

7/1/2020

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: July 9 Meeting

PC 7.9.20

Item #3

Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>



Fwd: July 9 Meeting

1 message

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>
To: Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Wed, Jul 1, 2020 at 3:11 PM

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

From: <nancywws@aol.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 1, 2020 at 2:57 PM
Subject: July 9 Meeting
To: planning@edcgov.us <planning@edcgov.us>

Clerk of the Planning Commission

Please provide these comments for the planning commission meeting. Thank you.

Notice Requirements: It appears that the planning commission is recommending less public notice instead of increasing notice. I don't understand, or maybe I do, why you would want less public involvement in your work. We are the taxpayers and we count on you to serve us well. Transparency is one of the county guidelines, and keeping us uninformed reeks of opaqueness. I advocate for much more notice in order that the commission doesn't later say that we never commented on something so too bad. We may be an opinionated bunch, but another way to view it is to consider us another pair of eyes. Furthermore, the more that residents learn about how county government works, the better prepared we are to be knowledgeable citizens and voters. I believe that is one of the building blocks of our democracy. Please consider increasing rather than decreasing notice. If it is a burden, we can volunteer to do the job. I don't expect mailed 10 day notice about run of the mill items, but I certainly expect notice of an appeal of Cool General, Amendments to the General Plan, etc. Lately it seems your printed legal notices are not consistently in any particular papers. Fortunately our library is open again and I can make a weekly planned visit to read the legal notices. It's only a 22 VMT kind of expedition. I was surprised that you consider a plan involving 300 parcels to be one with so little notice. That is a huge change to the neighborhood! And I get it that people didn't respond well to the mailed notice. Thank goodness for legistar.

Amendments: I can't discern the importance and true effects of the changes to CEQA. My concern with the changes is the vocabulary. Where is it described what is 'feasible'/'not feasible'; 'significant'/'not significant' and substantial, major, minor etc. Who gets to decide these things? This leads right back to: is a heritage tree important enough to beat the definition of not feasible? Who decides that one? Overall the major amendments seem reasonable, though I hope you have a picture of Apple Hill in mind when you contemplate expanding all those uses. Oh, boy.

Thank you for your time,

Nancy DeRodeff
Quintette, CA