



COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION

Board of Supervisors Meeting Room
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
<http://www.edcgov.us/planning>
Phone: (530) 621-5355 Fax: (530) 642-0508

Walter Mathews, Chair, District 4
Rich Stewart, First Vice-Chair, District 1
Dave Pratt, Second Vice-Chair, District 2
Tom Heflin, District 3
Brian Shinault, District 5

Char Tim Clerk of the Planning Commission

DRAFT MINUTES

**Special Meeting
August 20, 2014 – 8:00 A.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 8:18 a.m. Present: Commissioners Stewart, Pratt, Heflin, Mathews, and Shinault; KayAnn Markham-County Counsel; and Char Tim-Clerk of the Planning Commission.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Heflin, and carried (5-0), to approve the agenda as presented.

AYES: Stewart, Shinault, Heflin, Pratt, Mathews
NOES: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGENDA ITEMS

2. (11-0356) HEARING - Community Development Agency, Long Range Planning Division, recommending the Planning Commission receive public comment and prepare a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the Targeted General Plan Amendment-Zoning Ordinance Update (TGPA-ZOU). The County is proposing targeted amendments to certain General Plan Polices (TGPA) and a comprehensive update to the Zoning Ordinance (ZOU) to bring it into conformance with the General Plan as required by Government Code 65860. The Project would take effect county-wide in those areas that are under County jurisdiction including County lands outside the cities of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe that are not under the Jurisdiction of federal or state agencies or tribal lands. (Cont. 08-18-14, Item 1)

Shawna Purvines went over Next Steps, with Chair Mathews ensuring that staff's response to comments would be brought to the Commission for review.

Dave Defanti stated that once staff had finished the response to comments to the DEIR, they would be returning to the Commission. He also stated that the flagged list is the Planning Commission's list, but staff had received public requests to view other items.

County Counsel KayAnn Markham reminded the Commission that if there was a conflict of interest, they needed to recuse themselves from the discussion.

Flagged Item #4 – Noise

Although this item was discussed at the last meeting, Ms. Purvines wanted to address some questions raised and to confirm that the questions were limited to non-conforming uses.

Commissioner Stewart felt that construction noise needs to be brought back as there are inconsistencies with the General Plan. Significant discussion ensued on temporary construction noise.

Don Van Dyke made the following comments:

- Thanked Commission for considering the changes;
- Spoke on other jurisdictions' methods of handling noise; and
- Requested clarification on Title 17 vs Title 9 regarding new and existing construction.

The Commission and staff discussed noise exemptions being added, particularly for the cutting of firewood.

Valerie Zentner, El Dorado County Farm Bureau, spoke on animal raising/keeping and that the noise and non-conforming use tracks back to Title 6.

Bill Bacchi made the following comments:

- Responded to a Commissioner's comment on early hours for garbage collection by stating that it is done for safety, efficiency and cost savings;

- Commission is not designed for individual personal issues, which is delaying the process; and
- Obvious that delay tactics are being used by certain individuals.

Ellen Van Dyke made the following comments:

- Appreciated the time being spent on items;
- Spoke on noise exemptions and felt that a note needs to be added on the document indicating that staff would make changes;
- Title 9 and Title 17 are supposed to work together; and
- Unsure why parks needs to be exempted.

Chris Daley inquired on the definition of “religious” since religious groups are specifically identified in the document. Planning Commission concurred with Mr. Defanti’s suggestion to remove “religious groups” from the document.

Flagged Item #5 – Protection of Wetlands and Sensitive Riparian Habitat

Commissioner Stewart stated that the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance seemed to be inconsistent regarding setbacks and he didn’t see any analysis in the DEIR.

Cheryl Langley spoke on biological resources and flood plain and referenced her submitted written comments.

Flagged Item #6 – Infill Program/Opportunity Areas

Chair Mathews liked the idea.

Commissioner Stewart is fine with the concept but had concerns if certain parcels were identified by lines, then it would give a sense of entitlement. He would like the criteria to speak for itself.

Commissioner Pratt viewed it as an option for someone to pursue and not as identification.

Commissioner Heflin felt that based on the Commission’s comments they all felt that this was a good thing.

Ellen Van Dyke voiced concern that opportunity areas were not being identified now and that no site specific review would be done.

Valerie Zentner, El Dorado County Farm Bureau, voiced concern on recycled water not restricted to rural areas.

Noah Briel stated that the common way to identify areas but not parcels is to put a marker on a map where transit stops are located.

Flagged Item #7 – PD/Open Space Requirements

Ms. Purvines presented proposed new language.

Commissioner Stewart stated that there had been a lot of comments from Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills residents as this is a very hot topic. This would help alleviate lots of concern.

Commissioner Pratt felt it worked against the “infill” concept.

Significant discussion ensued which included considering new language for clarification on intent.

Bill Bacchi, Lotus, made the following comments:

- Trying to represent rural lands;
- Once factors such as oak woodlands, wetlands, 30% slope, 30% open space, roads and infrastructure are taken out, there isn't much land left, even with larger parcels;
- This is a complicated factor;
- Open space creates no revenue and questioned who would maintain it and who/what would be allowed on it;
- Inquired where the 30% came from;
- Need to keep options open;
- No longer have an economy that can maintain large parcels and large homes;
- Restrictions cost money; and
- Quality and usefulness of open space is more important than the percentage of land identified for open space.

Ellen Van Dyke reinforced that open space in El Dorado Hills is golden.

Noah Briel, El Dorado Hills, made the following comments:

- Group met on open space 6 years ago and there is some open space in Cameron Park that is landlocked; and
- Perhaps open space can be used for common or biological purposes.

Don Van Dyke, Rescue, made the following comments:

- Other jurisdictions require 30% open space;
- Nobody is required to take care of open space, it is a low maintenance cost; and
- Provides visual pleasure.

Eva Robertson, Cameron Park realtor, spoke on moderate housing and open space.

Commissioner Shinault spoke on the methodology used in Tahoe for open space. He stated that this needs significant review as there are a lot of alternatives that could be used and would like to see this pulled for further discussion.

Commissioner Stewart suggested identifying specific zone districts or community regions.

Chair Mathews stated that one size does not fit all and this is too big of a change.

Flagged Item #8 – New Rural Commercial (CRU) Zone

Chair Mathews felt it was great idea.

Commissioner Stewart confirmed that it was an empty zone that would be available for people to use.

Valerie Zentner, El Dorado County Farm Bureau, made the following comments:

- Concerned that in some cases this is more restrictive;
- If zoning is tied to use, what is the benefit;
- This is not necessary and makes parcels unequal; and
- Need to look at use and ensure it is appropriately conditioned.

Noah Briel, El Dorado Hills, stated that he didn't mind the CRU zoning as a choice as long as it wasn't the only choice.

Commissioner Heflin inquired if this could be used as an "either/or".

Mr. Defanti provided some options on how to use the CRU zone.

Flagged Item #9 – Mixed Use Development Design Manual

Ms. Purvines agreed that more clarification was needed.

Flagged Item #10 – Standards within the DISM/LDM or successor document

No discussion.

Mr. Defanti explained that the next meeting would be to go over everything and the Next Steps. Staff would then return in 4-6 weeks with a tentative recommendation to discuss.

There was no further discussion.

Hearing was continued to Wednesday, August 27, 2014 at 8:30 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11:48 a.m. the hearing was continued to Wednesday, August 27, 2014.

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION
Authenticated and Certified:

Walter Mathews, Chair