this into any Plan or Zoning Ordinance. It is unacceptable.