

**COUNTY OF EL DORADO
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**



Agenda of: July 11, 2019

Staff: Efren Sanchez

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

FILE NUMBER: GPA19-0002

APPLICANT: County of El Dorado

REQUEST: General Plan Amendment (GPA19-0002) to amend the General Plan Land Use Element (Policies 2.1.1.1, 2.1.2.1, 2.2.5.11, 2.2.5.20, and Table 2-4); the Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element (Policies 6.2.2.2 and 6.8.1.1); the Transportation and Circulation Element (Policy TC-Xa3); and the Glossary.

LOCATION: Countywide

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT: A program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update (TGPA/ZOU) Project was previously prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (El Dorado County TGPA/ZOU Final Program EIR, December 2015, SCH #2012052074). It has been determined that an additional EIR or addendum is not required for GPA19-0002 as discussed in the environmental review section of the staff report.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to take the following actions:

1. Determine that pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15168, there is no substantial evidence requiring the preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration or an Addendum to the existing El Dorado County TGPA/ZOU Final Program EIR (SCH #2012052074), adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 15, 2015.
2. Approve General Plan Amendment GPA19-0002 amending the General Plan to incorporate revisions to the Land Use Element Policies 2.1.1.1, 2.1.2.1, 2.2.5.11, 2.2.5.20, and Table 2-4; Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element Policies 6.2.2.2 and 6.8.1.1; Transportation and Circulation Element Policy TC-Xa.3; and the Glossary, based on the Findings presented.

BACKGROUND

On December 15, 2015, the Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted Resolution 196-2015 for the Targeted General Plan Amendment/Zoning Ordinance Update (TGPA/ZOU) Project. One of the objectives of the TGPA/ZOU project included the understanding that the General Plan, as a living document, would require routine updates to help facilitate the implementation of its General Plan Elements. Because of this General Plan Objective, planning staff has recognized a series of necessary text updates to policies found within the General Plan Elements of Land Use; Public Health, Safety, and Noise; and Transportation and Circulation. The following staff analyses, separated by proposed update subheadings, are findings that describe and explain the need for updating these individual general plan policies.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project consists of an amendment to the General Plan for revisions to specific policies within the Land Use Element (Policies 2.1.1.1, 2.1.2.1, 2.2.5.11, 2.2.5.20, and Table 2-4); Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element (Policies 6.2.2.2 and 6.8.1.1); and Transportation and Circulation Element (Policy TC-Xa3); and the Glossary as described below.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE LAND USE ELEMENT

This General Plan Amendment includes revisions to Land Use Element Policies 2.1.1.1, 2.1.2.1, 2.2.5.11, 2.2.5.20, and Table 2-4 (as shown below).

- Policy 2.1.1.1 The Communities within the County are identified as: ~~Camino/Pollock Pines~~, El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, El Dorado, Diamond Springs, Shingle Springs, and the City of Placerville and immediate surroundings.
- Policy 2.1.2.1 The Rural Centers within the County are identified as: Camino, Cedar Grove, Coloma, Cool, Fairplay, Garden Valley, Greenwood, Georgetown, Grey's

Corner, Grizzly Flat, Kelsey, Kyburz, Latrobe, Little Norway, Lotus, Mosquito, Mount Ralston, Mt. Aukum, Nashville, Oak Hill, Phillips, Pilot Hill, Pleasant Valley, Pollock Pines, Quintette, Rescue, Somerset, Strawberry, and Chrome Ridge.

Policy 2.2.5.11 This policy recognizes the need and importance of managing forest products and natural resources. This policy further recognizes that it is important to provide for an efficient and cost effective means of harvesting and using forest lands. It is further recognized that the forested areas have a need for certain commercial support uses which should be allowed in a manner which is consistent with the forest use and outdoor recreation areas.

Uses which are consistent here may include the processing of forest products and natural resources, overnight individual and group outdoor accommodations, outdoor recreation ~~facilities~~activities, including ski resorts, ~~hunting and fishing clubs~~, equestrian facilities, and interpretive centers and conference/convention centers. These special support uses shall only be allowed to be established with the approval of a ~~conditional~~special use permit.

Policy 2.2.5.20 ~~All non-residential development, all subdivisions, residential development on existing legal lots involving any structure greater than 4,000 square feet of living area or requiring a grading permit for which land disturbance of an area of 20,000 square feet or more occurs, and all development located on lands identified as Important Biological Corridor (IBC) on the Land Use Diagram, Figure LU-1, shall be permitted only upon a finding that the development is consistent with this General Plan and the requirements of all applicable County ordinances, policies, and regulations. For projects that do not require approval of the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, this requirement shall be satisfied by information supplied by the applicant demonstrating compliance. All building permits shall be consistent with the land uses described in the land use designation established for the site, as provided in Policy 2.2.1.2 and set forth on Figure LU-1.~~*intentionally blank*

Policy Revision Rationale: The revisions to these policies are minor text edits as explained by the following rationale:

Land Use Element Policies 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1

The Board approved the revisions to these two policies on December 15, 2015 as part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment Project which included amendments to the General Plan Figure LU-1 (Land Use Diagram) to modify the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region to three Rural Centers of Camino, Cedar Grove and Pollock Pines (Legistar File 11-0356, Executed Resolution 196-2015, page 2 and Exhibit A, attached herein as Exhibit A). During post-adoption implementation, it was

discovered that the amendments to Policies 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1 were unintentionally omitted from Resolution 196-2015.

Policy 2.2.5.11

Policy 2.2.5.11 recognizes the need and importance of managing forest products and natural resources. This policy also denotes that outdoor recreation activities, including hunting and fishing clubs, shall only be allowed to be established with the approval of a special use permit. The County's current Zoning Ordinance requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Hunting/Fishing Club or Farm Facility in several land use zones including Forest Resource (FR) and Timber Production Zone (TPZ). The proposed text changes to Policy 2.2.5.11 are to clarify that outdoor recreation facilities (not activities) are subject to the CUP requirement. The removal of "hunting/fishing club or farm" from the policy language is consistent with the County's Zoning Code which allows these outdoor recreation activities by right in FR and TPZ zones. The change of the word "special" to "conditional" is consistent with the current CUP which replaced the Special Use Permit.

Policy 2.2.5.20

Policy 2.2.5.20 is an obsolete policy as a result of the Conservation of Biological Resources Policies in the Conservation and Open Space Element that were comprehensively revised and adopted by the Board on October 24, 2017. The text will be deleted and Policy 2.2.5.20 will state *Intentionally Blank* to reserve it for future use.

Table 2-4 and the Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts Table

As part of the TGPA/ZOU Project, Table 2-4 and the Land Use Designations and Zoning Districts Table should have been updated. Public Facilities (PF) should have been added as a Land Use Designation and Commercial, Rural (CRU) should have been added to the Zoning Districts, but through an oversight were omitted. The table below shows the proposed changes, which include adding a row for the CRU Zoning District and a column for the PF Land Use Designation. The PF land use is allowed in all the Zoning Districts except Industrial High (IH), Open Space (OS), and Timber Production Zone (TPZ).

Table 2-4: General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning Districts Table

TABLE 2-4 GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION AND ZONING DISTRICT CONSISTENCY MATRIX													
Zoning Districts*	Land Use Designations*												
	MFR	HDR	MDR	LDR	RR	AL	NR	C	R&D	I	OS	PF	TR
RM	•							• 1				■	
R1		•	Δ									■	
R20K		•										■	
R1A		•	•									■	
R2A			•									■	
R3A		◊	•									■	
RE (-5-10)			• ²	•	• ²							■	
CPO								•				■	
CL								•				■	
CM								•				■	
CC								•				■	
CR								•				■	
CRU												■	
CG								•				■	
R&D									•	•		■	
IL										•		■	
IH					•	•	•			•			
LA (10-160)				• ⁴	•	•	•				• ³	■	
PA				• ⁴ ★	•	•	•				• ³	■	
RL (10-160)				• ⁴	•	•	•				• ³	■	
AG (40-160)				★	•	•	•				• ³	■	★
TPZ				•	•	•	•						
FR					•	•	•					■	
RFL	•	•	•	•	•		•				•	■	•
RFH	•	•						•			• ⁵	■	•
OS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•		•
TC	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	■	•

Notes:
 • – Consistent with General Plan Policy
 Δ - Consistent when combined with the Platted Lands (-PL) Overlay Only
 ★ - Consistent when in a Williamson Act Contract
¹ As part of a Mixed Use project
² MDR is for 5 acres only; RR is for RE-10 only
³ With a conservation easement
⁴ LA-10, PA-10 and RL-10 only
⁵ When inside a Community Region
 * See table **below on next page** for land use designations and zoning districts

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND ZONING DISTRICTS			
Land Use Designations		Zone Districts, Continued	
MFR	Multifamily Residential	CPO	Professional Office Commercial
HDR	High-Density Residential	CL	Limited Commercial
MDR	Medium-Density Residential	CM	Mainstreet Commercial
LDR	Low-Density Residential	CC	Community Commercial
RR	Rural Residential	CR	Regional Commercial
		CRU	Rural Commercial
AL	Agricultural Lands	CG	General Commercial
NR	Natural Resource	R&D	Research and Development
C	Commercial	IH	Industrial High
R&D	Research & Development	IL	Industrial Low
I	Industrial	LA	Limited Agricultural
OS	Open Space	PA	Planned Agricultural
PF	Public Facilities	RL	Rural Lands
TR	Tourist Recreational	(10-160)	
Zone Districts		AG (40-160)	Agricultural
RM	Multifamily Residential	TPZ	Timberland Preserve Zone
R1	One-family Residential	FR	
R20,000	One-half Acre Residential	RFL	Recreational Facilities Low
R1A	One-acre Residential	RFH	Recreational Facilities High
R2A	Single-family Two-acre Residential	OS	Open Space
R3A	Single-family Three-acre Residential	TC	Transportation Corridor
RE-5	Estate Residential Five-acre		
RE-10	Estate Residential Ten-acre		
(Zone Districts continued in next column)			

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND NOISE ELEMENT

This General Plan Amendment includes revisions to Policies 6.2.2.2 and 6.8.1.1 as shown below:

Policy 6.2.2.2 The County shall preclude development in areas of high and very high wildland fire hazard or in areas identified as “urban wildland interface communities within the vicinity of Federal lands that are a high risk for wildfire,” as listed in the Federal Register of August 17, 2001, unless such development can be adequately protected from wildland fire hazard, as demonstrated in a Fire Safe Plan prepared by a Qualified~~Registered~~ Professional Forester (RPF) and approved by the local Fire Protection District and/or California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Policy 6.8.1.1 All development within the Airport Influence Area of the Placerville Airport, the Cameron Airpark Airport, and the Georgetown Airport shall comply with El Dorado County Airport Land Use Commission’s policies and maps as set forth in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for each airport. All development within the Airport Influence Area of the South Lake Tahoe Airport shall comply with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the areas around the South Lake Tahoe Airport. Where there is a difference between the County development standards and the development standards of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as applied to proposed development, the standards that will most reduce airport-related hazards shall apply.

Policy Revision Rationale: The revisions to Policies 6.2.2.2 and 6.8.1.1 are minor text edits as explained by the following rationale:

Policy 6.2.2.2: This policy requires a Fire Safe Plan to be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester (RPF) however, this policy is limiting by the fact that RPFs who are authorized to prepare Fire Safe Plans are not readily available. The amendment to Policy 6.2.2.2 proposes to replace “Registered Professional Forester (RPF)” with “Qualified Professional.” This revision also requires adding a definition of “Qualified Professional” to the General Plan Glossary.

Policy 6.8.1.1: This policy requires all new development around airports to be compatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) of the neighboring airport. The current policy omits the ALUCP for the areas around the South Lake Tahoe Airport. The proposed revision adds language that requires all development within the Airport Influence Area of the South Lake Tahoe Airport shall comply with the ALUCP for the areas around the South Lake Tahoe Airport.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Policy TC-Xa3 ~~Developer paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development during~~

~~peak hours upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county. This policy shall remain in effect until December 31, 2018.~~*intentionally blank* (Resolution 201-2018)

Policy Revision Rationale: Policy TC-Xa3 is an obsolete policy as explained by the following rationale:

The sunset date for Policy TC-Xa3 was December 31, 2018. On September 25, 2018, the Board adopted Resolution 201-2018 which added a new policy TC-Xc, which is an identical policy without the sunset date as shown below.

Policy TC-Xc: Developer paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development during peak hours upon any highways, arterial roads and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the county.

Removing the text of Policy TC-Xa3 will effectively delete a duplicate policy within the Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE GLOSSARY

The proposed revisions to Policy 6.2.2.2 require adding a definition for “Qualified Professional” to the General Plan Glossary. On June 27th, staff will attend a meeting with the Fire Prevention Officers stakeholders group to solicit input on what types of professionals, besides Registered Professional Foresters, are qualified to prepare Fire Safe Plans. With this group’s input, staff will draft a definition of “Qualified Professional” and will include this proposed definition in the presentation of this item to the Planning Commission.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the County has determined that GPA19-0002 is within the scope of the Final Program EIR for the TGPA/ZOU Project, which was adopted on December 15, 2015 by the Board under Resolution 195-2015. The GPA19-0002 specifically addresses proposed minor text revisions to policies found within the General Plan Elements of Land Use; Public Health, Safety, and Noise Element; and the Transportation and Circulation Element. The text revisions do not produce effects to the environment that were not already analyzed under the scope of the TGPA/ZOU Final Program EIR. In addition, the text changes are minor enough that they do not trigger the need for preparing an Addendum to the EIR under the prescribed conditions of both CEQA Sections 15164 and 15162. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment; therefore GPA19-0002 is relying on the TGPA/ZOU Final Program EIR for CEQA compliance.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Staff proposes to update the above-mentioned policies as project GPA19-0002. The GPA19-0002 project is consistent with the General Plan amendments that were processed under the TGPA/ZOU Project. The objectives under the TGPA/ZOU included “Revise existing General Plan policies and land use designations to provide clarity while keeping land use map changes to a minimum.” This objective is consistent with the objective and staff’s proposed revisions under GPA19-0002. The minor text updates to policies are for the purposes of clarifying existing policies.

NEXT STEPS

Following this Planning Commission public hearing, staff will review the comments received from the public and the Planning Commission, and will make any necessary revisions to the proposed General Plan Amendment. Staff will present the proposed General Plan Amendment and the Planning Commission recommendation for the Board’s consideration and approval. The Board public hearing is anticipated to be held in August of 2019.

SUPPORT INFORMATION

Attachments:

Findings

Exhibit A.....Excerpt from Resolution 196-2015