

**EL DORADO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**September 14, 1995 8:30 A.M.**  
**Building C Hearing Room**  
**2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667**

**M I N U T E S**

=====

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Wolfenden called the meeting to order at 8:55 a.m. The following persons were in attendance: Commissioners Mahach, Noble, McKeehan, and Wolfenden; Edward A. Knapp, County Counsel; Peter N. Maurer, Principal Planner; and Jo Ann Brillisour, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

A Pledge of Allegiance was given by the Commission and those persons in the audience.

**3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOBLE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, IT WAS MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA, WITH ADDENDUM.

**4. CONSENT CALENDAR (All items on the Consent Calendar were approved by one motion unless a Commission member requests separate action on a specific item.)**

a. Minutes of August 17, 1995

Commissioner Mahach pulled the Minutes from the Consent Calendar.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, ~~SECONDED MAHACH~~, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKEEHAN AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, NOBLE, MCKEEHAN; ABSTAIN - COMMISSIONER WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 17, 1995, AS CORRECTED.

5. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

These items were considered during the day as time permitted.

The Clerk requested that the Commission set a meeting in November to consider regular applications. There is one meeting scheduled for General Plan consideration and none for regular applications. The Commission set November 30.

6. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Commissioner Mahach said he would like to go over the actions the Commission will be taking on the General Plan next week. One action would be on internal consistency. He would like to see a listing by next week, or a matrix, of all the significant impacts identified in the draft EIR. In the last few months, have we mitigated some of the impacts previously listed as significant to less than significant? There should be a statement whether the mitigation measure is feasible or infeasible. If it is infeasible, he would like to see a draft statement of infeasibility. There should also be draft statements of overriding consideration, if necessary.

**PUBLIC FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

7. ZONING BOUNDARY AMENDMENT (Public Hearing)

- a. Z94-18; petition submitted by ROBERT and MAYRE AARON and DAROL B. RASMUSSEN (Agent: Don Rippe) to rezone properties from Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD) to One-family Residential (R1) Zone. The properties, identified by Assessor's Parcel Nos. 083-465-22, -27, and -28, consist of 4.1 acres, are located on the west side of Mira Loma Drive, at the intersection with Perlett Drive, in the Cameron Park area. (Negative declaration prepared)

Janet Postlewait presented this item with a recommendation for denial.

Commissioner Noble asked if the inconsistency is based upon the policy that we should not be reducing the amount of multifamily. Mrs. Postlewait said the General Plan designation is actually on the map. Chairman Wolfenden said amending the General Plan map would be against the OPR extension.

Peter Maurer said the Commission should decide whether or not this type of density is appropriate for this location.

Commissioner Mahach said this property is surrounded by single family residential so it appears you could find consistency.

Darol Rasmussen said they are trying to develop the County to facilitate the needs of the people. He went over some background information on this property (Cameron Woods).

Mr. Rasmussen said there has been no interest in developing this area R2 (Multifamily). It is not economically feasible. The County is going towards single family ownership and family oriented residential ownership in this area. He said 100 percent of the people in this area are in favor of the reduction in density. Mr. Rasmussen referred the Commission to the large multifamily residential area on Exhibit D.

Don Rippy asked that when the County considers multifamily in this area that it consider the impacts on the Community Services District.

There was no further input.

Commissioner Noble said he is concerned when he sees a planned development overlay. Was it put on this property by the County? Mr. Maurer said he believes it was Imposed by the County so there could be review of the impacts of multifamily proposals on the single family residential areas. Commissioner Noble said he does not have a problem with this request, but we are up against some policies in the General Plan.

Commissioner Mahach asked if the Commission is just considering the rezoning today. Mrs. Postlewait said that is correct.

Chairman Wolfenden said he feels this is a logical area for this type zoning. Commissioner McKeehan agreed.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOBLE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, NOBLE, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AS PREPARED; RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MODIFY THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT GENERAL PLAN FROM MULTI-FAMILY TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES; AND RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE Z94-18, REZONING ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOS. 083-465-22, -27, AND -28 FROM LIMITED MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (R2-PD) TO ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R1), BASED ON THE FINDINGS PROPOSED BY STAFF.

Findings

1. The project is consistent with the Public Review Draft General Plan, as amended; and there is little to no probability the project will be detrimental to or interfere with the future adopted General Plan.
  2. The use is compatible with surrounding land uses.
  3. The site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development.
  4. The proposed zone change is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage.
- b. **Z94-19;** petition submitted by CAMERON WOODS ASSOCIATES, INC. (Agent: Don Rippy) to rezone properties from Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD) to One-family Residential (R1) Zone. The properties, identified by Assessor's Parcel Nos. 083-463-06 and -07, consist of 1.379 acres, are located on the east side of Cinsant Drive, 200 feet north of the intersection with Perlett Drive, in the Cameron Park area. (Negative declaration prepared)

Janet Postlewait presented this item with a recommendation for denial. She said, as mentioned by Wayne Swart, the commercial across the street is Professional Office Commercial (CPO) which allows different uses than those allowed under straight commercial.

There was no further public input.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOBLE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, NOBLE, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AS PREPARED; RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MODIFY THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT GENERAL PLAN FROM MULTI-FAMILY TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES; AND RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE Z94-19, REZONING ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOS. 083-463-06 AND -07 FROM LIMITED MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (R2-PD) TO ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R1), BASED ON THE FINDINGS PROPOSED BY STAFF.

Findings

1. The project is consistent with the Public Review Draft General Plan, as amended; and there is little to no probability the project will be detrimental to or interfere with the future adopted General Plan.
  2. The use is compatible with surrounding land uses.
  3. The site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development.
  4. The proposed zone change is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage.
- c. **Zoning Boundary Amendment 95-15**; petition submitted by EL DORADO HILLS DEVELOPMENT COMPANY (Agent: Sam Miller) to rezone lands in Village B (TM91-1242R) of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan as follows: Area A - Open Space (OS) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)—approximately 1.5 acres; Area B - One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD) to Open Space (OS)—approximately 12.0 acres; Area C - Planned Commercial (CP) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)—approximately 0.5 acres; and Area D - Planned Commercial (CP) to Planned Commercial-Planned Development (CP-PD)—approximately 25.7 acres. The properties, identified by Assessor's Parcel Nos. 111-630-01, -02, and 111-710-01, consist of approximately 40 acres, are located north of Serrano Parkway and east of Silva Valley Parkway, in the **El Dorado Hills area**. (Environmental Impact Report and negative declaration previously adopted)

Robert Britzman presented this item with a recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Noble asked for further clarification on Exhibits D and E.

Commissioner Mahach asked about screening between the residential and commercial areas. Mr. Britzman briefly explained.

There was no one else in the audience wishing to give input.

Neither the applicant nor his representative were present.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MCKEEHAN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOBLE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, NOBLE, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AS PREPARED AND APPROVE Z95-015, REZONING ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NOS. 111-630-01, -02 AND 111-710-01 AS FOLLOWS, BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS.

Area A: Open Space (OS) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD), approximately 1.5 acres.

Area B: One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD) to Open Space (OS), approximately 12.0 acres.

Area C: Planned Commercial (CP) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD), approximately 0.5 acre.

Area D: Planned Commercial (CP) to Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD), 25.7 acres.

Findings

1. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the applicable El Dorado County General Plan.
2. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the intent of the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan.
3. The proposed zoning is compatible with the adjacent uses.
4. The site is physically suitable for the proposed zoning.
5. The proposed zoning will not create any significant environmental effects not already addressed in the EIR, State Clearing House #86122912.

8. GENERAL PLAN/ZONING BOUNDARY AMENDMENT (Public Hearing)

- a. AZ95-01; initiated by the EL DORADO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS in response to recommendations from the Meyers Community Roundtable to amend the Meyers Community Plan, primarily changing some of the "allowed uses" to uses permitted by "special use permit". (Negative declaration previously adopted)

Robert Britzman presented this item with a recommendation for approval. He said before this application goes to the Board, the Commission recommendation will be forwarded to the Roundtable.

Norm Kosco, owner of Road Runners store, said he does not have a problem if the Commission goes with the recommendation of staff, particularly still requiring a special use permit for food and beverage sales in Special Area #4. There should be a separate category for food and beverage which includes the sale of gasoline. It should not be included with the food and beverage sales that do not include gasoline sales. Mr. Kosco said he talked to four members of the

Roundtable and they all expressed shock that a change was proposed to allow food and beverage sales as an allowed use.

Tom Bamert, part owner of Yank's Station complex, said he was concerned when he read the report and would not be allowed to have multifamily. They have owned their property for 22 years. At the present time, the building on the property is not used. They would like to convert the use to multifamily. Mr. Bamert said he would be willing to go through the special use permit process.

Tom Sweeney, property owner in Meyers and developer, said everyone he has talked to on this area is completely against this Plan. The City of South Lake Tahoe is spending millions of dollars to clean up past mistakes in the area, and we are here talking about creating a commercial zone on a scenic highway. Do we really want another Highway 50 on Highway 89? He does not want to see it. Mr. Sweeney said he does not believe you can create any services on Highway 89 that are not already on Highway 50 or which cannot be created on Highway 50.

Mr. Britzman said the area on Highway 89 has been zoned Industrial since the 1960s. There are no commercial zones in that area. Some uses may be allowed by special use permit. Mr. Sweeney said he would not like to see any commercial uses allowed either with or without a special use permit.

Bonnie Del Parto presented petitions from people (46) opposed to Mr. Kosco's comments.

Carl Fair said he agrees with the staff recommendation. The sooner this is done, the sooner they can clean up Meyers.

Brad Engebregson said he does not agree with what is being done. He presented his written comments.

Ray Nutting said the Roundtable was created by individuals in Meyers area. He supports that organization.

Mr. Fair asked if sending the Commission recommendation to the Roundtable will change the Board hearing in October. Staff said it would not.

Commissioner Noble asked if the City has any plans for annexing this area. Mr. Britzman said none that he is aware of.

Ridgley Reese, representing the Meyers Roundtable, presented a letter with their recommendation that there be a change in Special Area #4 to require food and beverage sales by special use permit. She read the letter into the record.

There was no further input.

Commissioner Noble said he has some concerns. He does not know why we are requiring a special use permit for some uses that seem reasonable by right. Mr. Britzman said one of the main purposes of the Meyers Community Plan was to maximize the efficiency and use of the various types of land uses in the area. They looked at the five areas and tried to consolidate the different types of uses in those areas. One of the results was Special Area #4 being industrial and attempting to preserve it primarily for that type of use. There is very little industrial land particularly in the unincorporated area of the Basin. The greater share of industrial land is already governmental land, i.e., fire station, County yards.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKEEHAN AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; NOES - COMMISSIONER NOBLE; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE MEYERS COMMUNITY PLAN AS BEING ADEQUATE FOR THE MINOR ACTIONS PROPOSED BY THIS PROJECT, AND FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AZ95-01, BASED ON THE FINDINGS PROPOSED BY STAFF.

**Proposed changes to Meyers Community Plan, Pages 2-8 through 2-13. Alter only the following listed uses, changing the categories (A) Allowed, and (S) Special Use, as noted.**

<b>Yank's Station Land Use District (Special Area #1)</b>		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Employee Housing	A	S
Bed and Breakfast Facilities	A	S
Local Post Office	A	S
Transit Stations and Terminals	A	S
Visitors Center	A	S
Secondary Storage	P	S*
Warehousing	P	S*
* Applies only to parcels on Santa Fe Road. Uses prohibited in remainder of Special Area #1		



Lake Valley Land Use District (Special Area #2)		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Employee Housing	A	S
Visitors Center	A	S
Transit Stations and Terminals	A	S*
* Maintenance facilities are not allowed within any new transit station.		
West Meyers Land Use District (Special Area #3)		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Single Family Dwelling	A	S
Bed and Breakfast Facilities	A	S
Social Service Organizations	A	S
Industrial Tract Land Use District (Special Area #4)		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Food and Beverage Sales	S	A <u>S</u>
Furniture/Home Furnishings/Equipment	A	S
Outdoor Retail Sales	A	S
Personal Services	A	S
Upper Truckee River Land Use District (Special Area #5)		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Visitors Center	A	S
Transit Stations and Terminals	A	S
Riding and Hiking Trails	A	S

**Findings**

**General Plan Amendment** -

1. The proposed amendment to the Meyers Community Plan is consistent with the policies and direction of the adopted Meyers Community Plan.

**Zoning Ordinance Amendment**

1. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment is consistent with the Meyers Community Plan policies and intent as amended herein.

2. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment is minor in nature and compatible with the existing and planned land uses and in the area.
3. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment will not create any significant environmental effects not already addressed in the previously approved Negative Declaration for the Meyers Community Plan.

9. **ZONING BOUNDARY AMENDMENT/PLANNED DEVELOPMENT/TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP** (Public Hearing)

- a. **Zoning Boundary Amendment Z95-12/Planned Development PD95-08//Tentative Map 95-1302 (Quicksilver Estates)**; petition submitted by EDWIN S. and LORRAINE BEALL (Agent: Gene E. Thorne & Associates, Inc.) to rezone property from Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A) to One-acre Residential-Planned Development (R1A-PD) Zone; development plan to allow clustering of lots to less than the one-acre minimum of the R1A Zone; and tentative subdivision map proposing to create 15 residential lots, ranging in size from 0.49 to 1.4 acres, and one 7-acre open space parcel on a 21.2-acre site with a design waiver request to allow a Hillside Standard cul-de-sac road without parking bays. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel No. 042-410-09, is located on Mercury Trail, 200 feet west of Gold Ridge Trail, 1,200 feet from the southern junction of Gold Ridge Trail and Sly Park Road, in the **Pollock Pines area**. (Negative declaration prepared)

Roger Trout presented this item with a recommendation for approval. Two letters were received which Mr. Trout summarized.

Commissioner Mahach asked for clarification on the land use designation for the property. Mr. Trout replied it is Medium Density Residential.

Commissioner Mahach asked how many parcels will be created by the parcel map application. Mr. Trout said there will be four.

Gene Thorne showed the Commission a colored rendering of the area indicating the proposed lots, proposed open space, and surrounding parcel sizes. They will be installing EID water. All lots are satisfactory for septic systems.

Chairman Wolfenden asked about the cul-de-sac which ends at the open space area. Mr. Thorne said they will not be able to do anything in the open space area that is not normally allowed in such an area. These are privately maintained roads. This will be a closed gate community.

Commissioner Noble said staff stated this property was previously zoned Agriculture and rezoned R3A with the adoption of the Area Plan. He does not see anything from Environmental Health. Mr. Trout read the memo from Pearl Irby.

Commissioner Wolfenden asked about the design waiver and not requiring parking bays as required by the Hillside standards. Randy Pesses, Department of Transportation, said putting in parking bays would create more damage than what would be received. There is sufficient on-site parking space.

Commissioner Mahach asked about maintenance of the open space area, i.e., fuel modification. Mr. Trout said staff would like to add the standard condition regarding fuel modification. Mr. Thorne agreed to the addition of such a condition.

Commissioner Noble asked the length of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Thorne said it is 1200 feet. Mr. Noble asked if that is in compliance with the fire safe regulations. Wayne Trumbley, El Dorado Fire Protection District, said he believes it is. Peter Maurer read the pertinent section from the regulations.

There was no further input.

Commissioner McKeehan said there is a possibility for development to the south. Mr. Thorne said the two parcels to the south get progressively steeper. He does not believe you could get more than five or six parcels because of the steepness.

Commissioner Noble asked who will maintain the open space area. Mr. Thorne replied it will be maintained by homeowners association.

Commissioner Mahach said he sees these lots as a transition between some larger acreage and the much too small lots in Gold Ridge Forest. He likes the open space, particularly with a fuel management plan.

After the motion and before voting, Commissioner Noble said he has some concerns. Most of the development in this area was not a good idea in the first place. One of the difficulties he has is that this is Cohasset soils. The Cohasset and Aikin soils are the best timber growing soils we have. They are also the best septic system soils. The project falls within the requirements, however, it is just on the edge of everything. He does not want to see all this area broken up into planned developments and one-acre parcels. Otherwise, it looks like a pretty good subdivision.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKEEHAN AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MCKEEHAN, NOBLE, MAHACH, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AS PREPARED; RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE Z95-12, BASED ON THE FINDINGS PROPOSES BY STAFF; AND RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PD95-08, ADOPTING THE DEVELOPMENT

PLAN AS THE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, BASED ON THE FINDINGS PROPOSED BY STAFF; FURTHER, THE COMMISSION APPROVED TM95-1302, BASED ON THE FINDINGS PROPOSED BY STAFF, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS MODIFIED THIS DATE.

Findings - Zoning

1. The proposed rezone from R3A to R1A-PD and OS is consistent with the land use designation and policies of the Public Review Draft General Plan.
2. The project site is suitable for the proposed zoning as all required services are located near the site and can be extended as part of the conditions of approval of a tentative subdivision map.
3. The project will not threaten the public health, safety, and welfare.
4. The project has a reasonable probability of being consistent with the final El Dorado County General Plan.
5. The project will not have a significant impact on the environment because the project design and standard conditions of approval will reduce the potential environmental impacts of the project to a point of insignificance.

Findings - Development Plan

1. The development plan is consistent with the Public Review Draft General Plan Policies and Land Use Map.
2. The development plan is authorized in Chapter 17.04 (Planned Development procedures).
3. The development plan is designed to provide a desirable environment within its own boundaries.
4. The site is physically suited for the proposed development.
5. The proposed development does not significantly detract from the natural land and scenic values of the site.
6. The project will not have a significant impact on the environment because the project design and standard conditions of approval will reduce the potential environmental impacts of the project to a point of insignificance.

Findings - Tentative Map

1. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the proposed R1A-PD and OS zoning of the property.
2. The proposed subdivision as conditioned, substantially conforms with the County design requirements.
3. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the land use map and the development policies of the El Dorado County Public Review Draft General Plan (December 1993).
4. The project will not be detrimental to or interfere with the future El Dorado County General Plan.
5. The project will not have a significant impact on the environment because the project design and standard conditions of approval will reduce the potential environmental impacts of the project to a point of insignificance.

Findings - Design Waiver

1. There are special conditions or circumstances peculiar to the property proposed to be divided which would justify the adjustment or waiver. The lots are considered to be large enough to handle all necessary parking on-site.
2. Strict application of the design or improvement requirements of this article would cause extraordinary and unnecessary hardship in developing the property, by creating significant additional grading requirements to provide parking bays, which is inconsistent with the intent of the Hillside Design Standards.
3. The adjustment or waiver would not be injurious to adjacent properties or detrimental to health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the public.
4. The adjustment or waiver would not have the effect of nullifying the objectives of the Land Division Ordinance or any other law or ordinance applicable to the land division.

Conditions - Tentative Map

Department of Transportation

1. A final grading plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Department of Transportation. The subdivision design shall be redesigned as necessary in order to meet the County grading and driveway standards.

2. The developer shall obtain approval of construction drawings consistent with the Subdivision Design and Improvement Standards Manual and cost estimates from the County Department of Transportation and pay all applicable fees prior to commencement of any improvements on the public street and service facilities. All improvements shall be consistent with the approved tentative map and development plan.
3. The developer shall enter into an Improvement Agreement with the County and provide security to guarantee performance of the Improvement Agreement as set forth within the County of El Dorado Major Land Division Ordinance.
4. The final map shall show all utility, road, and drainage easements per the recommendation of utility purveyors and the County Engineer. Final determination of the location of said easements shall be made by the County Engineer. The easements shall be irrevocably offered to the County.
5. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with subdivision improvements, the subdivider shall ensure that such blasting activities are conducted in compliance with state and local regulations.
6. If burning activities are to occur during the construction of the subdivision improvements, the subdivider shall obtain the necessary burning permits from the California Department of Forestry and air pollution permits from the County prior to said burning activities.
7. The project shall be subject to area of benefit fees which are currently set at the amount of \$2500 per parcel for each parcel created. Said fees are to be collected at the time of the building permit. If prior to collection of the fee a revised road fee is established, such revised amount shall be paid.
8. The on-site access road shall be constructed as shown on the tentative map except that the total paved width, including the gutter pan shown on the cut side, shall be 28 feet wide and the structural section shall be 3" AC over 8" AB. The road shown between Lots 13 and 14 shall be improved to the southerly property line of Lot 13 as shown on the tentative map except that the structural section shall be 3" AC over 8" AB.
9. The off-site portion of the access road shall be constructed to the same standard described in Condition 8 and shall be extended from the eastern property boundary to match the edge of pavement existing on Mercury Trail.

10. Parking bays are not required, as allowed by the design waiver. No parking is allowed on the street pursuant to the Hillside Design Standards. The street shall be adequately posted to comply with the restriction.
11. The on-site cul-de-sac bulb located at the end of the access road shall be constructed per Standard Plan 114.
12. An irrevocable offer of dedication, in fee, shall be made of 50 feet in width for the proposed roads, with slope easements where necessary. Said offer shall be rejected at the time of the final map; therefore, a homeowners' agreement and association, or other entity, shall be established in order to provide for the long-term maintenance of the roads.
13. An irrevocable offer of dedication, in fee, shall be made of 60 feet in radius for the cul-de-sac, with slope easements where necessary. Said offer shall be rejected at the time of the final map; therefore, a homeowners' agreement and association, or other entity, shall be established in order to provide for long-term maintenance of the roads.
14. Subdivision improvements shall include driveways for all lots with street cuts or fills along the frontage of six feet or more difference in elevation, or as found necessary for reasonable access by the County Transportation Director. Driveways shall be installed in a manner and location acceptable to the County Department of Transportation.
15. The developer shall prepare a drainage study in compliance with the El Dorado Drainage Manual which includes a complete analysis of proposed surface water drainage improvements. Said study shall include analysis of on-site and downstream impacts created as a result of modification of surface water runoff characteristics by this project. Said study shall also identify mitigation of surface water impacts including estimated costs for drainage infrastructure improvements. A final drainage plan shall be prepared by the developer which mitigates those impacts identified by the study. Said study and plan shall be subject to the review of and approval by the Department of Transportation.

At the discretion of the developer and with approval by the County, the drainage plan may be limited to on-site mitigation measures. On-site mitigation shall reduce downstream impacts from this project to less than significant. Peak runoff rates shall be controlled to pre-development quantities. The developer shall demonstrate that on-site mitigation measures will not aggravate flooding problems downstream of the project site during the design storm or other return period events. The developer shall install drainage facilities as shown on said plan. These requirements shall be satisfied with each phase of development.

At the discretion of the developer and with approval by the County, the drainage plan may include or be completely comprised of downstream mitigation measures. Said measures shall be designed to accommodate build-out of the entire tributary catchment assuming ultimate build-out densities designated within the General Plan. Said plan shall extend to a point downstream identified within the drainage study as being subject to no significant, adverse impact from the future development of the entire catchment. The developer shall install all drainage facilities as shown on said plan with the proposed Phase 1 development of this project. The developer shall establish a reimbursement agreement for drainage infrastructure improvement costs expended which exceed the pro rata share of this project as defined within the drainage study.

The drainage study and drainage plan shall be submitted and approved prior to recordation of the final map.

16. Prior to approval of the final map by the Board of Supervisors, the subdivider shall be required to form a County Service Area Zone of Benefit to fund drainage facilities maintenance.
17. All grading plans shall be prepared and submitted to the Soil Conservation Service and the Department of Transportation. The Soil Conservation Service shall review and make appropriate recommendations to the County. Upon receipt of the review report by the Soil Conservation Service, the Department of Transportation shall consider imposition of appropriate conditions for reducing or mitigating erosion and sedimentation from the project. No building permit shall be issued by the County until final grading plans and erosion control plans are approved by the Department of Transportation and the grading is completed.
18. The timing of construction and method of revegetation shall be coordinated by the El Dorado County Resource Conservation District. If grading activities are not completed by September, the developer shall implement a temporary grading and erosion control plan. Such temporary plans shall be submitted to the Soil Conservation Service for review and recommendation to the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation shall approve or conditionally approve such plans and cause the developer to implement said plan on or before October 15.
19. The location of fire hydrants and systems for fire flows are to meet the requirements of the El Dorado County Fire Protection District. The location of hydrants shall be shown on the improvement plans which shall be subject to the approval of the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.



20. In recognition of the need for expanded infrastructure and services to meet the demand on Highway 50 and other arterial roadways generated by cumulative residential development, the developer shall participate in an appropriate mechanism, to provide such funds, or shall pay such fees as may be lawfully adopted for said purposes, should such funding mechanism or fee be established by the County. In the event such funding mechanism or fee is not established by the time of the final map submittal, the applicant shall pay a supplemental fee in the amount of \$1,000 per unit. Such fee shall be paid at the time of the issuance of the building permit for each parcel. At such time as the County adopts a fee which differs from the amount paid, those parcels for which the fee had not already been paid shall pay the new fee amount. In the event the County has not adopted an appropriate mechanism to provide for expanded infrastructure and services as set forth above within one year after recording the final map for Quicksilver Estates, then this condition shall be of no force and effect. If the adopted fee is lower than the \$1,000, then those properties for which the fee had already been paid shall receive a refund of the difference or, in the event no fee is adopted, the full amount refunded.
21. The entry gate on Mercury Trail shall meet all requirements of the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.

**County Surveyor**

22. All survey monuments must be set prior to the presentation of the final map to the Board of Supervisors for approval, or the developer shall have surety of work to be done by bond or cash deposit. Verification of set survey monuments, work completed, or work to be completed, and cost of completion is to be determined by the County Surveyor.
23. All roads shall be named by filing a completed road naming petition for each road with the County Surveyor's Office prior to filing the final map.

**Planning Department**

24. If human remains are discovered at any time during the subdivision improvement phase, the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted per Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code. The procedures set forth in Supplementary Document J, Section VIII, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines concerning treatment of the remains shall be followed. If archaeological sites or artifacts are discovered, the subdivider shall retain an archaeologist to evaluate the resource. If the resource is determined to be important, as defined in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures, as

- agreed to by the subdivider, archaeologist and Planning Department shall be implemented. Treatment of Native American remains and/or archaeological artifacts shall be the responsibility of the subdivider and shall be subject to review and approval by the County Planning Director.
25. A meter award letter or similar document shall be provided by the water purveyor prior to filing a final map.
  26. The subdivision is subject to parkland dedication in-lieu fees, based on values supplied by the County Assessor's Office and calculated in accordance with Section 16.12.090 of the County Code. The fees shall be paid at the time of filing the final map.
  27. The subdivider shall be subject to a \$150 appraisal fee payable to the El Dorado County Assessor's Office for the appraisal determination in order to calculate parkland dedication in-lieu fees.
  28. A letter of agreement from the cable television franchisee, pursuant to Section 16.16.010 (I) of the County Code, shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to approval of the final map.
  29. Prior to the recording of the final map, the developer shall provide evidence of agreement with the El Dorado Union High and Pollock Pines School Districts for payment of such fees as may be established by said school districts in accordance with Government Code Sections 65995-65997. The developer shall produce evidence of an agreement with said school districts to pay, for each building permit issued thereafter, the amount of \$7,198 per residential unit pursuant to Resolution No. 220-91, or such other fee amount established by the Board of Supervisors pursuant thereto or pursuant to any successor thereto.
  30. A Notice of Restriction shall be recorded on the Open Space parcels restricting it from residential development but allowing other uses per Chapter 17.68 of the County Zoning Ordinance.
  31. The tentative map and development plan shall not become effective until the appropriate zoning is approved by the Board of Supervisors.
  32. A fuel modification plan, acceptable to the fire district and the California Department of Forestry, shall be implemented. A letter of compliance with this condition shall be submitted by the fire district to the Planning Department prior to recording the final map.

A D D E N D U M

APPEAL (Public Hearing)

- a. Design Review 95-07; submitted by BILL VOLLENHALS (Kentucky Fried Chicken, Cameron Park), appealing staff's conditions of approval on DR95-07 pertaining the a maximum sign height of 30 feet, instead of the requested 50-foot sign, and that the sign pole shall be encased on wood with decorative support at the base of the sign. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel No. 083-340-14, consists of 0.66 acre, is located on the northeast side of Cameron Park Drive, 0.10 mile north from the intersection with U.S. Highway 50, in the Cameron Park area.

Paul Dettner presented this item with a recommendation that the appeal be denied.

Commissioner Noble asked the height of the sign at the gas station. Mr. Dettner replied 50 feet. Commissioner Noble asked the height of the signs in the shopping center. Mr. Dettner said they are over 50 feet. Commissioner Noble asked if there is a Caltrans sign in the area. Chairman Wolfenden said there is. It is the one that incorporates the Taco Bell sign.

Commissioner McKeehan asked for clarification on the design of the pole. Mr. Dettner explained.

Bill Vollenhals said he purchased the property last year. There was one previous owner. The requirements of Caltrans to use their sign are prohibitive. One requirement is that you be open from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Since Kentucky Fried Chicken does not serve breakfast, they do not open that early.

Commissioner Noble said he does not believe it is important for the locals to see the sign over the overpass. From the freeway, the problem is that the business is set back a ways.

Mr. Vollenhals showed some pictures indicating the locations of 30-foot and 50-foot signs. He would be willing to encase the entire sign if he can have the 50-foot sign.

Mr. Dettner said in the pictures, the applicant is holding a 4 x 8-foot piece of plywood. That is about one third the size of the proposed sign.

Chairman Wolfenden said he did some research on this property. The original owner said there would only be a monument sign because of the visibility in the area. He feels the Caltrans signs are the best way to go.

Harriett Segel, El Dorado Hills, said we are trying to work for a scenic corridor along Highway 50. She questions the usefulness of the sign being 50 feet high, even from the east. It is not going to bring someone off the freeway.

There was no one else in the audience wishing to give input.

Chairman Wolfenden said as this is an appeal, he does not believe the Commission can deny the entire sign. It must approve either the 30 or 50-foot height.

Commissioner McKeehan said he does not have a problem with the pole sign. He does not know about the height and wonders about the effectiveness of the sign.

Commissioner Noble said he does not care for the pole being incased by a wooden sleeve.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER WOLFENDEN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MAHACH AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, NOBLE, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO DENY THE APPEAL ON THE HEIGHT OF THE SIGN AND REQUIRE SAID SIGN TO BE NO HIGHER THAN 30 FEET.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NOBLE AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, NOBLE, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO GRANT THE APPEAL ON CONDITION 2 AND NOT REQUIRE THE POLE SIGN TO BE ENCASED.

### REDEVELOPMENT

- a. **Discussion:** Redevelopment process and the role of the Planning Commission.
- b. **Discussion:** Preliminary Project Area and Preliminary Plan

Commissioner Noble said he would have to abstain on this item due to a possible conflict of interest.

Bruce Pope, Consultant, presented this item to the Commission. He introduced Nancy Miller who is the redevelopment attorney for the Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Pope spoke about the role of the Planning Commission with regard to redevelopment.

Art Marinaccio, representing Sundown Plaza, said a lot of the things we are talking about should have been addressed in the Circulation Plan. He indicated a portion of a parcel on the map that should be included in the redevelopment area. Mr. Marinaccio said he believes the El Dorado Savings property should be excluded from both the Planned Community 5 area and the redevelopment area. The properties on the south side of Highway 50 just are not retail properties. The only reason for leaving them in the

redevelopment area would be to define what the uses would be. These maps need additional work before you use them as a resource. There are very few undeveloped parcels within this area. Mr. Marinaccio said we have a lot of work ahead of us.

There was no one else in the audience wishing to give input.

Commissioner Mahach asked how the Commission feels about leaving the El Dorado Savings property within the area. Chairman Wolfenden said he does not want to see it in Planned Community 5. He is not sure about leaving it in the redevelopment area.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKEEHAN AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSTAIN - COMMISSIONER NOBLE; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 95-01, WITH THE EXCLUSION OF THE PROPERTIES SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 50 AT EL DORADO ROAD.

ON MOTION OF COMMISSIONER MAHACH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCKEEHAN AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES - COMMISSIONERS MAHACH, MCKEEHAN, AND WOLFENDEN; ABSTAIN - COMMISSIONER NOBLE; ABSENT - COMMISSIONER VEIT, IT WAS MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 95-02, WITH THE EXCLUSION OF THE PROPERTIES SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 50 AT EL DORADO ROAD.

10. COUNTY COUNSEL'S REPORTS - None
11. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS - None
12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Wolfenden adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION  
Authenticated and Certified:

  
John Wolfenden, Chairman