

16.20.010 Purpose.


A preliminary map is a generalized document which will allow the feasibility and practicality of a tract of land to be assessed informally in regard to its suitability for subdivision. This requirement is based upon the increasing complexity of subdivision map processing as required by the state and the county. A preliminary map may be submitted, at the option of the applicant, pursuant to this chapter. Where a larger or complicated project is proposed, the applicant may wish to utilize the preliminary map process to assist in focusing upon environmental issues associated with the project. (Ord. 3514 §1, 1985: prior code §9318)



"Thaleia Georgiades"
<Thaleia@directcon.net>
06/29/2007 01:54 PM

To <bosthree@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
cc <ccourtney@ranchocortinaproperties.com>,
<machadodavid@sbcglobal.net>
bcc

Subject Mandatory CONCEPTUAL PUBLIC HEARING?

History:  This message has been replied to.

July 29, 2007

Dear Supervisor Sweeney,

I am writing to ask that you agendize for discussion and direction from the Board, the issue of mandatory **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW PUBLIC HEARINGS** before the Planning Commission. Although County Codes allow applicants to submit their projects for conceptual review at the option of the applicant, apparently Larry Appel has directed his staff to make all projects requiring a general plan amendment, or having potential controversial issues, be mandated to a conceptual, publicly noticed hearing before the Planning Commission for pre-view. As near as I can tell, this is simply Larry Appel's decision and Greg Fuz apparently supports it. However, Larry Appel and Greg Fuz apparently apply this rule at their own discretion without regard to actual merit. I have come to an impasse with Larry Appel as it relates to the Shinn Ranch project in your district.

Larry Apple unilaterally directed our Planner, Jason Hade, to prepare for, agendize, and notice our project for a Conceptual Review Hearing on July 26th against our wishes. I presume they will attempt to charge us for same, which we will protest. We explicitly told them we do not want a Conceptual Hearing. We specifically requested them to prepare for our actual Public Hearing at the soonest date possible. We were told we would not be heard until September or October because they are "so busy". Since we have practically done their jobs for them, which they recognize, we do not feel another 2-3 month delay is justified.

Yesterday at the Planning Commission meeting Larry Appel was challenged as to why these Conceptual Hearings are being held and why staff deems some seemingly more controversial projects as a priority to push through without a Conceptual Hearing while other projects with little or no controversy (such as Shinn Ranch) are being mandated to Conceptual Hearing. The Shinn Ranch project was discussed (in our absence) and the Commissioners were told that our project is incomplete and not ready to be scheduled. This is not true. (I plan to get a copy of the tape for you to hear.) Our project was submitted long ago and is 99.5% complete. As of Monday they should have the other 1/2% of material they requested, and they know it. There is no legitimate reason for them to delay preparing or processing our project for Hearing. It is despicable to portray our highly professional work as incomplete.

- The Shinn Ranch project is a 167acre site including HDR, MDR, and LDR land use designations. Because the Planned Development rules have changed that would have previously allowed several land use designations to be combined and redistributed over a single project, the new General Plan requires we apply for a General Plan amendment to accomplish the same result.
- We also have a Community Region Boundary running through the project that makes perfect sense to be moved slightly since there is already MDR land use designation outside of the line. Moving this line was previously listed by Planning to have been a GP "cleaned up" item but we opted to pull it off because it was being addressed through our project application.
- There are no controversial issues.
- Therefore, just because a General Plan amendment is required, Larry Appel is requiring the Conceptual Review Hearing.

I am at my wits end with this. There is no legitimate excuse for these delays. If Larry Appel and Greg Fuz weren't so busy trying to think up ways to invent more levels of bureaucracy to create "busy work" simply to sustain employment, they might be able to hear what the Board is telling them about streamlining. They have mastered the skill of obstructionism and are throwing it our faces. They're getting away with it and are openly insubordinate. Only your Board can put a stop to this.