



---

## Concerns Regarding Proposed Reduction in Park Parking Requirements (Ordinance XX-2026)

---

From Daniel Norman <ninjanorm@gmail.com>

Date Fri 5/15/2026 9:13 AM

To Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

---

### This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear El Dorado County Planning Commission,

I am writing to express serious concerns about the proposed amendment to Title 130 that would reduce required parking for parks from 1 space per 1,000 square feet of outside use area to 1 space per 10,000 square feet.

While I support efforts to lower development costs, reduce excessive pavement, and prioritize green space, this specific change goes too far and appears more focused on benefiting developers than serving the needs of the public who actually use our parks.

#### Specific Concerns:

This new standard is unusually low compared to typical park parking requirements in California. Many jurisdictions use standards closer to 4–5 spaces per acre or provide substantial additional parking for sports fields (often 15–30+ spaces per field depending on the sport). A full football field (57,600 sq ft) would drop from approximately 58 spaces to just 6 spaces under the proposal.

El Dorado County and neighboring areas like Placer and Sacramento are car-dependent suburban/rural communities with active youth sports leagues, tournaments, family gatherings, and weekend events that regularly draw large crowds. Severely limited on-site parking will push overflow onto residential streets, creating safety issues, congestion, and neighbor conflicts.

Families with young children, elderly residents, and those with mobility challenges depend on convenient parking. This change could make parks less accessible and reduce overall usage.

Additionally, this extreme reduction in parking requirements could expose the County to future litigation. Public parks must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and insufficient parking or accessible spaces has led to successful lawsuits against other California jurisdictions. Overflow parking on residential streets could also create nuisance and safety issues for neighbors.

I respectfully request that the Commission reject or significantly modify this parking reduction. Reasonable alternatives could include a less aggressive standard (e.g., 1 space per 2,000–4,000 sq ft), requiring parking demand studies for larger active recreation areas, or maintaining stronger

requirements for high-use facilities like sports fields.

Thank you for considering this public input before the May 28 hearing and before forwarding any recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. I appreciate your service to the community.

Sincerely,

Daniel Norman  
2340 Drake Ct. Placerville, CA 95667  
[ninjanorm@gmail.com](mailto:ninjanorm@gmail.com)  
530-295-7442