



# COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION

Building C Hearing Room  
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667  
<http://www.edcgov.us/planning>  
Phone: (530) 621-5355 Fax: (530) 642-0508

Walter Mathews, Chair, District 4  
Rich Stewart, First Vice-Chair, District 1  
Dave Pratt, Second Vice-Chair, District 2  
Tom Heflin, District 3  
Brian Shinault, District 5

Char Tim .....Clerk of the Planning Commission

---

## MINUTES

**Regular Meeting**  
**April 24, 2014 – 8:30 A.M.**

### CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. Present: Commissioners Stewart, Pratt, Mathews, and Shinault; David Livingston-County Counsel; and Char Tim-Clerk of the Planning Commission.

### ADOPTION OF AGENDA

**Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (4-0), to approve the agenda as presented.**

**AYES:** Stewart, Shinault, Pratt, Mathews  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** Heflin

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**CONSENT CALENDAR** (All items on the Consent Calendar are to be approved by one motion unless a Commission member requests separate action on a specific item.)

**Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (4-0), to approve the Consent Calendar.**

**AYES:** Pratt, Shinault, Stewart, Mathews  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** Heflin

1. (14-0467) Clerk of the Planning Commission recommending the Commission approve the MINUTES of the regular meeting of March 27, 2014. (Cont. 04-10-14, Item 1)

**This was Approved on Consent Calendar**

2. (14-0468) Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division, submitting request to consider the transfer of River Use Permit #03 from Trevor Croft, owner of Pacific Coast Ventures Group, Inc. dba Pirate Rafting Co., to Jerry Ashburn, owner of Earthtrek Expeditions, Inc., and holder of River Use Permit #58, along with the request to consolidate the user days from River Use Permit #03 into River Use Permit #58; and staff recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Approve the transfer of River Use Permit #03 from Trevor Croft, owner of Pacific Coast Ventures Group, Inc. dba Pirate Rafting Co., requests the transfer of River Use Permit #03 to Jerry Ashburn, owner of Earthtrek Expeditions, Inc.; and
- 2) Approve the request to consolidate the user days from River Use Permit #03 into River Use Permit #58. (Cont. 04-10-14, Item 2)

**This was Approved on Consent Calendar**

3. (14-0469) Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division, submitting the 2013 Annual Report on the River Management Plan as a receive and file; and staff recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Approve the 2013 Annual Report on the implementation of the River Management Plan; and
- 2) Recommend the continued implementation of the River Management Plan as currently prescribed. (Cont. 04-10-14, Item 3)

**This was Approved on Consent Calendar**

4. 14-0589) Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division, recommending approval of three-year Commercial River Use Permits for the following applicants: (a) American Whitewater Expeditions-Permit #45; (b) Action Whitewater Adventures-Permit #63; (c) River Rat and Co.-Permit #67; and (d) H2O Adventures-Permit #72.

**This was Approved on Consent Calendar**

**END OF CONSENT CALENDAR**

**DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**  
**(Development Services, Transportation, County Counsel)**

Roger Trout announced that the public review period was still open for the Draft EIR for the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Update.

Dave Spiegelberg/Transportation introduced Andrew Gaber, Deputy Director.

**COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Shinault announced that May 1<sup>st</sup> was the beginning of the construction season.

Commissioner Pratt attended a recent Fire Safe Council meeting in which animal evacuation plans were discussed.

Commissioner Stewart stated that the Silva Valley interchange was showing progress.

**PUBLIC FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

Dyana Anderly questioned the placement of Item #6 on the agenda.

Kris Payne stated that this was an awkward time for the County with projects that have been on the books for many years and although the land use is in limbo, these projects are still significant for each community. He stated that he may not be able to stay for the entire meeting, so he wanted to caution the Commission to do the right thing for the County.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**5. (14-0280)** Hearing to consider request to amend the El Dorado Hills Specific Plan reducing the required commercial acreage in Village J, rezone approximately 4.5-acres from Planned Commercial-Planned Development (CP-PD) to One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD), a Development plan to modify the one-family residential zone standards, and Tentative Map creating 119 lots, ranging in size from 6,000 to 15,000 square feet, 9 landscape lots, 1 passive park, and a road easement for the future Sienna Ridge Drive [Specific Plan Amendment SP13-0002/Rezone Z13-0002/Planned Development PD13-0001/Tentative Map TM13-1511/Serrano Villages J5 & J6]\*\* on property identified by APNs 123-040-07, 123-040-09, and 115-400-13, consisting of 36.54 acres, in the El Dorado Hills area, submitted by Serrano Associates, LLC; and staff recommending the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to take the following actions:

- 1) Certify the project is Statutorily Exempt pursuant to Section 15182 of the CEQA Guidelines;
- 2) Adopt Specific Plan Amendment SP13-0002 based on the Findings presented;
- 3) Approve Rezone Z13-0002 based on the Findings presented;
- 4) Approve Planned Development PD13-0001, adopting the Development Plan as the official development plan, based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval;
- 5) Approve Tentative Map TM13-1511 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval; and
- 6) Approve the following design waiver requests as the appropriate Findings have been made:
  - (a) Modifications to Standard Plan 101B for reduction of the following roadway right-of-way and improvement widths including reduction of sidewalks from six foot widths to four foot widths:

- (1) 35 feet = E Street, sta. 8+43.60 to 10+43.00

- (2) 36 feet = A Street, sta. 1+49.00 to 4+15.82; E Street, sta. 5+79.28 to 8+43.60; and C Street, F, G, and H Courts.
- (3) 37 feet = J Street
- (4) 38 feet = I Street
- (5) 42 feet = A Street, sta. 4+15.82 to 10+50.69; E Street, sta. 1+00 to 5+79.28; and B, D, and G Streets.
- (b) Elimination of sidewalks on one side of A, C, D, E, G, and I Streets and F, G, and H Courts;
- (c) Reductions of cul-de-sac right-of-way radius from 60 feet to 45.5 feet and road width radius from 50 feet to 40 feet at the end of F, G, and H Courts; and reductions from 100 feet centerline curve radius to 50 feet for “elbow” curves on A, C, and I Streets, and G Court; and
- (d) Modification of the standard road encroachment under Standard Plan 110 to allow for an entry gate and landscaping median. (Supervisorial District 1) (Cont. 02-27-14, Item 4)
- Applicant is requesting to continue item off-calendar.**

Lillian MacLeod announced that the applicant was requesting the item to be continued off-calendar.

Kirk Bone, applicant’s agent, stated the request for off-calendar continuance was due to the project being converted from attached to detached housing and there were also questions on the school siting.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

There was no further discussion.

**Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (4-0), to continue the item off-calendar.**

**AYES: Pratt, Shinault, Stewart, Mathews**  
**NOES: None**  
**ABSENT: Heflin**

**6. (14-0470)** Hearing to consider request for a design review revision to the existing Valero fuel station to allow placement of an 8 foot x 10.5 foot metal storage container for the collection of aluminum cans and plastic/glass bottles, an attendant on site during the hours of operation, and one unlit wall sign [Design Review Revision DR90-0034-R/Recycling Center]\*\* on property identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number 083-340-07, consisting of 0.492 acre, in the Cameron Park area, submitted by Joshua Alexander; and staff recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Determine the project is Categorical Exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines; and
- 2) Approve Design Review Revision DR90-0034-R based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval. (Supervisorial District 4) (Cont. 04-10-14, Item 4)

Lillian MacLeod presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation for approval.

David Anderson, applicant's agent, made the following comments:

- Appreciates the larger recycling center that is located on the adjacent property;
- Recycling is the core issue as 50% of public doesn't reuse;
- Facility would make recycling convenient to the public;
- Anticipating using El Dorado Waste Management; and
- Applicant is committed to business.

Dyana Anderly made the following comments:

- Very familiar with recycling facilities;
- Significant space around the shed would be used when it was open for business;
- Cameron Park Design Review Committee recommended against approving project;
- Location is within 50 feet of Highway 50 and is visible from Cameron Park Drive which is the entry point into Cameron Park, across from the Cameron Park welcome sign, and is at the main entry point to a shopping center;
- Disagreed with staff's conclusion that project was consistent with the General Plan;
- There are alternate locations;
- Disagreed with staff's conclusion that the project was in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines;
- If project is approved, it should be reviewed within 6 months; and
- Site currently has too many signs.

Terry Rogers, President of the Shingle Springs-Cameron Park Chamber of Commerce, made the following comments:

- Opposed to project;
- Already a recycling center in shopping center which would be within 150 feet of the proposed project site; and
- Unsightly mess for main entrance into shopping center.

Albert Jimenez, El Dorado Disposal, made the following comments:

- Existing recycling center has been in the location behind CVS for 10 years, averages 70-90 customers a day and parking is an issue;
- If project is approved, existing facility may need to be closed;
- Explained that the existing facility recycles much more than just bottles and cans, but still has the public dropping unacceptable items (i.e., mattresses, large appliances, etc.) after hours; and
- Has an employee that specifically cleans up the recycling center's outside area each day in order to remove items dropped off after hours.

Kris Payne made the following comments:

- Does his shopping at that shopping center;
- Staff is following County rules but this project may still not be community acceptable;

- A new use is being added to an existing project;
- Ingress/egress is very important and how is this going to work while still being consistent with location;
- Community viewshed is important; and
- A lot is at stake besides just another business coming into the area.

Paul Ryan, Cameron Park CSD, made the following comments:

- Opposed to project;
- Supports the Chamber of Commerce's stance on this;
- Existing recycling center has a contract with Waste Connections; and
- Recycling centers are the greatest thing as long as they are hidden.

Linda Hopkins, Cameron Park resident and Chamber of Commerce employee, made the following comments:

- Has used the existing recycling center and there are usually several customers there at one time;
- Public leaves unsightly items after hours;
- Animals will be attracted to the bags that are left unattended;
- Existing business is adequately handling the community's recycling needs; and
- As a resident, opposed to the project.

Mr. Anderson made the following rebuttal comments:

- Staff would be on site 7 days a week;
- Only recycling bottles and cans;
- Would be monitored daily;
- Public testimony heard today are common complaints regarding recycling centers;
- Intent is to encourage recycling;
- Area would be kept clean and orderly by the leasing agent and property owner;
- Business would be in a box with a sign outside listing times, contacts, and acceptable items;
- The proposed location is an unused corner of the lot and 3 existing parking spaces would be utilized;
- Applicant is complying with County's rules;
- No screening is being provided as the business would be conducted within the box;
- Open to adding planters for aesthetics;
- Does not want to see the existing recycling center close; and
- Welcomes visibility to encourage recycling and would use signage.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

Mrs. MacLeod stated that the gas station is required to have 5 parking spaces and they currently have 9 spaces. In addition, the Fire Department and Transportation had no issues with the project.

Commissioner Stewart made the following comments:

- Preference is to move it behind the gas station;
- 24/7 on-site operation (gas station) alleviates some concerns; and
- Allow temporary 90 day signage.

Commissioner Shinault made the following comments:

- Will start seeing more of these due to new codes;
- Should require fully enclosed shed with fence and that all activity occurs inside enclosure;
- Have gates positioned so public can't see inside and box should be screened by a fence that can cover it; and
- Opposed to project as it is currently presented; needs to be redesigned.

Chair Mathews made the following comments:

- Fan of recycling;
- Agreed with Cameron Park Design Review Committee's comments;
- Not opposed to competition;
- Agreed with Commissioner Stewart's comment to hide the facility behind the gas station; and
- If not moved behind the gas station, building needs to be aesthetically pleasing and not a metal box.

Commissioner Pratt made the following comments:

- Visibility neutral;
- Have to consider the activity area;
- Good idea to move behind the gas station;
- Accountability to traffic;
- Suburban area and needs to have suburban niceties; and
- Not a fan of storage containers.

Mr. Anderson welcomed the opportunity to go back to the applicant to relay the Commission's comments. As a designer, he supported everything the Commission had said.

There was no further discussion.

**Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (4-0), to continue the item off-calendar.**

**AYES: Pratt, Shinault, Stewart, Mathews**

**NOES: None**

**ABSENT: Heflin**

7. (14-0584) Hearing to consider a Development Agreement to establish contractual obligation to maintain Alto LLC Tentative Map approval of 23 residential lots for a minimum

period of 10 years from the date of execution, with possible extension term of 5 years [Development Agreement DA13-0001/Alto LLC Tentative Map DA] on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 126-100-19, consisting of 81.6 acres, in the El Dorado Hills area, submitted by Alto LLC; and staff recommending the Planning Commission recommend the Board of Supervisors take the following actions:

- 1) Find that the negative declaration prepared for action on the zone change and tentative map (Z06-0005/TM06-1408/Alto LLC) sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts of the project and approval of the proposed development agreement does not raise any new or increased environmental effects; and
- 2) Execute the proposed Development Agreement. (Supervisory District 4)

Roger Trout presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation for approval to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Trout spoke on the traffic circulation plan with the other approved developments in the area and the time extension process for Tentative Maps.

Sam Neasham, applicant's agent, said the Development Agreement was very straightforward, considered it a model agreement, 10 years was a reasonable time period, and made reference to the letter he had submitted.

Ellen Van Dyke made the following comments:

- Referenced her submitted written comments;
- Felt the basis of extending the project was because the Mitigated Negative Declaration elements and traffic have since changed; and
- There is currently a significant amount of land use discussion occurring at the Board of Supervisors level.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

Commissioner Pratt commented that there was reliance and inter-operability with the other developers in the area.

Commissioner Stewart made the following comments:

- Requested clarification on the category of fees listed in Exhibit C of the Staff Report;
- Questioned if the Development Agreement consisted of "standard" language;
- Voiced concern that \$30,000 was a low amount and questioned what the County was giving up for it;
- Referenced the Zoning Ordinance Update and if the project would be grandfathered in regarding building heights; and
- Voiced concern over extending the approval of an environmental document for a significant length of time.

Chair Mathews made the following comments:

- Project has already had lots of challenges;



- If continually setting limits on what a developer can do, then nothing will get done, which is what some may want to occur; and
- Doesn't see area drastically changing in the next 15 years.

County Counsel David Livingston responded to one of Commissioner Stewart's comments by stating that the County was not giving up something for the \$30,000, but instead it was receiving a mutual benefit. He also stated that it was not an unfettered right to terminate unilaterally.

Mr. Trout responded to one of Commissioner Stewart's comments regarding the Zoning Ordinance Update by stating that the project was under a Planned Development.

There was no further discussion.

**Motion: Commissioner Shinault moved, seconded by Commissioner Pratt, and carried (3-1), to recommend the Board of Supervisors take the following actions: 1. Find that the negative declaration prepared for action on the zone change and tentative map (Z06-0005/TM06-1408/Alto LLC) sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts of the project and approval of the proposed development agreement does not raise any new or increased environmental effects; and 2. Execute the proposed Development Agreement.**

**AYES: Pratt, Shinault, Mathews**  
**NOES: Stewart**  
**ABSENT: Heflin**

**8. (14-0588)** Hearing to consider request for a Finding of Consistency pursuant to Condition of Approval Number Two of Planned Development PD97-0011 [formerly known as Sundance Plaza and now named The Crossings] to find that the proposed phasing revision is consistent with the project's approval on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 325-220-49, 327-110-02, 327-110-03, 327-110-06, 327-110-08, 327-120-19, 327-120-20, 327-120-21, 327-120-22, 327-130-01, and 327-130-02, consisting of 72 acres, in the Placerville area, submitted by Palos Verdes Properties. (Supervisory District 3)

Aaron Mount presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation for approval.

Roger Trout provided the following additional information:

- Unusual for a Finding of Consistency for a project at this scale;
- This is a phasing change;
- Applicant was to perform transportation analysis and report was just released this week and staff has not had sufficient time to review; and
- Recommended the Commission consider the request, take public testimony, and continue the item to the May 8, 2014 meeting to allow time for review of the traffic study.

In response to Commissioner Stewart's inquiry on if they had a limited scope, Mr. Trout stated that the action was limited, but not the discussion.

Craig Sandberg, applicant's agent, made the following comments:

- This is about phasing;
- At time of approval, it was logical to develop from one direction to the other, but now they were wanting to switch directions;
- Was unable to get the traffic study released early enough to allow time for review prior to today's hearing; and
- Wants to keep the project on the fast track.

Ken Anderson, applicant's agent, spoke on the traffic study and stated that the current conditions were meeting County standards and the proposed project would not impact this. In response to Commissioner Stewart's inquiry, he stated that the study did not investigate the build-out of the site.

Adolf Zierke, Placerville Transmission, made the following comments:

- Voiced concern on the ultimate build-out, impact to his property and business, and eminent domain;
- Doesn't want to see the project stopped or stalled but does want all parties to be able to prosper;
- Hasn't seen plans that will show how the project would be located on the site; and
- Concerned on the impacts to his business when the project expands the road intersection.

Jim Archer, El Dorado Road resident, made the following comments:

- Voiced traffic-driven concerns;
- Currently, can see the lights from the Kmart shopping center and concerned on the impacts to his residence when more lighting is installed for the project;
- Inquired when the final plans would be released to the public; and
- Project would impact his residence.

John Newton made the following comments:

- Voiced concern on the proposed turn lanes as it would impact his rental property which is only .7 acre; and
- Requested that any expansion of the road be done equally on both sides of the road.

Jack Sweeney, applicant's agent, made the following rebuttal comments:

- Apologized for the time delay in releasing the traffic study;
- They would be returning to the Commission for the rest of the project to be considered, in addition to road improvements, and would be working with the neighbors on their concerns;
- The change in phasing is needed in order to start moving forward with the project;
- Need to move quickly as the weather is starting to get hotter and they have proposed tenants; and
- Requested a conceptual approval pending review of the traffic study.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

In response to Commissioner Stewart's inquiry, Dave Spiegelberg/Transportation stated that the ultimate configuration had not changed and although there was a conceptual plan, no finalized stamped plans have been prepared for Headington Road.

There was no further discussion.

**Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, and carried (4-0), to conceptually approve the Finding of Consistency pursuant to Condition of Approval Number Two of Planned Development PD97-0011 pending final review of the traffic study and continue the item to the May 8, 2014 meeting.**

**AYES: Shinault, Stewart, Pratt, Mathews**  
**NOES: None**  
**ABSENT: Heflin**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:28 a.m.

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION  
Authenticated and Certified:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Walter Mathews, Chair