

FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9, 2012

Prior to the beginning of the Public Hearing portion of the meeting, Chair Pratt announced that they did not have a full Commission today, although they did have a quorum to make decisions. He stated that Commissioner Rain had significant health issues in his family and would not be present for today's hearing or the next hearing. Historically, the Commission, as a courtesy, has allowed applicants before the Commission to request their item be continued to be heard by a full Commission. That request must be made before the item is started. Once the hearing is started, the applicant may not request a continuance on the grounds of not having a full Commission. At this time, the earliest that there may be a full Commission would be at the March 8, 2012, hearing.

8. REZONE

Z04-0016/Village P submitted by EDH 52 PARTNERS to rezone the northern 51.45-acre portion of subject property from One-Family Residential (R1) to Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD). The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 122-720-09, consisting of 57.78 acres, is located at the northeast corner area of Tong Road and Silva Valley Parkway, in the El Dorado Hills area, Supervisorial District 1. [*Project Planner: Mel Pabalinas*] (Negative declaration prepared)*

Mel Pabalinas presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors. He made reference to the public comments and agency comments received for this item, which were distributed to the Commission.

Mike McDougall/applicant's agent commented that staff had prepared a thorough and comprehensive Staff Report.

Eva Tak stated that she lives approximately 1 ½ blocks away from this project and made the following comments:

- Project will impact the neighborhood and the residents' quality of life;
- Project will change the make-up and character of the area;
- There is no commercial north of Hwy 50;
- Approval of this commercial project will cause other commercial projects to move into the off-ramp area, which will increase noise, etc.; and
- Project will cause light pollution.

Sue Taylor voiced concern on a rezone to Commercial with no proposed development and with an environmental document stating "no impacts". She felt that an EIR is required and inquired if any portion of the project was located within the historic Clarksville designation area.

Art Marinaccio did not like a rezone with a Planned Development that didn't have any proposed development attached. He stated that this violates General Plan policies 2.6.1.4 and 2.2.5.6 and read them into the record. Mr. Marinaccio said that this is premature and there is no compelling reason to rezone the parcel now.

Lindsey ? stated that she was unaware of this project although she commutes in that area on a daily basis and was here for another project on the agenda. She inquired why she was not notified. She also felt that this would cause traffic congestion.

Mr. McDougall stated that the rezone would put the parcel in conformance with the General Plan and the Planned Development would require it to return to the hearing process. He also stated that all cultural resources and environmental reviews would be conducted prior to returning.

Commissioner Mathews liked the Planned Development aspect as it would force the project to return back to them.

Commissioner Tolhurst felt that Mixed Use Development would be a “plus” and not a “minus”.

Commissioner Heflin stated that the Planned Development portion protected the public.

County Counsel Paula Frantz spoke on the meeting notification process. She stated that the General Plan designation for this parcel is Commercial and that this is a consistency rezone. She spoke on Mr. Marinaccio’s comments and also stated that there are no new impacts for this rezone and site-specifics would be reviewed for individual projects. County Counsel Frantz indicated that the CEQA analysis was adequate for this rezone.

No further discussion was presented.

Motion: Commissioner Heflin moved, seconded by Commissioner Mathews, and carried (4-0), to recommend the Board of Supervisors take the following actions: 1. Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; and 2. Approve Rezone Z04-0016 based on the Findings as presented.

AYES: Heflin, Mathews, Tolhurst, Pratt
NOES: None
ABSENT: Rain