File Number: $(ADM-G23-OOC3)$ Receipt No.: $142LL$ Date Received: $7-25-202-3$ Amount: $239$
Date Received.
APPEAL FORM (For more information, see Section 130.52.090 of the Zoning Ordinance) 2023 JUL 25 PH 1:45
Appeals must be submitted to the Planning Department with appropriate appeal fee. Please see fee schedule or contact the Planning Department for appeal fee information.
APPELLANT
2887 Royal Park Dr., Cameron Park, CA 95682
DAYTIME TELEPHONE 530-409-2939 email: lizrgates@gmail.com
A letter from the Appellant authorizing the Agent to act in his/her behalf must be submitted with this appeal.
AGENT
ADDRESS
DAYTIME TELEPHONE
APPEAL BEING MADE TO: Board of Supervisors Planning Commission ACTION BEING APPEALED (Please specify the action being appealed, i.e., <u>approval</u> of an application, <u>denial</u> of an application, <u>conditions</u> of approval, etc., <u>and</u> specific reasons for appeal. If appealing conditions of approval, please attach copy of conditions and specify appeal.)
Approval of ADM23-0014
Omission of pertinent facts in the project Zoning Findings
Refer to attached for Specific Reasons For This Appeal
July 24, 2023 DATE OF ACTION BEING APPEALED
Signature Date
Signature Nath MAL

23-1530 B 1 of 41

July 25, 2023

Dave & Liz Gates 2887 Royal Park Drive, Cameron Park, CA 95682 (530) 409-2939 2023 JUL 25 PH 1:46 RECEIVED PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Appeal to the El Dorado County Planning Commission

Opposing the Request for approval of a staff level review and recommendation for Planning Director approval of Administrative Permit Application ADM23-0014 to allow for four permanent pickleball courts, two multiuse pickleball/tennis courts and one dedicated tennis court.

### Background

We are homeowners with a shared property line to Cameron Park Lake community park. Our residence has bedroom windows within 48 feet of the rear property line. The tennis courts are located 11 feet behind our back fence which sits on the property line. We have lived in our home since 2001 and until the tennis courts were modified to add pickleball courts approximately six years ago, we had no concerns or complaints about noise from the courts.

When the Cameron Park CSD modified the tennis courts without informing adjacent property owners, we noticed a substantial increase in daytime ambient noise. We had never heard of pickleball before nor had we ever heard the noise produced by pickleball play. Our quality of life, health and the previous peace and quiet of our home and yard were negatively and significantly impacted because we have had to endure daily and near constant pickleball noise. We hear this loud, impulsive noise nearly everyday, all day long, even with our windows shut. Realtors have said we must legally disclose this impulsive noise nuisance which will very likely adversely impact our home value.

In an effort to stop this new, intrusive, impulsive noise, we complained to the Cameron Park CSD and asked for them to help mitigate this unreasonable noise and consider relocating the pickleball courts to a site further away from homes.

Seeking a solution and urging action, we and our fellow concerned neighbors communicated with CSD staff and the general manager and CSD board members. Since 2018, we have made in-person visits, phone calls, sent emails, attended and spoke at Parks & Rec committee and CSD Board meetings, and participated

in the Pickleball Noise Mitigation taskforce. At our behest, the CSD eventually retained a professional noise engineer and a noise study was completed in August 2022.

View the full study by visiting <u>https://www.cameronpark.org/2022-11-14-parks-recreation-committee-meeting</u> Click on agenda and scroll down 11 pages.

### The professional noise study states:

- The conversion of tennis courts to pickleball courts was and is subject to the EDC noise ordinance.
- · Noise from the pickleball courts exceeds EDC noise limits.
- "The maximum sound level exceeded 65 dB(A) at least 250 times an hour or more than 4 times a minute." Sound level readings recorded were as high as 93Lmax.
- A minimum 12 feet high solid sound barrier wall on the property line extending 40 feet beyond the pickleball courts will NOT meet the sound level reduction goal of compliance with the EDC noise standard.

With reliable data that demonstrated the pickleball noise was excessive and having received ongoing complaints about the noise, little was done by the CSD to address the issue. The CSD posted signage on the court fence that play hours begin at 8am. Some players voluntarily delayed play until 8:30am. Other than these measures, the CSD made no efforts to mitigate or relocate the courts. When our efforts failed to produce relief, we filed a noise complaint with EDC Code Enforcement.

During the processing of this filed noise complaint, a parcel search revealed that the CSD did not have a permit for the four original tennis courts. The county also advised the Cameron Park CSD of the noise exemption determination. The EDC planning department verified to us that no permit was ever granted for the original four tennis courts. We were told the CSD would have to submit an application for a permit for the original four tennis courts. However, the permit application they submitted is instead, for the recently modified courts and the project name/ request on their application is "Cameron Park Community Services District Pickle Ball Courts."

## Specific Reasons For this Appeal

(Refer to responses to the project findings which are noted in blue as follows.)

### ZONING FINDINGS

3.3 **The project is consistent with Section 130.40.210 Outdoor Recreational Facilities.** Rationale: As the project is exempt from the noise standards of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, is located within an established park and would be limited to daytime hours, the project is not anticipated to have a significant impact to the surrounding area.

Administrative Permits are considered to be Ministerial. The noise exemption is classified as a categorical exemption. The categorical noise exemption does not apply to ministerial projects.

Per the CEQA Guidelines for Implementation Article 19 Categorical Exemptions Section 15300.1 Relation to Ministerial Projects: "Since ministerial projects are already exempt, categorical exemptions should be applied only where a project is not ministerial under a public agency's statutes and ordinances."

Furthermore, the project is already known to have a significant impact on the area, as documented by the professional noise study and several registered complaints from the nearby neighbors. Realtors advise that the pickleball noise nuisance must be disclosed to prospective homebuyers. Pickleball noise is classified as "impulsive noise." These concerns represent injury to the neighborhood and risk to public health and welfare.

Per Section 15300.2 Exceptions (c) Significant Effect. "A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances." When pickleball courts were added, they caused a significant effect on the environment. The daytime ambient noise level increased significantly and is quantified in the professional noise study as having more than doubled. The addition of pickleball courts and their use has been in violation of the EDC county noise standard.

Consistent with this project and these concerns, there are many other similar cases across the country of formally registered complaints about pickleball noise from nearby homeowners. Refer to the partial listing of pickleball lawsuits attached. There is a growing number of media articles about pickleball noise complaints. Refer to the attached New York Times article, "Shattered Nerves, Sleepless Nights: Pickleball Noise Is Driving Everyone Nuts."

### ZONING FINDINGS

3.1 The project is consistent with Section 130.20.030.A.2.3.a

Rationale: The use of a pickleball court is not listed within the zoning ordinance, but it is determined to be similar and compatible in nature with a tennis court, as both sports are hard surface racquet and ball based games. The project is zoned RFH, which is intended to regulate and promote recreational uses and activities with high concentrations of people or activities of a more urban nature. As a recreational use the proposed pickleball courts would be consistent and compatible with the RFH zone and the other uses allowed within the RFH zone.

Section 130.25.020 Matrix of Allowed Uses Table 130.25.020 Special Purpose Zones Use Matrix lists the allowed uses for RFH zones subject to the specific type of permit requirements. This would assume a prior review and consideration of potential noise impacts of each listed allowed use. Tennis is explicitly listed as an allowed use with an Administrative permit, while pickleball is not listed on this table. Given the known substantially greater noise impact and the fact that pickleball noise is classified as "impulsive" while tennis noise is not "impulsive," pickleball courts are not consistent and compatible with the RFH zone, without special noise mitigation.

The broad determination of "similar and compatible" neglects consideration of several relevant dissimilarities between tennis and pickleball. Since the primary concern is the completely different level of noise generated by the sports, it should be noted that they are not both racquet games and are played with different equipment.

Pickleball is played with a hard, solid surface paddle. Tennis racquets are not solid, rather, they have open strings. The balls used for each of these games are not similar. Pickleball balls are made of rigid, hard plastic and resemble whiffle balls. Tennis balls are a smaller soft rubber-type ball and are covered in felt. Due to the nature of the hard ball and paddle, the noise of pickleball is verifiably louder and the sound frequency or pitch is much higher, and is classified as an impulsive noise, as such. Refer to the photos and graph and explanation below.

Additionally, pickleball is played on a much smaller court. In the same space one tennis court uses, four pickleball courts can be accommodated. As part of their modification project, the Cameron Park CSD completely removed one existing tennis court and replaced it with four separate pickleball courts. This court conversion made it impossible to play tennis on what was originally one tennis court.

With the modification of the original tennis court, now, sixteen players striking a hard ball with a hard paddle play on a space that previously accommodated up to four tennis players, using a string racquet and soft, felt-covered ball. The additional conversion of two adjacent tennis courts to multiuse courts now allows as many as 32 people to play pickleball simultaneously. Often, there are several other people on the courts socializing

and watching. Frequently, over 35 individuals have been observed to be on the converted courts at the same time.

This court conversion effectively quadrupled the intensity of the original space because 4x as many players play simultaneously in the same space. Per the EDC General Plan Section 130.61.040.A Legal Nonconforming Uses, "A legal nonconforming use may be continued and maintained as follows: a. No increase in intensity or of the area, space, or volume occupied or devoted to a legal nonconforming use shall be allowed."

Per Section 130.25.030 Special Purpose Zone Development Standards Table 130.25.030, the minimum setback for RFH is 50 feet. Because the tennis courts intrude on the minimum setback, they would become legal nonconforming with a permit.

Per Section 130.61.050.A Changes or Expansion of Legal Nonconforming Uses, "A legal nonconforming use may be changed to another nonconforming use of the same or less intensive nature." Pickleball is more, not less, intensive in nature to tennis. Converting the original tennis courts to a more intensive use is not allowed.

### Stated in the Findings Letter, first page, third paragraph:

"Currently the Zoning Ordinance requires the approval of an Administrative Permit for the establishment of tennis courts. Due to the time of which the tennis courts were initially established, the original tennis courts are legal nonconforming. The additional courts added for pickleball are an expansion of the original legal nonconforming use and would require either an Administrative Permit, to establish the courts as legal conforming, or a Conditional Use Permit to expand a legal nonconforming use. The project applicant chose to pursue an Administrative Permit. With the approval of this Administrative Permit the courts would no longer be legal nonconforming and would be legal conforming instead."

As mentioned in the Background portion of this Appeal, the required permit for the four original tennis courts was never granted, the CSD was obligated to submit an application to EDC Planning by Code Enforcement for the four unmodified tennis courts. Until the Administrative permit is granted for the four tennis courts as they were originally installed, they are not considered legal nonconforming. Without a permit, they cannot be legal. They will remain nonconforming regardless of their permit status, due to their current location, since they do not conform to the setback standard or the design standard put forth in Section 130.40.210.F.2

Prior to the recent modification which added pickleball courts to the original tennis courts, we had no complaint or concern about the noise generated by tennis play. If an Administrative permit is granted to the four original and unmodified tennis courts to make them a Legal Nonconforming use, this would be a reasonable decision expectation. It would not be an expectation however, for the tennis courts to be modified to a more

intensive use after decades establishing the courts as being used exclusively for the sport of tennis.

Per CEQA Title 19 Categorical Exemptions 15323 Normal Operations of Facilities for Public Gatherings, "Class 23 consists of the normal operations of existing facilities for public gatherings for which the facilities were designed, where there is a past history of the facility being used for the same or similar kind of purpose."

Under Discussion, "The section relates the concept of past history to public expectations for use of the facility in the future, continuation of that use would not represent a change in the environmental conditions." It has been both quantified and qualified and documented that tennis and pickleball are not the same and are substantially dissimilar when evaluated by their impacts on environmental conditions, especially given the close proximity of nearby homes. Further, ""the court found that the existence of residential areas near a racetrack constituted "unusual circumstances."" Likewise, the very close proximity of the tennis courts has bearing and should constitute "unusual circumstances."

Additionally, the location of the four original tennis courts does not conform to the intent of the design standard which expressly addresses minimizing noise impacts.

Per Section 130.40.210.F.2 Outdoor Recreational Facilities, "Playground equipment shall be centrally located on the park site, or situated in a way that minimizes noise impacts on adjacent residential property owners." This policy expresses concern for minimizing noise impacts and by logical extension can be applied to other park amenities and allowed uses. The original tennis courts are not centrally located and their location is not consistent with this concern.

Finally, per Section 130.61.110 Public or Private Nuisance: "Nothing contained within this Chapter shall be construed to allow a legal nonconforming use to be conducted in such a way as to constitute a public or private nuisance, or a danger to the public health, safety and welfare." In conclusion, we request your careful review and consideration of these Appeal facts and ask for your fair and impartial decision. Thank you for your time.

Gratefully,

Liz and Dave Gates

July 24, 2023

### 2. THE SOUNDS OF PICKLEBALL AND TENNIS

To compare the sounds from pickleball and tennis, the impact sound was measured with a ball drop onto a pickleball paddle and a tennis racquet mounted in a test chamber. The ball speed was 18.9 miles per hour at impact. Figure 1 shows the 1/3 octave spectrum and the maximum sound level for A-weighted, fast response (LAFmax) measurements for the paddle and the racquet impacts. The pickleball impact generates a higher overall sound level and has more high frequency content than the tennis impact.



Figure 1 - Pickleball and tennis impact from a dropped ball at 18.9 MPH

The pickleball impact at 86 LAFmax is over 20 dB higher than the tennis impact at 62.9 LAFmax. This difference shows that pickleball can be 4 or more times louder than tennis. It explains why pickleball sound is receiving attention when former tennis courts are used for pickleball. The loudness of each pickleball impact can further vary based on the paddles and balls being used, the skill level of each player, and the force of each impact.

Wireman, B., & Unitech, R., Pickleball Sound 103 - Mitigating Pickleball Sound - Is Pickleball Compatible with Residential Environments?, NoiseCON 2023, Grand Rapids, MI, May 15 - 18, 2023.

## 2023 JUL 25 PH 1:46 RECEIVED PLANHING DEPARTMENT

Community planners have only limited alternatives to control the propagation of pickleball impact noise. As we have seen above, pickleball courts would need to be located a long distance from residential communities, or they would need to be located in areas where there is already a significant amount of background noise, such as near major highways, transportation hubs, commercial, or industrial areas.

Some <u>researchers</u> have studied the effects of vegetative barriers on traffic noise, but these studies indicate that only a modest amount of sound attenuation is achievable (4 dB), particularly at frequencies in the 250 Hz to 2500 Hz range. The use of vegetation such as trees is somewhat of a two-edge sword, as branches and leaves can re-direct acoustic energy from being transmitted upward into the atmosphere to downwards towards the earth.

The only other alternative to interrupting the propagation of pickleball impact noise into communities is to erect artificial structures, such as sound barriers and walls around pickleball courts. These sound barriers will need to be capable of reflecting and absorbing sound, while being sufficiently high so as to limit diffraction over the top of them.

### Source:

Pickleball Science. "Pickleball Noise Propagation." *Pickleball Science*, 8 July 2023, pickleballscience.org/pickleball-noise-propagation/.

July 24, 2023

Pickleball paddle and ball



## Tennis racquet and tennis ball



July 24, 2023

Title 14. California Code of Regulations Chapter 3. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act

## **Article 19. Categorical Exemptions**

### Sections 15300 to 15333

### **15300.** Categorical Exemptions

Section 21084 of the Public Resources Code requires these Guidelines to include a list of classes of projects which have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and which shall, therefore, be exempt from the provisions of CEQA.

In response to that mandate, the Secretary for Resources has found that the following classes of projects listed in this article do not have a significant effect on the environment, and they are declared to be categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental documents.

Note: Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code; Reference: Section 21084, Public Resources Code.

### **15300.1. Relation to Ministerial Projects**

Section 21080 of the Public Resources Code exempts from the application of CEQA those projects over which public agencies exercise only ministerial authority. Since ministerial projects are already exempt, categorical exemptions should be applied only where a project is not ministerial under a public agency's statutes and ordinances. The inclusion of activities which may be ministerial within the classes and examples contained in this article shall not be construed as a finding by the Secretary for Resources that such an activity is discretionary.

Note: Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code; Reference: Section 21084, Public Resources Code.

### 15300.2. Exceptions

(a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located - a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

(b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

### CEQA Title 19 - Categorical Exemptions

Resources Code.

## 15323. Normal Operations of Facilities for Public Gatherings

Class 23 consists of the normal operations of existing facilities for public gatherings for which the facilities were designed, where there is a past history of the facility being used for the same or similar kind of purpose. For the purposes of this section, "past history" shall mean that the same or similar kind of activity has been occurring for at least three years and that there is a reasonable expectation that the future occurrence of the activity would not represent a change in the operation of the facility. Facilities included within this exemption include, but are not limited to, racetracks, stadiums, convention centers, auditoriums, amphitheaters, planetariums, swimming pools, and amusement parks.

Note: Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code; Reference: Section 21084, Public Resources Code.

Discussion: This section clarifies what is meant by the term "a past history of the facility being used for the same kind of purpose." The section relates the concept of past history to public expectations for use of the facility in the future. Where the facility has been used for a particular purpose for several years and people expect the use to continue in the future, continuation of that use would not represent a change in the environmental conditions. For example, if a county fair had included a stock car racing meet for each of three consecutive years, people living in the area would have come to expect that the county fair would involve stock car racing in the future. Continuing racing activity would not represent a substantial change in the environment from what people had come to expect. However, in Lewis v. 17th District Agricultural Ass'n (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 823, the court found that the existence of residential areas near a racetrack constituted "unusual circumstances" (Guidelines section 15300.2 (c)) which removed the racing activity from the exemption. Additionally, the court found that imposing mitigation measures to offset the possible significant adverse change in the environment caused by the activity will not cause the exemption to be applicable unless the mitigation measures result in the elimination of the possibility of a significant adverse change in the environment. The decision to allow stock car racing at a county fair in the first place could well call for some kind of CEQA analysis before starting that activity. Once the activity has been established, however, continuing the activity does not represent a change, and absent a significant change in the use and absent the existence of unusual circumstances. Concerning what are considered normal operations of facilities for public gatherings see Campbell v. Third District Agricultural Association (1987) 195 Cal.App. 3d 115.

July 24, 2023

Sec. 130.25.030 - Special Purpose Zone Development Standards.

Allowed uses and associated structures shall comply with the following development standards listed in Table <u>130.25.030</u> (Special Purpose Zone Development Standards) below in this Section, in addition to any other applicable requirements of this Title, unless a variance is obtained in compliance with <u>Section</u> <u>130.52.070</u> (Variance) in <u>Article 5</u> (Planning Permit Processing) of this Title.

Development Attribute	RFL	RFH	тс	OS
Minimum Lot Size	5 acres	20,000 sq. ft.	None	None
Setbacks: (in feet) Front and Secondary front	50	50	None	50
Sides	50	50	None	50
Rear Rear	50	50	None	50
Maximum Height (in feet)	35	35	None	25

Table <u>130.25.030</u>—Special Purpose Zone Development Standards

<sup>1</sup> Lots that are created for access road, parking areas, common area landscaping and open space purposes are exempt from the area and width standards of the respective zones

July 24, 2023



View showing adjacent nearest homes to Cameron Park Lake tennis courts.

These homes are the most impacted by the conversion of the original tennis courts to pickleball courts.

(Our Home is in the center with the pool.)

## Noise by the numbers

All information in this section is from "Environmental Noise" from Brüel & Kjær

Noise comes in many forms. Many municipal codes and simpler measures rely on the simple decibel measurement, but this does not accurately capture all types of noise.

Туре	Description	Depiction
Continuous Noise	Lawn mowers, leaf blowers, machinery. Things that are long running but can fade into the background.	When man by perhaps
Intermittent Noise	Airplanes, alarm clocks, train horns. Things that are loud, last a few seconds, but are not continuously repeated.	Japan Cooperation of the coopera
Impulsive Noise	Gun shots, fireworks, pickleball. A small peak in noise level that grabs your attention.	Fast Slow 000059/1

Pickleball Lawsuits partial listing April 3 2023 & official complaints		https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uyV3Rwnmbhw	general video		
ocation	Parties	https://www.youtube.com/watch?y=uy//3Rwmmbhw	Comments		
Falmouth MA	Residents vs city	https://www.falmouthma.gov/896/Tennia-Pickleball- Courts2 Ibclid=jwAR2h7xeMLYXD_u8hp6mjd8TEbyr3ZISUPI sctQqPv[LdwdP84VV/AVvP]	Judge Issues Preliminary Injunction Closing Pickleball Courts – In 2019 the city of Falmouth spant \$310,000 to convert one tennis court and one basketball court into 5 pickleball courts. file:///Users/trudischifter/Downloads/Falmouth% 20motiontodismiss%20denied%20(1).pdf		
River Canyon	Residents vs HOA	https://www.rivercanvonestates.com/p/Picklebsil	Closed down to avoid litigation. As the popularity of PickleBall has grown in communities like ours, so has the increase in litigation, contesting placement of PickleBall facilities in residential areas due to the noise created during play. For these reasons, failure to address this situation in a serious way only opens the HOA to potential litigation. With review by legal coursel, we were advised that litigation would be costly with a low level of confidence we could win.		
Mission Woods Kansas	City Mayor Vs Country Club	https://www.kshb.com/naws/local-naws/no-love-lost- between-mission-woods-couple-mission-hills-county- club-over-pickle-ball-courts	demanding court be moved 600 feet from residences		
Water Tower recreation Chestnut Hill PA	Residents vs city	https://www.voutube.com/watch?vervdri9QuT3Va, https://www.chestnuthilliccal.com/stories/parks-rec- put-on-notice-by-water-tower-neighbors-over- pickleball-notes,23765	lawsuit in process, restricted play times, no play on Sundays		
Newport Beach	Residents vs City	https://www.latimes.com/socal/daily-pilot/tn-dpt-me- 0330-noise-lawsuit-20160330-story.html	https://www.ocregister.com/2016/04/07/womap-sues-newport-beach-over-pickleball-ncise-at-park-near-her-home/		
The Reserve Woodside SC	Residents vs Club	https://clubandresortbusiness.com/residents-file- lewsuit-reserve-woodside-pickleball-dispute/			
Ridgewood, nj	Residents vs dty	https://theridgewoodblog.net/village-of-ridgewood- declares-war-on-picklaball/	nearest house 63 feet		
Exeter NH	Residents vs City	https://www.ysl.com/articles/thwack-pop-whack- picklebell-noises-tum-naiphbors-into-activists: 11656423321	in process		
Pacific Groves	Residents vs city	https://www.mercurvnews.com/2019/09/19/pickleball- noise-controversy-goes-before-city-leaders/			
GreebBriar Hills	Residents vs Country	https://www.timesnewspapers.com/webster- kirkwocdimes/sickleball-courts-allowod-witi- cavasVarticle_4a561970-9284-11ed-b2c4- efafdaeb65b0.html	settlement by Mayor, courts have to meet sound ordinance AFTER built-, if not met they can not be used. country club takes the full risk		
Ten law suits in California by one law firm	Residents vs, residents, residents vs HOA, residents vs city	https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-03- 03/oickieball-noise-fueling-neighborhood-drama	Over the last two years, Nicholas Caplin, a founding partner at Lubin Pham & Caplin in Irvine, has represented members of more than 10 California residential communities with newly built or converted pickleball courts in cleims egainst the homeowners' associations that allowed the changes. Caplin said he could not discuss the specifics of the cases because they all settled via mediation and are typically subject to confidentiality or non-disclosure agreements. But he said that in case after case, HOA codes and covenants included noise provisions that the pickleball courts were ultimately found to have violated.		
City of Centenial	Residents vs city	https://douglascountynewsprass. net/stories/centennial-council-passes-temporary- pickleball-moratorium-to-consider-noise-impact. 427167	"The recommended ordinance presents you with two questions: Whether to allow unregulated pickleball to be constructed within the city and accept the potential for consistent or reoccurring noise complaints and other impacts that may come along with it, versus taking a brief pause to study the issues possibly regulate to ilmit those noise comptaints and other potential impacts that may come along with pickleball," he said. The moratorium applies to projects that have not been built or established by the city yet and are proposed to be within 500 feet of residential properties, residentially zoned areas, or residential land uses, he said."It puts a six-month pause on the city accepting, processing or reviewing and then an issuance of approvals or permits for outdoor pickleball courts, again, within that 500 feet," Marciniak said.		
Old Glebe Civic Association	rasidents vs civic	https://www.adnow.com/2022/11/15/county-may-be- sued-over-pickleball-courts-civic-association-says/	3 of 4 courts closed, 135 ft from nearest homes, one court now haveing sound mitigation added to evaluate results a compromise		

The city of Lake Oswego	residents vs city	https://kolc.com/news/local/pickleball-franzy-comes- with-noise-complaints-and-lawsuits, https://www. lakeoswegoreview.com/news/lake-cswego-closes- georae-rogers-park-pickleball- courts/article_35e1ffe2-9770-11ed-a751_ 5b9109c97b22.html	shut down courts, moving to areas 7-800 ft from any residences
Bigelow Center gymnasium	resident vs resident and resident vs city	https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/fairfield-settles- suit-ct-judge-injured-17801720.php	personal injury due to spacing of the courts not big enough
Niagra on the Lake	Residents vs town and resident vs club	https://www.thestar. com/news/canade/2022/04/21/neighbour-claims- pickleball-neigh-is-torture-takes-town-and-club-to- court.html	Claims noise is torture
Glenhaven Park CA	residents vs city	https://abc7.com/pickleball-noise-complaints-la- canada-filmtridge-sports/12387558/2 fbclid=lwAR1aCnmOPIX61st9Ekt2AE5vc2xk9Ji062K Mg/bXn-7DKkJont6WKImgCRdk	Glenheven Park in La Candad Flintridge, CA (nearest house 66 feet)
Park City Utah	adopted new zoning rules due to resident compliants	https://parkojty.municipalcodeonline.com/bcok? type=ordinances#name=15-4- 22. Outpoor: Pickleball_Courts_In_Residential_Areas	Park City, Utah – Adoption of new Zoning Rules for Residential PickleBall Courts The Planning Commission can grant Special Use Exceptions for PB courts when the setback from the nearest property boundary is 600 feet. Also, if a study by a certified professional demonstrates there will be compliance with the Noise Code, the setback can be reduced from the 600 feet, but must be at least 150 ft from the property line. The approval is conditioned upon construction of the noise mitigating features included in the noise study. Corraction for Duration of Sound: It is a violation of this chapter for any person to operate, or permit to be operated, any stationary source of sound within any land use district which creates a tentih percentile sound pressure level (L10) of fifteen (15) dBA greater than the levels set forth for the receiving land use districts in subsection A of this section for any measurement period. Such period shall not be less than ten (10) minutes. Notwithstanding subsection B1 of this section, It is a violation of this chepter for any person to operate, or permit to be operated, any stationary source of sound within any land use district which creates at this percentile sound pressure level (L10) greater than (15) dBA above the amblent sound pressure level (L90) of any measurement period. Such period shall not be less then ten (10) minutes. Corraction for Character of Sound: For any stationary source of sound which emits a pure tone, cyclically varying sound or repetitive impulsive sound, the limits set forth in subsection A of this section shall be reduced by five (5) dBA. Notwithstanding compliance with subsection C1 of this section, it is a violation of this chepter for any person to operate or permit to be operated any stationary source of sound which emits a pure tone, cyclically verying or repetitive impulsive sound which creates a noise distubance.
Melbourne Beachside FLA	Resident against HOA	in process, not yet public	
Todd Park Kelowana BC	Residents against city	https://vancouverieland.ctvnews.ca/mobile/popular- victoria-pickleball-court-closing-due-to-noise- complaints-1.58282047cache=tzta6hrdf%3Fclipid% 3028953184bclid=twAR3AMFrrTHd2sCp2U8wKBd62t w3StRFMcl8VtyBH-uuhVhlowO2mtDA_0	Closed due to noise complaints to avoid litigation, nearest house 58 feet, no noise study done when lined in 2018
Congress Park and Sloans Lake Park	Residents complaints to city	https://www.9news.com/article/news/local/next/next- with-kyle-clark/clckleball-noise-divides-neighbors- and-players/73-8beb759c.c19f-40f2-83f3- g09d0753242a2 fbclid=lwAR1TJ8AZ0hH4MEZLsHKwudHjb1lleNBgk7 -adxxTromyp-4ee_QJKgiIDNE	city council in Centennial passed a six-month moratorium on new builds of outdoor courts in that city.
Arlington	Residents threatening lawsuits	https://www.fox5dc.com/video/1149369	https://www.arlnow.com/2022/11/30/exclusive-more-residents-are-threatening-leggl-action-because-of-pickleball-noise/ The group says they're considering legal action along similar lines to what the Old Gisbe Civic Association has discussed, as previously reported by ARLnow.

## Shattered Nerves, Sleepless Nights: Pickleball Noise Is Driving Everyone Nuts

By Andrew KehAudio produced by Alyssa Schukar NYT: 30 Jun 2023

It sounded like popcorn warming in a microwave: sporadic bursts that quickened, gradually, to an arrhythmic clatter.

"There it is," Mary McKee said, staring out the front door of her home in Arlington, Va., on a recent afternoon.

McKee, 43, a conference planner, moved to the neighborhood in 2005 and for the next decade and a half enjoyed a mostly tranquil existence. Then came the pickleball players.

She gestured across the street to the Walter Reed Community Center, less than 100 feet from her yard, where a group of players, the first of the day, had started rallying on a repurposed tennis court. More arrived in short order, spreading out until there were six games going at once. Together they produced an hourslong ticktock cacophony that has become the unwanted soundtrack of the lives of McKee and her neighbors.

"I thought maybe I could live with it, maybe it would fade into the background," she said of the clamor, which began around the height of the coronavirus pandemic and now reverberates through her home, even when her windows are closed. "But it never did."

Sports can produce all kinds of unpleasant noises: referees' whistles, rancorous boos, vuvuzelas. But the most grating and disruptive sound in the entire athletic ecosystem right now may be the staccato *pop-pop-pop* emanating from America's rapidly multiplying pickleball courts.

The sound has brought on a nationwide scourge of frayed nerves and unneighborly clashes — and those, in turn, have elicited petitions and calls to the police and last-ditch lawsuits aimed at the local parks, private clubs and homeowners associations that rushed to open courts during the sport's recent boom.

The Growing Appeal of Pickleball

A mash-up of tennis, badminton and Ping-Pong, this sport has long enjoyed a cult following. Now, it is going mainstream.

• Going Pro: Pickleball had no problem attracting millions of amateur players. Now, as the sport grows at the professional level, it must convince spectators that the game is as fun to watch as it is to play.

• Pandemic Pastime: Pickleball began soaring in popularity as the search for new activities during the coronavirus pandemic turned many people into "picklers."

• A Cultural Battle: Tennis enthusiasts and pickleballers are pitted against each other in a clash that goes beyond the fight for court space.

• A Tennis Player's Perspective: A Times columnist who grew up playing competitive tennis took up a paddle to see what all the fuss was about.

The hubbub has given new meaning to the phrase racket sport, testing the sanity of anyone within earshot of a game.

"It's like having a pistol range in your backyard," said John Mancini, 82, whose Wellesley, Mass., home abuts a cluster of public courts.

"It's a torture technique," said Clint Ellis, 37, who lives across the street from a private club in York, Maine.

"Living here is hell," said Debbie Nagle, 67, whose gated community in Scottsdale, Ariz., installed courts a few years ago.

Modern society is inherently inharmonious — think of children shouting, dogs barking, lawn mowers roaring. So what makes the sound of pickleball, specifically, so hard to tolerate?

For answers, many have turned to Bob Unetich, 77, a retired engineer and avid pickleball player, who became one of the foremost authorities on muffling the game after starting a consulting firm called Pickleball Sound Mitigation. Unetich said that pickleball whacks from 100 feet away could reach 70 dBA (a measure of decibels),

similar to some vacuum cleaners, while everyday background noise outside typically tops off at a "somewhat annoying 55."

But decibel readings alone are insufficient for conveying the true magnitude of any annoyance. Two factors — the high pitch of a hard paddle slamming a plastic ball and the erratic, often frantic rhythm of the smacks — also contribute to its uncanny ability to drive bystanders crazy.

"It creates vibrations in a range that can be extremely annoying to humans," Unetich said.

These bad vibrations have created an unforeseen growing pain for pickleball, which emerged from relative obscurity in recent years to become the fastest-growing sport in the country.

The sounds were even dissected last month at Noise-Con 2023, the annual conference of North American noise control professionals, which featured an opening-night session called "Pickleball Noise."

"Pickleball is the topic of the year," said Jeanette Hesedahl, vice chair for the conference.

The same story, the same jarring sound, has echoed across American communities like rolling thunder.

Sue-Ellen Welfonder, 66, a best-selling romance novelist from Longboat Key, Fla., once enjoyed listening to the singing birds and the gentle swish of trees during her daily walks — her "soul balm time" — through a local park. The *thump-thump* of a tennis match never bothered her, either. But the arrival of pickleball this spring, she said, shattered her idyll.

"Pickleball has replaced leaf blowers as my No. 1 noise nuisance," said Welfonder, who has been sketching the outlines of a new novel, set in the present day, with a couple of pickleball-loving characters: "I'm making them really nasty people."

The complaints were equally dramatic at a Feb. 6 city council meeting in West Linn, Ore., where residents have been vexed by the constant click-clacking from Tanner Creek Park.

"One of our neighbors who lived directly across from the courts

and was dying from cancer noted the pickleball noise was worse than his cancer," Dan Lavery, a West Linn resident, said at the meeting. "Sadly, he recently passed."

Scores of similarly suffering Americans are finding their way to a rapidly growing Facebook group, also started by Unetich, where upward of 1,000 frazzled users exchange technical advice, let off steam and engage in a sort of group therapy.

"We try to keep it civil," Unetich said, "because it gets pretty emotional."

A few lessons have crystallized within the group. Soundproof barriers — a go-to solution for many at first — can be expensive and are often improperly deployed. New paddles and balls designed to dampen noise have had marginal uptake among players. Moving pickleball far away from human life may be the only surefire solution — but many are slow to reach that conclusion, which presents its own hurdles.

# Pickleball & Community Noise

Pickleball Noise / January 12, 2023



2012 UL 25 PM 1:46

Photo: South Florida Sun Sentinal

## Pickleball is a Community Noise Problem

The increasing popularity of pickleball has generated an increasing demand for pickleball courts to be constructed near residential communities. This has caused concern among nearby residents who have described the loud pinging and popping generated by the pickleball striking the paddle as "ping pong on steroids". The excessive noise has been attributed to numerous health and wellness issues, including loss of sleep, poor concentration, increased fatigue, hypertension, and impaired cognitive performance. Other residents claim that the excessive noise and traffic has caused a reduction in property values, as few buyers are willing to purchase homes in high noise areas.

The pickleball noise problem is real and significant, pitting pickleball players against residents, and potentially impacting pickleball businesses and community planning. In some communities, the push-back from residents has been extreme, resulting in fewer pickleball courts, limited playing hours, or requirements to use modified equipment. In recent years, there has been an increased interest in materials or equipment that promise to reduce pickleball noise, however, it is questionable as to whether these are truly effective. The pickleball noise problem must be addressed through a cooperative effort between pickleball players, residents, communities, pickleball equipment manufacturers, and pickleball governing organizations.

## Community Noise Standards

Noise standards in community and in workplace environments are loosely based on studies of hearing impairment, where the goal was to minimize human exposure to high noise levels over a certain amount of time. The so-called permissible exposure level (PEL) in a workplace environment (as defined by the <u>US Occupational Safety and Health Administration</u>) is 85 dB averaged over an 8-hour period. Workplace noise surveys are therefore conducted by measuring the ambient noise to which a worker is exposed and identifying the amount of time when the average noise levels exceed 85 dB. Exceedances to the maximum PEL require use of ear protection or modification of the workplace machinery to reduce ambient noise levels.

Workplace noise standards and measurement techniques do not necessarily apply to the establishment of community noise standards. These may vary according to how the areas within the community are zoned. Commercial zones that have high ambient noise levels, such as those that are close to major highways, railroad tracks, factories, airports, etc. may have higher allowable noise levels than quieter residential zones in suburban or rural areas. Noisy urban areas may have ambient noise levels on the order of 60-70 dB, whereas suburban residential areas may have ambient noise levels on the order of 40-50 dB. Figure 1 shows a comparison of average acoustic levels in various scenarios.

### Typical Sound Levels (dBA)



Figure 1. Noise Levels

Typical community noise standards will allow for activities that exceed "normal" ambient noise levels by 5-10 dB depending on the zone in which the activity takes place. A 10 dB increase in sound levels is significant, as it is perceived as a doubling of the perceived loudness level. Communities use these guidelines to allow for the operation of certain businesses (such as factories, restaurants, or nightclubs), equipment (such as trucks, machinery, or air conditioners), or activities, such as pickleball. Community noise standards may allow a restaurant owner to install an outdoor patio if it increases the noise level at the property line by less than 5 dB; however, he may not be allowed to play amplified music on the patio if it increases the noise levels by over 10 dB.

## The Problem with Impulse Noise

The pickleball impact sound may have a peak amplitude that exceeds 120 dB at a distance of one meter over a very short duration. Measurements by acoustical engineers at pickleball courts have found that the pickleball activity increases the overall *average* noise levels by a miniscule amount over ambient levels (1-2 dB). Why is this so? The answer lies in the fact that typical noise surveys are structured to measure steady-state noise levels that do not change significantly over time, such as continuously operating machinery or fans from air conditioning units. The noise from a pickleball impact is a short-duration impulse, that cannot be accounted for with the steady-state measurement equipment and techniques.

As an illustration, a sound level meter might be used to obtain the average ambient noise over a sixty second period. Within this sixty second period, the ball might be hit loudly only a few times. Since the duration of the impact noise is on the order of milliseconds, the total time that the acoustic levels exceed the ambient levels might be less than one second! Consequently, the cumulative short duration impact noise of the paddle striking the ball will be "lost" in the longer time average of the background (ambient) noise. We will address the noise measurement problem in a future article, "<u>Pickleball Noise Fundamentals</u>".

## Where Do We Go From Here?

Current community noise standards are not equipped to handle the random short-duration high-amplitude noise from pickleball because the noise criteria are based on steady-state long duration noise. We are all aware how we can tolerate high noise levels if these levels are steady-state, like sound from a white-noise generator, fan, or waterfall. However, we become disturbed if the steady-state background noise is interrupted periodically with high-amplitude sound, like the slamming of doors or the striking of a pickleball. To account for these impulsive noises, some <u>researchers</u> have proposed use of an annoyance penalty for impulsive sounds, however this methodology is not yet widely accepted.

Clearly, traditional community noise standards and acoustic measurement techniques cannot be used to assess and regulate noise from pickleball courts. New standards and measurement techniques must therefore be developed to address the short duration impulse pickleball noise. In recent years, researchers have studied the effects of <u>impulsive noise</u> to determine ideal ways to minimize its effect on hearing loss. The <u>National Institute for Occupational</u> <u>Safety and Health (NIOSH)</u> has developed a high impulse noise measurement system that was used to assess noise exposure from firearms on law enforcement and military personnel. These and similar studies should be used to develop improved community noise standards and measurement techniques for pickleball.

Pickleball Science. "Pickleball & Community Noise." *Pickleball Science*, 8 July 2023, pickleballscience.org/pickleball-community-noise/.

# 'Pickleball noise MILL 25 PH ILLE creates a human health risk,' study says

ON OCTOBER 12, 2020 BY ARTSCHUMANN

- Published by the Sun Port Charlotte
- By DANIEL SUTPHIN Staff Writer
- Apr 18, 2019 Updated Jul 17, 2020

PUNTA GORDA — Punta Gorda Historic District homeowners in Punta Gorda served up another shot against pickleball play in Gilchrist Park at Wednesday's City Council meeting.

During previous council meetings, homeowners along West Retta Esplanade said the noise causes anxiety, panic attacks and insomnia.

Bernie DePaul, who owns a house across from the courts, blames the noise for his stroke a few years ago.

"The noise across the street was relatively constant," DePaul said. "I didn't need a medical doctor to tell me it was bothering me. It's been bothering me for years. When I

went into the emergency room, the physician said there is nothing wrong with you ... we can't figure it out."

Wednesday, DePaul presented to the council findings from a 2017 noise impact study he paid to have conducted in the area.

William Thornton, of Thornton Acoustics and Vibrations, wrote in his findings:

- The pickleball noise creates a human health risk as the link between certain types of noise (which includes the type of noise emitted by pickleball) and the risk of hypertension, heart disease, etc. is well established.
- The pickleball noise exceeds the limits set for in objective, science-based community noise ordinances as promulgated by communities similar to Punta Gorda.
- The pickleball noise exceeds accepted U.S.
- and international standards and guidelines (such as those produced by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, World Health Organization, etc.) for community and environmental noise emissions/levels.
- The pickleball noise significantly increases the community noise levels (relative to existing ambient noise levels) and the relationship between community noise increase and human impact/annoyance is well established in the scientific body of knowledge.

 There are no effective means (other than enclosing the entire pickleball court in a well-designed building) of reducing the noise emitted by the pickleball courts such as noise walls, barriers or screens. Although these types of solutions are frequently suggested, they are not effective (for reasons of fundamental physics) and will not reduce the noise to acceptable levels.

Thornton Acoustics has completed over 1,500 projects of similar nature since 1972, according to the company's website.



# **PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

## **PLANNING DIVISION**

https://www.edcgov.us/Government/Planning

PLACERVILLE OFFICE: 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667 <u>BUILDING</u> (530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 Fax <u>bldgdept@edcgov.us</u> <u>PLANNING</u> (530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 Fax planning@edcgov.us LAKE TAHOE OFFICE: 924 B Emerald Bay Rd South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 (530) 573-3330 (530) 542-9082 Fax tahoebuild@edcgov.us

June 28, 2023

Cameron Park CSD Michael Grassle 2502 Country Club Drive Cameron Park, CA 95682

## RE: Request for Administrative Approval Administrative Permit Application ADM 23-0014 Cameron Park CSD Pickle Ball Courts Assessor's Parcel Number 083-020-024

Pursuant to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Table 130.25.020, and Section 130.40.210 for Recreational Facilities, High-Intensity (RFH)-Zoned lots within a Community Region, an Administrative Permit has been completed and approved to allow for four permanent pickleball courts, two multiuse pickle ball/tennis courts and one dedicated tennis court.

The project site is located within Cameron Park Lake, a public park operated by the Cameron Park Community Services District. The tennis/pickleball courts are located at the northern portion of the park approximately 10 feet from the northern property line. The site has been used for tennis courts since at least the mid 1970's. Originally consisting of four tennis courts, the CSD began converting tennis courts to pickle ball courts in 2015. Currently there are four dedicated pickleball courts, two multiuse pickleball/tennis courts, and one dedicated tennis court. Although pickleball courts are not directly listed within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, it has been determined to be a similar and compatible use with tennis courts.

Currently the Zoning Ordinance requires the approval of an Administrative Permit for the establishment of tennis courts. Due to the time of which the tennis courts were initially established, the original tennis courts are legal nonconforming. The additional courts added for pickleball are an expansion of the original legal nonconforming use and would require either an Administrative Permit, to establish the courts as legal conforming, or a Conditional Use Permit to expand a legal nonconforming use. The project applicant chose to pursue an Administrative Permit. With the approval of this Administrative Permit the courts would no longer be legal nonconforming and would be legal conforming instead.

## FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

Based on the review and analysis of this project by staff and affected agencies, and supported by discussion in the staff report and evidence in the record, the following findings can be made:

Approval Letter, ADM23-0014 2 of 3

## 1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

- 1.1 Section 130.52.010 of the Zoning Ordinance states, "The issuance of an Administrative Permit shall be a ministerial project pursuant to CEQA".
- 1.2 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

## 2.0 GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY FINDINGS

- 2.1 The Administrative Permit is for a multi-use tennis/pickleball courts that is consistent with the Public Facilities (PF) General Plan land use designation.
- 2.2 The proposed tennis/pickleball court is consistent with Policy 2.2.5.21 (compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood) as the approval is required to be compliant with the Zoning Ordinance standards.

## 3.0 ZONING FINDINGS

## 3.1 The project is consistent with Section 130.20.030.A.2.3.a

Rationale: The use of a pickleball court is not listed within the zoning ordinance, but it is determined to be similar and compatible in nature with a tennis court, as both sports are hard surface racquet and ball based games. The project is zoned RFH, which is intended to regulate and promote recreational uses and activities with high concentrations of people or activities of a more urban nature. As a recreational use the proposed pickleball courts would be consistent and compatible with the RFH zone and the other uses allowed within the RFH zone.

## 3.1 The project is consistent with Section 130.25.020.

Rationale: The project is within the RFH zone district which regulates and promotes recreational uses and activities with high concentrations of people or activities of a more urban mature, such as recreational vehicle parks, sports fields and complexes, and amusement parks or facilities that are primarily located in Community Regions and Rural Centers. As a recreational use the proposed pickleball courts would be consistent and compatible with the RFH zone.

## 3.2 The project is consistent with Chapter 130.37-Noise Standards.

Rationale: Pursuant to section 130.37.020 activities conducted in public parks, public playgrounds, and public or private school grounds, providing an amplified sound system is not required or used is exempt from the noise standards of Chapter 130.37. The project would allow for a tennis/pickleball court within a public park (Cameron Park Lake). As the project is an activity not requiring an amplified sound system, the use of a tennis/pickleball court would be exempt for the noise standards of Chapter 130.37.

23-1530 B 29 of 41

## 3.3 The project is consistent with Section 130.40.210 Outdoor Recreational Facilities.

Rationale: As the project is exempt from the noise standards of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, is located within an established park and would be limited to daytime hours, the project is not anticipated to have a significant impact to the surrounding area.

## 3.4 The project is consistent with Section 130.52.010.A.2.

Rationale: The project is in compliance with the RFH zone provisions, standards and requirements and would not conflict with any previously approved entitlements.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or would like to meet, please contact me at evan.mattes@edcgov.us

Sincerely,

Karen Garner Planning and Building Department Director

By: Evan Mattes, Senior Planner Planning Division

cc: File, ADM23-0014

Enclosures

Attachment 1:Approved Application page;Exhibit A:Site plan

				R 20 AM 9:21
OPADO COL			PLAN	C DEPA. LAT
	EL DORADO	COUNTY PLANNIN	G SERVICE	S
CALIFORNIA	2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville,	CA 95667 (530) 621-5355	http://edcgov.u	s/Planning/
APPLICATION FOR:	DMINISTRATIVE	PERMIT		DM23-00
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.(	083-02	0-024		
A REAL PROPERTY OF A REAL PROPER	: (Describe proposed use)	amoon Purk com	munity ser	vices District
Pickle Ball court				
APPLICANT/AGENT	ichael Grassp			
	2502 COUNTRY O. Box or Street	club drive cam	eron Purk	(A 9568.
	677-2231			
	meron Park Commun:		<u> </u>	in a g
	.0. Box or Street			(A 956.8. State & Zip
P. Phone ( <u>530</u> ).		City EMAIL:		
-	T ADDITIONAL PROPERTY O			' )
ENGINEER/ARCHITECT				
Mailing Address P.	0.0	<u> </u>		Chata Di Tia
P. Phone ( )		City		State & Zip
LOCATION: The property i			combridge 1	load
	N/E	TW/S	street	or road
<u> </u>	iles Of the N/E/W/S	intersection with	major	street or road
in the Temis	Courts	area. PROPERTY S	IZE <u>56</u>	Acces acreage / square foo
x Adg	-	Dat	e 3-8-0	2023
signature	of property owner or authoriz	red agent		
3-20-23	14()	OFFICE USE ONLY	hi h	V
Date	PE	·	ec'd by Twn	Census Rng
		JCC		·····
ACTION BY: DI	RECTOR		IG ADMINISTRA	TOR
ApprovedD	Denied	Hearing Date		Denied
Findings and/or co		Applo		or conditions attached
		APPEAL: Approv	ved	Denied
Title				(Application Revised 3/2

Attachment C



# EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES RECEIVED

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667 (530) 621-5355 http://edcgov.us/Planning/

MAR 2 0 2023

### Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver

EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

### PURPOSE

An Administrative Permit is required in cases where limited review of a proposed structure or use through the site plan review process is necessary to verify compliance with established standards adopted to ensure compatibility with adjacent uses and availability of public services and infrastructure. The Administrative Permit shall also be used for the processing of administrative relief or waiver requests in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Subsection 130.52.010.B or to establish the legal nonconforming status of a use or structure in compliance with Chapter 130.61.

The issuance of an Administrative Permit shall be a ministerial project pursuant to CEQA.

### **INITIAL PROCESS**

- 1. Applicant/agent prepares all required submittal information and makes an appointment to submit the application to Planning Services.
- 2. Planning Services reviews submittal and makes a determination on zoning conformance or if public hearing is required within 20 working days.

NOTE: Ranch marketing and winery activities require Agricultural Commission review, extending the determination by approximately 30-45 days.

### APPEALS

A decision of the Development Services Director or if public hearing is required, the Zoning Administrator, may be appealed to the Planning Commission. Action by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. Appeals must be made within ten working days from date of decision and filed with Planning Services with the current appeal fee, as adopted by the Board of Supervisors through fee resolution.

### FEES

Current application and revision fees may be obtained by contacting the Planning Services at (530) 621-5355 or by accessing the Planning Services online fee schedule at <a href="http://edcgov.us/Planning">http://edcgov.us/Planning</a>.

**NOTE:** Should your application be denied, application fees are nonrefundable. Should you request withdrawal of the application, you may receive only that portion of the fee which has not yet been expended.

### **DEED RESTRICTIONS**

Please review and understand any private deed restrictions recorded against your property to insure your proposed application does not violate such deed restrictions. If a conflict exists between the deed restrictions and your application, the County can still approve your application

## RECEIVE

MAR 2 0 2023

Last revised 09/2016

EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver Page 2

and issue necessary permits. <u>However, County approval does not absolve your obligation to</u> comply with deed restrictions.

### APPLICATION

If the application and submittal requirements are not attached to this information packet, please contact Planning Services. You may also call Planning Services at (530) 621-5355 for general assistance.

### APPOINTMENT

Applications are accepted by appointment only. Please call ahead for an appointment with a planner when you are ready to submit your application. Please have all required submittal information completed before your appointment. Appointments are generally made within 48 hours of your call to Planning Services at (530) 621-5355.



MAR 2 0 2023

Required Submittal Info Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver Page 2

EL DORADO COUNTY EL

EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES

PLANNIN<del>G AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT</del> 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667 (530) 621-5355 http://edcgov.us/Planning/

### REQUIRED SUBMITTAL INFORMATION for Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver

The following information must be provided with all applications. <u>If all the information is not</u> <u>provided, the application will be deemed incomplete and will not be accepted</u>. For your convenience, please use the check ( $\sqrt{}$ ) column on the left to be sure you have <u>all</u> the required information.

### FORMS AND MAPS REQUIRED

2)

3)

Check  $(\sqrt{})$ Applicant County

\_\_\_\_\_1) Application form, completed and signed.

- Letter of authorization from all property owners authorizing agent to act as applicant, when applicable.
- Proof of ownership (Grant Deed), if the property has changed title since the last tax roll.

An 8  $\frac{1}{2}$  x 11" vicinity map showing the location of the project in relation to the distance to major roads, intersections, and town sites.

5) Narrative of project and request.

Provide name, mailing address and phone number of all property owners and their agents.

### SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

6)

One full-sized site plan drawn to scale and of sufficient size to allow for a clear delineation of the following required information (where applicable) in an electronic PDF format (CD-ROM or other medium) and one 11"x17" version of the full-sized site plan. Both versions must include a graphic scale. For your convenience, please check the <u>Applicant</u> column on the left to be sure you have <u>all</u> the required submittal information.

#### Check (√) Applicant County

 Image: Second Stress
 1)
 Project name (if applicable).

 Image: Second Stress
 2)
 Name, address of applicant and designer (if applicable).

 Image: Second Stress
 3)
 Date, north arrow, and scale.

 Image: Second Stress
 4)
 Entire parcels of land showing perimeter with dimensions.

 Image: Stress
 5)
 All roads, alleys, streets, and their names.

	Required Submittal Info Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver Page 3			
SITE PLAN REQUI	REMENTS			
Check (√) Applicant <u>County</u>				
6)	Location of easements, their purpose and width.			
<u>N/A</u> 7)	All existing and proposed uses (i.e. buildings, driveways, dwellings, utility transmission lines, etc.).			
<u>MA</u> 8)	Parking and loading stalls with dimensions (refer to Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.35 – Parking and Loading, and the Community Design Standards – Parking and Loading Standards).			
9)	Trash and litter storage or collection areas, and propane tank location(s).			
<u>///4</u> 10)	Total gross square footage of proposed buildings.			
<u>Ma</u> 11)	Proposed/existing fences or walls.			
<u>NA</u> 12)	Sign location and size (if proposed).			
<u>MA</u> 13)	Pedestrian walkways, courtyards, etc. (if proposed).			
<u>MA</u> 14)	Exterior lighting (if proposed). (Refer to Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.34 the Community Design Standards – Outdoor Lighting Standards).			
<u>N/A</u> 15)	Existing/proposed water, sewer, septic systems, and wells (if applicable).			
16)	Existing/proposed fire hydrants.			
<u>N/A_</u> 17)	The location, if present, of rock outcropping, lava caps, drainage courses, lakes, canals, reservoirs, rivers, streams, spring areas subject to inundation and wetlands. (Show respective 100-foot and 50-foot septic system setbacks when a septic system is proposed.)			
18)	Identify areas subject to a 100-year flood on perennial streams or creeks, and show high water level (100-year) on map.			
<u>N/A</u> 19)	Note any proposed trails within the project; and where applicable, connection to existing or proposed trail systems.			
<u>//4</u> 20)	Summary table on plans (or attached) demonstrating compliance with zoning regulations regarding the following: <ul> <li>Signs (Chapter 130.16 (Signs) - Ordinance No. 5025);</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Parking (Chapter 130.35 – Parking and Loading, and the Community Design Standards – Parking and Loading Standards);</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Landscaping (Chapter 130.33 – Landscaping Standards, and the Community Design Standards – Landscaping and Irrigation Standards); and</li> </ul>			

• Development standards regarding maximum coverage for the lot (see the applicable zone district development standards).

	Required Submittal Info <b>Administrative Permit, Relief, or Waiver</b> Page 4
LANDSCAPE PLAN	REQUIREMENTS (Two copies required when parking facilities are proposed.)
Check (1)	
<u>A/A</u> 1)	Location, quantity, and a gallon size of proposed plant material (See Zoning Ordinance Chapter 130.33 and the Community Design Standards – Landscaping and Irrigation Standards ).
<u>N/A</u> 2)	Lists of both common and botanical names of plant material.
<u>N/A</u> 3)	Location/type of irrigation proposed. The Landscape Plan will be required to meet the County's Water Conserving Landscape Standards, available at Planning Services or online at <a href="http://www.edcgov.us/planning/">http://www.edcgov.us/planning/</a> .

NOTE: APPLICATION WILL BE ACCEPTED BY APPOINTMENT ONLY. MAKE YOUR APPOINTMENT IN ADVANCE BY CALLING (530) 621-5355.



RECEIVED

MAR 2 0 2023

EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

2502 Country Club Drive, Cameron Park, CA 95682 telephone (530) 677-2231 • fax. (530) 677-2201 • www.cameronpark.org

Project Name: Pickle Ball Noise Ordinance Waiver

Date: 3-14-2023

The Cameron Park Community Services District is applying for an Administrative Waiver to allow the community to play Pickle Ball a Cameron Park Lake. The district has received complaints from the residents who live to the North of the Pickle Ball courts regarding the noise. The district hired a third-party firm to conduct a sound study to verify if Pickle Ball violates any county ordinances when is comes to the noise the sport generates. It appears that Pickle Ball does in fact create a constant noise that violates the sound ordinance in El Dorado County.

The Residents property lines are 11 feet from the Pickle Ball courts. There are 4 permanent Pickle Ball courts and another 4 multi use courts. The hours the public can utilize the courts is from 8AM until dusk 7 days a week. The district is investigating to see if Pickle Ball and Park Property is held to the same standard as the rest of El Dorado County. The district is unsure if El Dorado County is aware that Pickle Ball is an amenity at Cameron Park Lake and if this amenity is in fact violating any County ordinances.

Included is a sight map showing the location of the existing Pickle Ball Courts at Cameron Park Lake. The residents directly north of the existing courts are experiencing the negative noise impact.

Thank you for your time in reviewing this information.

Michael Grassle Parks and Facilities Superintendent Cameron Park Community Services District mgrassle@cameronpark.org



530-558-1146





Imagery ©2023 Google, Imagery ©2023 Maxar Technologies, U.S. Geological Survey, USDA/FPAC/GEO, Map data ©2023 200 ft

https://www.google.com/maps/@38.6842385,-120.9945725,1077a,35y,50.51h,2.01t/data=!3m1!1e3!5m1!1e4?authuser=0





1/1