

**Findings**

Based on the review and analysis of this project by staff and affected agencies, and supported by discussion in the staff report and evidence in the record, the following findings can be made:

**1.0 CEQA FINDINGS**

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with the comments received during the public review process. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is adequate for this project.
- 1.2 No significant impacts to the environment as a result of this project were identified in the initial study.
- 1.3 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Planning and Building Department at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

**2.0 GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS**

**2.1 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2.**

General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2 identifies that the purpose of the Rural Residential (RR) land use designation is to establish areas suitable for residential and agricultural development with a wide range of allowable densities ranging from one dwelling unit per 10 acres to one dwelling unit per 160 acres. Lands designated as RR shall be located in Rural Regions.

Rationale: Policy 2.2.1.2 provides for single-family residential unit densities ranging from one dwelling unit per 10 acres to one dwelling unit per 160 acres. As proposed, P18-0011 would create three parcels ranging in size from 26.7 acres to 33.13 acres, consistent with this policy.

**2.2 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.2.**

This policy requires that all applications for discretionary projects or permits shall be reviewed to determine consistency with the policies of the General Plan.

Rationale: Staff has prepared this section on General Plan findings to document the project's consistency with the policies of the General Plan.

2.3 **The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3.**

Policy 2.2.5.3 requires that the County evaluate future rezoning: (1) To be based on the General Plan's general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density; and (2) To assess whether changes in conditions that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The specific criteria to be considered include, but are not limited to, the following nineteen criteria:

1. Availability of an adequate public water source or an approved Capital Improvement Project to increase service for existing land use demands;

Rationale: There are existing private wells on proposed Parcel 1A, proposed Parcel 1B, and proposed Parcel 1C.

2. Availability and capacity of public treated water system;

Rationale: The project proposes to be served by existing private wells. There are no plans to connect to a public treated water system. No substantial increase in water supply use is expected.

3. Availability and capacity of public waste water treatment system;

Rationale: The project would be served by private septic systems and does not propose a connection to a public waste water system.

4. Distance to and capacity of the serving elementary and high school;

Rationale: The school nearest to the site is Latrobe Elementary School, which is located adjacent to the south boundary of proposed Parcel 1B. The project would not generate a significant amount of additional students or significantly affect school capacity.

5. Response time from nearest fire station handling structure fires;

Rationale: The nearest fire station, operated by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department, is located approximately 0.25 miles from the site. Although the project would result in the potential for additional residential units, the project would not affect standard response times.

6. Distance to nearest Community Region or Rural Center;

Rationale: The project is within a Rural Region. The nearest rural center is Latrobe, which is located approximately 0.25 miles to the east of the site. The site is to remain in residential and agricultural use.

7. Erosion hazard;

Rationale: The project site would remain residential and proposes no significant construction or improvements. However, if any allowed uses were proposed for the property that would require any permits, erosion would be controlled through adherence to County grading requirements.

8. Septic and leach field capability;

Rationale: The project proposes to be served through private septic systems. A private septic system currently exists on proposed Parcel 1A. New private septic systems would need to be installed for proposed Parcels 1B and 1C. The County Environmental Management Department (EMD) reviewed the project plans and recommended standard conditions of approval to demonstrate adequate septic and leach field capability exists on the proposed parcels prior to recordation of the final map.

9. Groundwater capability to support wells;

Rationale: The project would be served through existing wells. On June 24, 2019, the County Environmental Management Department (EMD) reviewed the project plans and determined that, based on several existing producing wells on the project parcel, the project site contains adequate groundwater capacity to support existing and proposed uses.

10. Critical flora and fauna habitat areas;

Rationale: As proposed, the project would not adversely affect biological resources.

11. Important timber production areas;

Rationale: The project is not located in and would not adversely affect timber resource areas.

12. Important agricultural areas;

Rationale: The project would not adversely affect important agricultural areas, as it is not designated as or adjacent to Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Locally Important Farmland.

13. Important mineral resource areas;  
  
Rationale: The project is not located near and would not adversely affect mineral resource areas.
14. Capacity of the transportation system serving the area;  
  
Rationale: Based on DOT review of the project plans, the project would not affect transportation system capacity. The project has the potential to add three primary dwelling units (one new unit per parcel). Traffic impacts are expected to be less than significant.
15. Existing land use pattern;  
  
Rationale: The project would be consistent with the existing large lot residential and agricultural uses adjacent to the north, east and west and the agricultural land use pattern to the south. The project has been designed to provide adequate setbacks, buffers, and transitions to neighboring properties. Future use of the property will remain as residential and agricultural as it is currently.
16. Proximity to perennial water course;  
  
Rationale: No perennial water courses exist on the property.
17. Important historical/archeological sites;  
  
Rationale: The Latrobe Cemetery, adjacent to the northern edge of the project parcel, is the only known historic site in the vicinity. The cemetery will be protected from inadvertent impacts from the project by a 100-foot building setback imposed from the boundary of the existing cemetery parcel. There is one known archaeological site on the project parcel; however, that site will be permanently protected from development by imposition of a conservation easement, to be shown on the final map prior to recordation.
18. Seismic hazards and presence of active faults; and  
  
Rationale: There are no active faults or extraordinary seismic hazards in the vicinity of the project.
19. Consistency with existing Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions.  
  
Rationale: There are no CC&Rs currently at the site.

2.4 **The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21.**

General Plan Policy 2.2.5.21 requires that development projects be located and designed in a manner that avoids incompatibility with adjoining land uses.

Rationale: The project would create three parcels, zoned Rural Lands (RL-20), ranging in size from 26.7 acres to 33.13 acres, allowing for a mix of residential and agricultural uses similar in scope and scale to most parcels in the vicinity. However, along a portion of the north project boundary, the project site abuts the existing historic Latrobe Cemetery. To avoid incompatible uses in proximity to the existing cemetery, the project will be conditioned to require a 100-foot building setback to avoid inadvertent disturbance of burial sites outside of the formal cemetery boundary. Further, a portion of the southeast project boundary abuts land zoned Agricultural Grazing (AG), containing an active grazing operation. To avoid incompatible uses (e.g. new residential structures) encroaching into this adjacent grazing land, the project has been designed to incorporate the existing, permanent paved and fenced buffer created by County-maintained South Shingle Road. Therefore, the project has been located and designed to be compatible with adjoining land uses and is consistent with this policy.

2.5 **The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xa**

(1) Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service F (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the county.

Rationale: The project would create three residential parcels; therefore this policy does not apply.

(2) The County shall not add any additional segments of U.S. Highway 50, or any other highways and roads, to the County's list of roads from the original Table TC-2 of the 2004 General Plan that are allowed to operate at Level of Service F without first getting the voter's approval.

Rationale: This is not applicable as the Project is not requesting any modifications to Table TC-2.

(3) and (4). Intentionally blank as noted in the General Plan.

(5) The County shall not create an Infrastructure Financing District unless allowed by a 2/3<sup>rd</sup>'s majority vote of the people within that district.

Rationale: This is not applicable as the Project is not requesting the County create an Infrastructure Financing District.

(6). Intentionally blank as noted in the General Plan.

(7) Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with the policies above. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads and highways are in place as such development occurs.

Rationale: The project would create three residential parcels; therefore this policy does not apply.

**2.6 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xb**

Policy TC-Xb ensures that potential development in the County does not exceed available roadway capacity.

Rationale: This policy is not applicable as this policy refers to the County preparing a Capital Improvement Program (CIP), preparing a Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) Fee Program, and monitoring traffic volumes.

**2.7 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xc**

Policy TC-Xc directs that developer paid traffic impact fees combined with any other available funds shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development.

Rationale: This policy is not applicable as this policy directs how the County will pay for building the necessary road capacity.

**2.8 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xd**

Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Table TC-2 shall not exceed the ratio specified in that table. Level of Service will be as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgement of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.”

Rationale: This project will not worsen (as defined by General Plan Policy TC-Xe) Level of Service (LOS) for any county- maintained road or state highway.

**2.9 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xe**

For the purposes of this Transportation and Circulation Element, “worsen” is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:

A. A 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or

B. The addition of 100 or more daily trips, or

C. The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.

Rationale: This project will generate fewer than 10 trips in the peak hour, and fewer than 100 daily trips. The thresholds in criteria A, B or C of this policy are not met.

**2.10 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xf**

At the time of approval of a tentative map for a single family residential subdivision of five or more parcels that worsens (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element based on existing traffic plus traffic generated from the development plus forecasted traffic growth at 10-years from project submittal; or (2) ensure the commencement of construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 10-year CIP.

For all other discretionary projects that worsen (defined as a project that triggers Policy TC-Xe [A] or [B] or [C]) traffic on the County road system, the County shall do one of the following: (1) condition the project to construct all road improvements necessary to maintain or attain Level of Service standards detailed in this Transportation and Circulation Element; or (2) ensure the construction of the necessary road improvements are included in the County’s 20-year CIP.

Rationale: The project would create three residential parcels and will not worsen traffic on the County road system. Therefore this policy does not apply.

**2.11 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xg**

Each development project shall dedicate right-of-way, design and construct or fund any improvements necessary to mitigate the effects of traffic from the project. The County shall require an analysis of impacts of traffic from the development project, including impacts from truck traffic, and require dedication of needed right-of-way and construction of road facilities as a condition of the development. This policy shall remain in effect indefinitely unless amended by voters.

Rationale: This policy is not applicable as this project does not worsen traffic conditions.

**2.12 This project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xh**

All subdivisions shall be conditioned to pay the traffic impact fees in effect at the time a building permit is issued for any parcel created by the subdivision

Rationale: This project will pay TIM fees at the time a building permit is issued.

**2.13 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy TC-Xi**

General Plan TC-Xi directs the County to coordinate and work with other agencies to plan for the widening of U.S. Highway 50.

Rationale: This policy is not applicable to the project as it is direction to the County to coordinate with other agencies.

**2.14 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 5.1.2.1**

General Plan Policy 5.1.2.1 requires a determination of the adequacy of the public services and utilities to be impacted by that development.

Rationale: The project was reviewed by the County Department of Transportation (DOT) for adequate road access. The project was reviewed by the El Dorado Hills Fire Department for emergency vehicular access and required fire flow requirements. The project was also reviewed by PG&E for electric service. Liquid waste service will be provided via on-site septic systems subject to final review and approval of the County Environmental Management Department. The above agencies and utility companies had no significant issues or concerns with the project and have determined that, as proposed and conditioned, public services and utilities would be adequate to serve the project. To ensure the project will comply with applicable regulations for public service, each entity recommended standard conditions of approval which have been incorporated into the project. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.

**2.15 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 5.2.1.2.**

General Plan Policy 5.2.1.2 requires that adequate quantity and quality of water for all uses, including fire protection, be provided with proposed development.

Rationale: The project was reviewed by the Environmental Management Department (EMD), Environmental Health Division on June 24, 2019 and EMD determined that, based on well permit records for the project parcel, an adequate water supply will be available to serve the new parcels. The El Dorado Hills Fire Department also reviewed the project plans and recommended standard conditions of approval to ensure that required



emergency fire flow will be available prior to issuance of new residential building permits. With incorporation of standard conditions of approval, both EMD and the El Dorado Hills Fire Department have deemed water service to be adequate for the project.

**2.16 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 5.7.2.1.**

General Plan Policy 5.7.2.1 (fire protection in Rural Regions) requires the applicant to demonstrate that adequate emergency water supply, storage, conveyance facilities, and access for fire protection would be provided concurrent with development.

Rationale: The El Dorado Hills Fire Department reviewed the project and recommended standard conditions of approval to ensure adequate water supply, storage and conveyance facilities, including access to those facilities, will be available to serve the project in perpetuity. As conditioned, the project is consistent with this policy.

**2.17 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 6.2.3.1.**

Policy 6.2.3.1 requires the applicant and the responsible fire protection district demonstrate that adequate emergency water flow, fire access and firefighting personnel and equipment will be available to serve the project.

Rationale: The El Dorado Hills Fire Department (Department) reviewed the project and determined that, with incorporation of standard conditions of approval from the Department, adequate emergency water flow, fire access and firefighting personnel/equipment will be available to serve the project in perpetuity. The project is consistent with this policy.

**2.18 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 6.2.3.2.**

Policy 6.2.3.2 requires the applicant demonstrate that adequate access exists, or can be provided to ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site and private vehicles can evacuate the area.

Rationale: Fire and vehicular access to the proposed parcels would be provided via Victoria Way, an existing paved non-County maintained 60-foot roadway and public utility easement from the north side of South Shingle Road, a County-maintained roadway. Both the County Department of Transportation and the El Dorado Hills Fire Department have reviewed the project and found that adequate emergency access exists for the project. To ensure adequate emergency access is maintained in perpetuity, these agencies recommended standard conditions of approval which have been incorporated into the project.

**2.19 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.4.4.**

Policy 7.4.4.4 requires all development projects or actions resulting in impacts to oak woodlands and/or individual native oak trees, including Heritage Trees, mitigate for those impacts as outlined in the County Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP).

Rationale: There are no native oak trees in the vicinity of project-related improvements and therefore, no mitigation will be required as part of the project. Future impacts to Oak Resources are unlikely due to few oak trees on the project parcel. However, if oak trees are impacted by future development, such impacts will be mitigated consistent with the requirements of the ORMP, as implemented under Chapter 130.39 (Oak Resource Conservation) of the Zoning Ordinance. This project is consistent with this policy.

**2.20 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 8.1.2.2.**

Policy 8.1.2.2 requires 40-acre minimum parcel sizes on lands suitable for grazing. This policy also grants the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors flexibility to allow smaller minimum parcel sizes based on other considerations justifying the need for smaller parcels, including but not limited to economic, social or other considerations. Before taking any action to create parcels of less than 40 acres in areas subject to this policy, this policy directs the Board of Supervisors and/or Planning Commission to solicit and consider input from the Agricultural Commission.

Rationale: The project was reviewed by the Agricultural Commission (Commission) on November 14, 2018 and further reviewed on September 12, 2019 for compliance with the General Plan. However, after both hearings, the Commission failed to reach a consensus on a recommendation for this policy due to disagreements on whether the site should be considered as suitable grazing land. The Commission did concur, however, that there had not been any grazing operation on the project parcel since prior to 2004. The El Dorado County General Plan is a comprehensive document in which no single component can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. As the Commission failed to reach consensus on this policy, staff concludes that there was no substantial evidence that the project site should be considered as grazing land, and that the General Plan allows for 25 to 30-acre parcel sizes for this project because the land is designated Rural Residential (10 acre minimum), is surrounded on three sides by non-agricultural lands, and complies with other General Plan Policies designed to protect agricultural land, including Policy 8.1.3.1 requiring a 10 acre minimum parcel sizes adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands and Policy 8.1.3.2 requiring a 200 foot setback for agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands.

**2.21 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1.**

According to Policy 8.1.3.1, agriculturally zoned lands including Williamson Act Contract properties shall be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by requiring a minimum of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands. Those parcels used to buffer agriculturally zoned lands shall have the same width to length ratio of other parcels.

Rationale: The parcel to the east is agriculturally-zoned (Exhibit F). A 10-acre minimum parcel size and an appropriate width to length ratio would be required for parcels located to the north of the agriculturally-zoned land. The required parcel configuration and minimum lot sizes for agricultural compatibility have been provided, as shown on the Tentative Parcel Map. In compliance with the Right-to-Farm Ordinance (Zoning Ordinance Section 130.40.290.E), a written disclosure statement from any seller of real property advising the buyer of the property of agricultural setback requirements and a statement that intensive agricultural activities may be conducted on neighboring properties is required.

**2.22 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 8.1.3.2.**

For parcels 10 acres or larger, Policy 8.1.3.2 requires agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally-zoned land outside of designated Agricultural Districts provide a minimum setback of 200 feet.

Rationale: The project parcels are not located in a General Plan Agricultural District and are over 10 acres in size. Accordingly, all agriculturally incompatible uses (e.g. future single-family residences and residential accessory structures) will be required to provide a 200-foot setback from adjacent agricultural-zoned land as directed by this policy.

**2.23 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 8.1.3.5.**

Policy 8.1.3.5 requires parcels 10 acres or larger identified as having an existing or potential agricultural use be reviewed by the Agricultural Commission for a recommendation on whether the project would diminish or impair the existing or potential agricultural use of the site.

Rationale: The Agricultural Commission (Commission) reviewed the project for consistency with the General Plan on November 14, 2018 and again on September 12, 2019. Although the Commission failed to reach consensus on recommendations for Policies 8.1.4.1 and 8.1.2.2, the Commission reviewed the project for consistency with Policy 8.1.3.5 and did not express any specific issues or concerns regarding the project's consistency

with this policy. The El Dorado County General Plan is a comprehensive document in which no single component can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. The General Plan Rural Residential land use designation allows for a wide range of residential and agricultural uses including single family residences, agricultural support structures and a full range of agricultural production uses. Therefore, staff concludes that there is no substantial evidence that the project would diminish or impair existing or potential agricultural uses on the project site. This project is consistent with this policy.

**2.24 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1.**

Policy 8.1.4.1 requires that the County Agricultural Commission review all discretionary development applications and the location of proposed public facilities involving land zoned for or designated agriculture, or lands adjacent to such lands, and shall make recommendations to the reviewing authority. Before granting approval, a determination shall be made by the approving authority that the proposed use:

- A. Will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and

Rationale: The Agricultural Commission reviewed the project for consistency with applicable General Plan policies on November 14, 2018 and again on September 12, 2019. During both meetings, the Agricultural Commission failed to reach a consensus on a recommendation for Policy 8.1.4.1(A) due to individual commissioner disagreements as to whether the project would or would not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities. The El Dorado County General Plan is a comprehensive document in which no single component can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. Therefore, staff concludes that there was no substantial evidence of an existing or potential conflict between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities and that the General Plan allows 25 to 30-acre parcel sizes as proposed because the land is designated Rural Residential (10 acre minimum), is surrounded on three sides by non-agricultural lands, complies with other General Plan Policies designed to protect agricultural land, including Policy 8.1.3.1 requiring a 10 acre minimum size adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands and Policy 8.1.3.2 requiring a 200 foot setback for agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands.

- B. Will not create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands will be negatively affected; and

Rationale: The Agricultural Commission reviewed the project for consistency with applicable General Plan policies including Policy 8.1.4.1(B) on November 14, 2018 and again on September 12, 2019. During both meetings, the Agricultural Commission failed to reach a consensus on a recommendation for Policy 8.1.4.1(B) due to individual commissioner disagreements as to whether the project would or would not create an island effect where agricultural lands would be negatively affected by the project. The El Dorado County General Plan is a comprehensive document in which no single component can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. Therefore, staff concludes that there was no substantial evidence that the project would create an island effect and that the General Plan allows 25 to 30-acre parcel sizes as proposed because the land is designated Rural Residential (10 acre minimum), is surrounded on three sides by non-agricultural lands, complies with other General Plan Policies designed to protect agricultural land, including Policy 8.1.3.1 requiring a 10 acre minimum size adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands and Policy 8.1.3.2 requiring a 200 foot setback for agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands.

- C. Will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.

Rationale: The Agricultural Commission reviewed the project for consistency with applicable General Plan policies including Policy 8.1.4.1(C) on November 14, 2018 and again on September 12, 2019. During both meetings, the Agricultural Commission failed to reach a consensus on a recommendation for Policy 8.1.4.1(C) due to individual commissioner disagreements as to whether the project would or would not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands. The El Dorado County General Plan is a comprehensive document in which no single component can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. Therefore, staff concludes that there was no substantial evidence that the project would significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands and that the General Plan allows 25 to 30-acre parcel sizes as proposed because the land is designated Rural Residential (10 acre minimum), is surrounded on three sides by non-agricultural lands, complies with other General Plan Policies designed to protect agricultural land, including Policy 8.1.3.1 requiring a 10 acre minimum size adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands and Policy 8.1.3.2 requiring a 200 foot setback for agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands.

### **3.0 ZONING FINDINGS**

#### **3.1 The proposed use is consistent with Title 130.**

The parcel is zoned Rural Lands Forty-Acre (RL-40) and proposes to rezone to Rural Lands 20-Acre (RL-20). The project has been analyzed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 130.21.030 (Agricultural, Rural and Resource Zone Development Standards) for minimum lot size, widths and building setbacks.

Rationale: The project, as proposed and conditioned, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance because the parcels have been designed to comply with the Rural Lands Twenty-Acre (RL-20) development standards as provided within Section 130.21.030 of the County Code.

### **4.0 PARCEL MAP FINDINGS**

#### **4.1 The proposed tentative map, including design and improvements, is consistent with the General Plan.**

Rationale: The proposed Parcel Map is consistent with the General Plan as set forth in Findings 2.1 through 2.14.

#### **4.2 The proposed Parcel Map conforms to the applicable standards and requirements of the County zoning regulations and Minor Land Division Ordinance.**

Rationale: The parcels have been analyzed in accordance with Section 130.21.030 (Agricultural, Rural and Resource Zone Development Standards) of the Zoning Ordinance. As proposed and conditioned, the Parcel Map conforms to the Minor Land Division Ordinance.

#### **4.3 The site is physically suitable for the proposed type and density of development.**

Rationale: The proposed development meets the minimum parcel size and density requirements of the Rural Residential (LDR) land use designation. With the adoption of the rezone request, the project parcels will adhere to the development standards of the Rural Lands Twenty-Acre (RL-20) zone district.

#### **4.4 The proposed subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage.**

Rationale: The project impacts have been analyzed in the Initial Study, which resulted in a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project would not cause substantial environmental damage.