



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
Phone (530) 621-4650, Fax (530) 642-0508

Date: December 5, 2017
To: Board of Supervisors
From: Roger Trout, Director of Planning and Building Department
Subject: Community Planning

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Community Development Services, Planning and Building Department, Long Range Planning is recommending the Board direct staff to return to the Board with a proposed scope of work prior to issuance of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for one of the following Community Planning options:

1. Update the existing Community Design Guide, adopted April 13, 1982, to include design standards and a menu of architectural design, public spaces, streetscape elements, and prototypes for commercial and multi-family development to be used in project site review of all discretionary project permits, pursuant to General Plan Policy 2.4.1.2; incorporate the following other design guidelines:
 - Historic Design Guide (adopted April 13, 1982)
 - Sierra Design Guide (adopted October 26, 1982)
 - Missouri Flat Design Guidelines (adopted June 3, 2008)
 - Mixed Used Design Manual (adopted December 15, 2015)
2. Create custom design guidelines/standards and prototypes for communities identified in General Plan Policy 2.1.1.1 (Cameron Park, Camino/Pollock Pines, Diamond Springs/El Dorado, El Dorado Hills, and Shingle Springs) and interested Rural Centers identified in General Plan Policy 2.1.2.1
3. Prepare corridor plans for the Diamond Springs/El Dorado and Cool communities that focus on enhancements to the transportation network (such as multi-modal options, Complete Streets with pedestrian and bicycle facilities)

Each option to include the appropriate environmental document (e.g., Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report) as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

BACKGROUND

The County's General Plan supports community-planning efforts. General Plan Policy 2.4.1.2 (2004 General Plan, pp. 37-38) directs the County to *"develop community design guidelines in concert with members of each community which will detail specific qualities and features unique to the community as Planning staff and funds are available. Each plan shall contain design guidelines to be used in project site review of all discretionary project permits. Such plans may be developed for Rural Centers to the extent possible. The guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, the following criteria:*

- A. *Historic preservation*
- B. *Streetscape elements and improvements*
- C. *Signage*
- D. *Maintenance of existing scenic road and riparian corridors*
- E. *Compatible architectural design*
- F. *Designs for landmark land uses*
- G. *Outdoor art"*.

On April 4, 2016, the Board held a special meeting to discuss community planning. Long Range Planning staff presented the Board with background information on community planning efforts that have been ongoing since 2009, including information on several communities that have asked the County to initiate some form of community planning. At that meeting, staff requested the Board provide direction on funding available for the FY 2016/17 County budget to initiate community planning efforts. Staff also presented the Board with five preliminary options for how community planning could be initiated. Based on public input and Board discussion, the Board directed staff to prepare additional information focused on two of the options: Option 3: Update countywide Community Design Guidelines/Standards and create custom design guidelines/ standards prototypes for interested communities; and Option 5: Prepare corridor plans in specific communities that focus on enhancements to the transportation network. At this meeting, the Board deferred providing guidance on available funding for the FY 2016/17 budget discussions. The five options were outlined in Attachment 5A - Staff Report 4-4-16 attached to Legistar File 13-0561. Copied below is the text from this staff report on Options 3 and 5.

3. Initiate Update to County-wide Community Design Guidelines/Standards; create custom design guidelines/standards prototypes for interested communities

Preliminary Gross-Level Estimated Resource Requirements/Cost: 1-2+ years, \$150,000 for preparation of County-wide plan; \$60,000 - \$150,000 for environmental review; add additional 3-6 months minimum for custom design guidelines/standards prototypes for interested communities and \$25,000 per community for additional environmental review. These two parts could be accomplished simultaneously or sequentially:

- Part 1: Update the County's existing Community Design Guide to include a menu of architectural design, public spaces, streetscape elements, and prototypes for commercial and multifamily. The County has already completed several design guides (e.g., historic, Missouri Flat Corridor, Mixed Use, Sierra, El Dorado Hills Specific Plan). These various design guidelines as well as photographs provided by communities such as Shingle Springs could be used as starting points for developing prototypes. The

resulting document would be an updated County-wide design guidelines/standards adopted by the Board.

- Part 2: Individual communities could “tier” from the County-wide document to create customized design guidelines/standards that fit their community’s unique character. The resulting document would be community-specific design guidelines/standards adopted by the Board.

This option addresses all communities at once, instead of initiating processes for only a select few. This may achieve economies of scale for staff time and professional services, thereby reducing cost as compared to multiple independent efforts. However, this option would tie individual community design guidelines/standards to a County-wide effort. If the County-wide effort is delayed for any reason, individual plans will also be delayed.

5. **Select corridor and transportation planning**

Preliminary Gross-Level Estimated Resource Requirements/Cost: 1-2 years or more depending on the number of areas selected; \$100,000 for preparation of the plan; \$60,000 - \$150,000 for environmental review. This option includes the preparation of corridor planning approaches such as being discussed by communities like Cool, El Dorado and Diamond Springs. It would address multiple forms of transportation, adjacent land uses and the connecting street network to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety and business connectivity. Planning and design improvements would be done via a professional services contract or by staff, depending on Board priorities and staff workload. If process includes design standards, professional services may include assistance with creating the standards (e.g., architectural renderings, graphics, prototypes, etc.). This option would be limited to the corridor, and would not address architectural design standards on private parcels.

In April 2017, a Draft Supplemental Budget Request for FY 2017-18 was submitted recommending funding for Community Planning Options 3 and 5 as follows:

- For Option 3, total estimated cost: \$700,000 (assuming a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the CEQA environmental document); \$1,000,000 if an Environmental Impact Report is required. Staff recommendation was to include \$250,000 in the annual budget for four consecutive budget years.
- For Option 5, total estimated cost for the Diamond Springs/El Dorado corridor (State Route 49/Pleasant Valley Road between Diamond Springs and El Dorado) was \$375,000; and \$230,000 for the intersection of State Routes 49 and 193 (one-quarter mile each way) in the Cool community.

Due to other higher County-wide priorities, this draft supplemental budget request did not make the initial cut for the preliminary FY 2017-18 budget.

On June 19, 2017, the Board-appointed Community and Economic Development Advisory Committee (CEDAC) submitted a memo dated June 14, 2017 to the Board with recommendations from the CEDAC Community Planning Ad Hoc Subcommittee requesting financial and staff support in the FY

2017/18 budget for community planning efforts. (Legistar File 17-0406, Attachment "Public Comment Rcvd 6-19-17 BOS 6-20-17")

On June 20, 2017, the Planning and Building Department Interim Director provided a Community Planning memo prior to the Board adoption of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18 County budget and recommended that the County focus on updating design guidelines for one community. "This would be consistent with CEDAC's recommendation, would serve as a feasible pilot project, and would streamline economic development in that community" (Legistar 17-0406, Attachment "Staff Memo regarding Community Planning in Fiscal Year 2017/18 Budget BOS Rcvd 6-20-17"). The Board's June 20, 2017 action on the proposed FY 2017/18 County budget included a subsequent motion to "consider Community Planning as a priority in the amount of \$150,000 if fund balance comes in higher than staff anticipates."

On September 19, 2017, the Board held a budget hearing to consider adoption of the final FY 2017/18 County budget, which included the following funding request for Community Planning:

"Community Planning Program Funding (4 year plan)

Include funding for Community Planning effort, at \$250,000, to be funded 50% through Economic Development Budget and 50% in the Planning Budget, and reduce the new OPEB/CalPERS Trust Designation by \$125,000 to balance. \$20,793 is appropriated in Economic Development and will be directed to this purpose." (Legistar 17-0406, Attachment 5A - Exhibit 2 FY 2017-18 Final Budget Revisions from Hearing 9-26-17).

The Board's motion on this funding request designated "\$250,000 for Community Planning in the budget with \$125,000 in the Economic Development budget and \$125,000 in the Planning budget reducing Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) reserve to balance. Any unspent money would be re-budgeted in Fiscal Year 2018/19 with the \$250,000 annual amount." (Minutes – Final, Board of Supervisors Meeting, September 19, 2017).

On November 9, 2017, Long Range Planning staff provided CEDAC with an update on the Board's direction to include \$250,000 in the FY 2017/18 County Budget for community planning. The CEDAC Community Planning Ad Hoc Subcommittee Chair expressed interest in working with Long Range Planning staff to develop the scope of work.

NEXT STEPS

Planning staff is requesting the Board's direction to proceed with developing a Scope of Work for an RFP for one of the three options outlined in the Staff Recommendation, with assistance from the CEDAC Community Planning Ad Hoc Subcommittee. Staff will return to the Board with a draft Scope of Work prior to issuance of an RFP. The County's Procurement and Contracts Division of the CAO's Office oversees the RFP process which typically involves these steps: 1) Prepare the RFP; 2) Route RFP to the Department for review/approval; 3) Issue the RFP; 4) Receive and evaluate proposals submitted; 5) Issue a Letter of Intent to Award (contracts over \$100,000 require Board approval); and 6) Initiate contract process. The RFP process timeframe is estimated to take 9 to 12 weeks.