

#27 26-0256
BOS Revd 3/3/26

 Outlook

Fw: Fire Agency Comments – Shingle Springs Community Design Standards and Guidelines (Public Review / Public Hearing Draft, November 2025)

From PL-Shingle Springs Community Design Standards <shinglespringscommunitydesignstandards@edcgov.us>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 10:17 AM
To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
Cc Thea A. Graybill <Thea.Graybill@edcgov.us>; Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>; Robert J. Peters <Robert.Peters@edcgov.us>

 1 attachment (189 KB)

Shingle Springs CDS comments 03 Mar 2026.pdf;

As requested by the County Fire District, would you add Fire Marshall Poganski's comments into the Legistar record for the Shingle Springs Design Standards and Guidelines (File 26-0256)?

Thanks!

From: Jacob Poganski <PoganskiJ@eldofire.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 1:37 AM
To: PL-Shingle Springs Community Design Standards <shinglespringscommunitydesignstandards@edcgov.us>
Subject: Fire Agency Comments – Shingle Springs Community Design Standards and Guidelines (Public Review / Public Hearing Draft, November 2025)

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good evening,

I realize these comments come short of the County Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow. Please consider these comments in developing this project. I will make public comment as to the contents of this letter tomorrow at the BOS meeting.

Respectfully,

Jacob Poganski

Division Chief

Fire Marshal



**EL DORADO COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT *partnering with* DIAMOND SPRINGS
– EL DORADO FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

4040 Carson Rd., PO Box 807

Camino, CA 95709-0807

office: 530-644-9630

poganskij@eldofire.com | www.eldoradocountyfire.com | www.diamondfire.org

Prevention offices are located at 501 Pleasant Valley Road, Diamond Springs, California 95619

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: *This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or forwarding of this message is strictly prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me by e-mail reply and delete the original from your system.*



27 26-0256
BOS Rcvd 3/3/26

El Dorado County Fire Protection District
partnering with Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District
501 Pleasant Valley Road, Diamond Springs, CA 95619
ECF 530-644-9630 | DSP 530-626-3190
www.eldoradocountyfire.com | www.diamondfire.org

March 2, 2026

Tom Purciel, Senior Planner
El Dorado County

LATE DISTRIBUTION
DATE 3/3/26

Re: Fire Agency Comments – Shingle Springs Community Design Standards and Guidelines
(Public Review / Public Hearing Draft, November 2025)

Thank you for circulating the Shingle Springs Community Design Standards and Guidelines (Public Review Draft, November 2025) for review in advance of the Board of Supervisors hearing. The Fire District supports the County’s goal of improving community design outcomes and appreciates that the draft includes general provisions stating the standards apply in addition to local and state regulations and that, where the standards conflict with state law, state law shall prevail.

However, we have concerns that several objective (“shall”) architectural requirements and the document’s internal conflict-resolution language could inadvertently direct applicants toward exterior features/materials that are inconsistent with mandatory State wildland-urban interface (WUI) construction requirements in mapped State Responsibility Area (SRA) High/Very-High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and other mapped WUI areas, and could complicate consistent ministerial enforcement during permit review.

1) Internal conflict-resolution language must be expressly subordinate to State WUI construction requirements.

Section 3.2(C) states that if a specific standard or guideline within the selected architectural style conflicts with any standard or guideline for the specified project type, the architectural style standard or guideline shall prevail. This “architectural style prevails” rule is problematic in WUI/SRA areas because architectural style sections include objective (“shall”) requirements that can involve combustible exterior features. State minimum wildfire construction requirements, Title 24, including CBC Chapter 7A and the California Wildland Urban Interface Code (CWUIC), cannot be reduced or overridden by a local design standards document.

Requested revision:

Revise Section 3.2(C) (or add an explicit qualifier immediately following it) to state that the “architectural style shall prevail” provision does not apply where it would conflict with applicable State wildfire/WUI construction requirements, and that CBC Chapter 7A and Title 24, Part 7 requirements govern where applicable.

2) Objective “wood/wood-effect” exterior requirements must be conditioned on CBC Chapter 7A / Title 24 Part 7 compliance.

The Shingle Springs DSG contains objective (“shall”) requirements in the architectural style sections that require exterior features to be “wood or wood-effect,” including exposed



El Dorado County Fire Protection District
partnering with Diamond Springs-El Dorado Fire Protection District
501 Pleasant Valley Road, Diamond Springs, CA 95619
ECF 530-644-9630 | DSP 530-626-3190
www.eldoradocountyfire.com | www.diamondfire.org

exterior structural trusses or beams and balcony posts, along with other exterior trim requirements. In mapped WUI/SRA areas, exterior materials and assemblies must comply with State wildfire exposure standards. Without an express qualifier, these “shall be wood/wood-effect” requirements can be interpreted as mandating combustible exterior features even where State WUI requirements restrict or condition their use.

Requested revision:

Add an explicit statement in each architectural style section (or a global provision applicable to all “wood/wood-effect” requirements) that any exterior materials, attachments, projections, and architectural features required or permitted by the DSG must comply with CBC Chapter 7A and Title 24, Part 7 (CWUIC) where those State requirements apply. Where wood is not permitted or is conditioned by State WUI provisions, ignition-resistant or noncombustible equivalent materials shall be allowed to satisfy DSG aesthetics without reducing State fire safety requirements.

3) Landscapes must be expressly conditioned to comply with PRC 4291 and Title 14 defensible space/fuel modification requirements in SRA.

Vegetation management and defensible space in SRA are regulated by Public Resources Code Section 4291 and implementing regulations (Title 14). Because the DSG provides landscaping standards and guidance that may influence plant density and combustible groundcover selection near buildings, the document should be explicit that these standards do not authorize landscape designs that conflict with PRC 4291 and Title 14 requirements.

Requested revision:

Add a clear statement in the landscaping standards that all landscaping in areas subject to PRC 4291 and Title 14 must be designed and maintained to meet those statutory defensible space and fuel modification requirements, and that DSG landscaping standards/guidance do not authorize landscaping that would conflict with those legal requirements.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments in advance of the Board hearing and are available to meet with Planning staff to finalize the above clarifications so the DSG remains enforceable as an objective, ministerial standard while maintaining compliance with mandatory State wildfire construction and defensible space requirements.

Respectfully,

Jacob Poganski

Division Chief / Fire Marshal
El Dorado County Fire Protection District

#27 26-0256



Outlook

Fw: Public Comments Shingle Springs Design Standards (Legistar File 26-0256)

From Tom R. Purciel <tom.purciel@edcgov.us>
Date Tue 3/3/2026 4:12 PM
To BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Board Clerk Staff,

Would you add the forwarded comment to the Legistar record for this item (if not already included in the record)?

Thanks!

Tom Purciel

Senior Planner

El Dorado County Planning and Building Department - Long Range Planning

2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 621-5903

tom.purciel@edcgov.us

From: danderly@comcast.net <danderly@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 3:32 PM
To: BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>
Subject: Shingle Springs Design

This Message Is From an External Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

This message came from outside your organization.

I apologize for having a problem with my ZOOM connection and was not able to communicate with you. My comments are still relevant:

A lot of time, money and just plain caring by Shingle Springs individuals resulted in the design guidelines you were being asked to support. It doesn't seem possible, but this plan is not the most challenging part of creating a wonderful neighborhood. Most important is the implementation of this plan.

In order to satisfy the intent of the Shingle Springs plan, there needs to be a planning staff with a good design and landscape backgrounds, WHICH EL DORADO COUNTY DOES NOT CURRENTLY HAVE! I support your hard-working Planning staff in the work that they do, but there is no one on the Planning Department staff who has the capability to adequately review structural design and/or landscaping review. Without a staff with these talents, the Shingle Springs document will either sit on a shelf or be ignored, or whatever an applicant submits will be approved (which is the case now)! There is a solution used by Planning Departments in other communities which is to contract with an excellent architectural firm and an excellent landscape architectural firm to review plans submitted to public entities. Shingle Springs residents and business owners expect and deserve good design. The cost of the plan review by outside businesses can be passed on to the developer (developers likely have to pay EDC staff for this anyway). The County Planning staff has told me on more than one occasion that they already have a heavy workload and are prohibited from working overtime,

I want to offer a suggestion that would contribute positively toward a charming Shingle Springs community, i.e., requiring a California Red Bud tree every 1000 feet or so along commercial streets, which would add some signature pizzazz to the community. Also, street trees should be required to be at least 20-inch box at time of planting. Another small suggestion is to require an attractive, common address sign design for each new commercial development - one, to add a cohesive element to the streetscape and also for emergency responsiveness -- a "signature piece" if you will. Anymore, folks looking for directions to a particular business, will look up the name of the establishment, be given its address, which is then found by number on a phone. Addresses have become the most important element for finding a business. Shingle Springs business owners and residents deserve the best!

I hope you take my suggestions seriously and support them.

Regards,

Dyana Anderly, American Institute of Certified Planners;
Master of Planning, University of Southern California
3484 Chasen Drive
Cameron Park, Ca 95682
(510) 913-0698 - cell