

PC 4/27/2023
Item # 5
3 Pages

Fwd: Comments for Item #5, Legistar # 23-0435

Sue Taylor <sue-taylor@comcast.net>

Mon 5/1/2023 8:24 AM

To: Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

📎 1 attachments (43 KB)

4-27-23 Planning Commission Meeting Comments.pdf

Woops, I accidentally sent this to Placerville planning. Please put in the record for this project.

Thanks,

Sue Taylor

From: Sue Taylor <sue-taylor@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2023, 12:39 PM

To: Boeger, Lexi <lexi.boeger@edcgov.us>; Harkin, Daniel <daniel.harkin@edcgov.us>; Nevis, Andy <andy.nevis@edcgov.us>; Payne, Kris <kpayne@edcgov.us>; Vegna, John <jvegna@edcgov.us>; pv.planning@gmail.com <pv.planning@gmail.com>

Subject: Comments for Item #5, Legistar # 23-0435

Please attach these comments to the Planning Commission meeting Item #5,
Legistar # 23-0435

Thank you,

Sue Taylor

Comments to the Planning Commission Item #5, Legistar # 23-0435, on 4-27-23

CEQA:

The Planning Commission should not approve CEQA as an "Addendum to the Targeted General Plan /amendment & Zoning Ordinance Update". Rather this should have been a stand alone CEQA project which would have been minimal compared to tying it to the TGPA/ZOU. This project has nothing to do with the TGPA/ZOU (Targeted to only certain points) and which was probably used the Ranch Marketing as a mitigation of any impact created to Ag due to the TGPA/ZOU and now you are impacting that mitigation. So unfortunately you must deny this project just based on the incorrect action of tiering off of the TGPA/ZOU. Also if trying to use the TGPA/ZOU to tier off, there was no analysis referencing a connection to the TGPA/ZOU and good luck going through 10,000 pages of documents trying to find that. I can tell you having followed the TGPA/ZOU, I could not find a connection. I would suggest that the County stop tiering off of the TGPA/ZOU and do the analysis project by project.

I would have kept this ordinance as a Section, similar to the Winery Ordinance and actually list it under the Winery Ordinance due to the referencing. Also I will mention that I had spent months researching history and historical references, code tracking and documenting those findings.

With that I created a simplified ordinance, cleaned up conflicting policies, reduced having to find policy requirements in other locations, and clarified the definitions for "Ranch Marketing", "Special Events" "Amplified Music". Corrected where Dining Facility is by right in one location, but not in another, referenced Code enforcement for zoning regulations should be the same as in Chapter 9, thus not creating a separate class within the same type of regulatory body, and merged the Crops, Christmas Trees, and Ranch Marketing sections for consistency.

Since the County has not chosen to go that direction, I will just list those issues that I think still need to be addressed.

There is no purpose listed for Ranch Marketing included in the ordinance for historical reference, while there are three paragraphs listed under context explaining the Winery Ordinance under context.

Titles: Thank you for adding "Agricultural" Commissioner, but the added section with references to "Commission" on pages 42 to 45 gets confusing with the Ag Commission since much of that section was for references structures or building permits.

Also thank you for clarifying many of the definitions and changing enforcement for Ranch Marketing to match the Winery Ordinance, which was less punitive.

Still need to fix "ensure" versus "insure" on page 8.

In the Table 130.21.020:

I question what "Timber" means in the use type and why is it allowed by right in Ag properties and not FP or TPZ. Those are required by CUP. Should it be Timber Harvest? Which I would understand why the CUP.

Health Resort & Retreat Center should not be allowed in TPZ, nor should an ADU be allowed in TPZ which jeopardizes the tax incentive on those more important uses as stated in our General Plan.

I could not find what superscript #3 was referencing.

Fuel Sales are listed as accessory to off-highway or off road vehicle recreational uses for both FR and TPZ zones only, but only FR allows off road vehicle recreational uses. I would add off road vehicle recreational use to TPZ.

On section 5, page 9 why not just add reserve rather than have a statement that says as follows: when nothing follows?

End of Table issues _____

Still think their needs to be a min. on the 1 to 250 or up to 250 for special events.

Pages 29, 42 and 43, which department is being referred?

Review of application is confusing as to who has jurisdiction for which permit on page 43, in which that following sections looks like it's referring to building permit.

Should just add charity events and define charities. The why it's written excludes many charitable organizations. I would suggest at least adding 501(c)(4) which is a "social welfare organization".

Page 23: Requiring you to go to Article 8 (Glossary) to find the definition of Accessory use. It is not in that glossary, but sends you back to 130.40.030 which refers to "Accessory Dwelling Units".

On page 25: "Primary use or function" is a definition that should be moved to definitions.

On page 40: Why still Reserved under Section 130.44.107 for Ranch Marketing Provisions for Small Livestock Operations? Has that not been taken care of with this update?

On page 42 and page 44 Are the Administrative Permits reviewed or approved by the Ag Commission. Shouldn't it be approved?

On page 44 can you explain "The Director shall be the review authority of original jurisdiction" and what that refers to.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sue Taylor