



## 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

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

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

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting  
December 10, 2015 – 8:30 A.M.**

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 8:34 a.m. Present: Commissioners Stewart, Miller, Heflin, and Pratt; David Livingston-County Counsel; and Julie Saylor-Planning Services.

Commissioner Pratt stated historically, our Commission has, as a courtesy, let applicants before this Commission request that their item be continued to another meeting to be heard by a full Commission. However, whether any such request is granted remains subject to the Commission's discretion. That request must be made before the item has started; once we have started hearing the item, the applicant may not request a continuance on the grounds of not having a full Commission. The next time we may have a full Commission would be, at the earliest, January 14, 2016.

#### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

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

**AYES: Heflin, Pratt, Miller, Stewart**

**NOES: None**

**ABSENT: Shinault**

#### **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.)

Chair Stewart noted a typographical error in the November 12, 2015 meeting minutes. For clarification purposes, he requested that he be listed under a new category title "RECUSED" instead of having him listed under "AYES" with an asterisk stating his recusal.

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

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

**1. 15-1394** Clerk of the Planning Commission recommending the Commission approve the MINUTES of the regular meeting of November 12, 2015.

**This was Approved on Consent Calendar.**

**END OF CONSENT CALENDAR**

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

Chair Stewart requested Roger Trout, Development Services Division Director, to the podium to discuss two matters. Chair Stewart noted that he had reviewed the Board of Supervisors Policy for on-site signage posting requirements for projects and questioned if this practice is currently in place. Roger Trout, Development Services Division Director, stated the policy was adopted by the Board of Supervisors and is currently in place. Chair Stewart questioned the possibility of adding "Proposed" to the signage language as well as the sign placement/location. Roger Trout, Development Services Division Director, stated that he will be going back to the Board of Supervisors within the next six to twelve months to discuss these requirements further.

Chair Stewart questioned Roger Trout, Development Services Division Director, as to when the DRAFT Bylaws will be available. Roger Trout, Development Services Division Director, stated that he is working on edits and will be sending the Bylaws to the Commissions for their review.

**COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Miller noted that the Merrychase cell tower is currently being built.

Commissioner Pratt stated that the Board of Supervisors recently had a Community Outreach meeting at Pioneer Park which he attended. Commissioner Pratt also spoke of the new trash and recycling cans that have been distributed by Waste Management now being a part of our landscape due to residents not being able to move them so they are now staying street side as well as some others disappearing entirely.

Chair Stewart noted that he was able to drive over the Silva Valley Interchange and it was nice to see the project moving forward. Chair Stewart also noted a recent accident that occurred on Green Valley Road and noted Transportation Division might want to look into it.

**PUBLIC FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT** – None

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**2. 15-1395** Hearing to consider the Verizon Wireless Communication Facility Cedar Ravine Monopine project [Special Use Permit S15-0011]\* to allow the construction of a new 86-foot tall monopine tower to replace an existing 53-foot monopole within an existing wireless communication facility on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 051-430-27, consisting of 76 acres, located in the Placerville area, submitted by Verizon Wireless; and staff recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; and
  - 2) Approve Special Use Permit S15-0011 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as presented.
- (Supervisory District 3)

Commissioner Heflin recused himself from this item and left the room.

The Planning Commissioners' reminded the applicant of previous announcement in regards to requesting a continuance. Mark Lobaugh, Applicant Agent, stated that was not necessary and he was fine to move forward with the item.

Rob Peters distributed a staff memo dated December 10, 2015 to the Commission and presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation of approval.

Mark Lobaugh, Applicant Agent, discussed the replacement process of the project for changing the monopine to a monopole.

Chair Stewart closed public comment.

Commissioner Pratt questioned and confirmed with Mark Lobaugh, Applicant Agent, that the monopole tower will be updated to the current regulation requirements.

There was no further discussion.

**Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried (3-0), to take the following actions: 1) Adopt the Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; and 2) Approve Special Use Permit S15-0011 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified: (a) Add Findings as identified in Staff Memo dated December 10, 2015.**

**AYES: Miller, Pratt, Stewart**

**NOES: None**

**RECUSED: Heflin**

**ABSENT: Shinault**

This action can be appealed to the Board of Supervisors within 10 working days.

### **Findings**

#### **1.0 CEQA FINDINGS**

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Negative Declaration together with the comments received during the public review process. The Negative Declaration 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 Development Services Division 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.**

According to Policy 2.2.1.2, the Agricultural Lands (AL) designation is applied to lands described in Policy 8.1.1.8. A maximum of two residential dwellings used to support the agricultural use are allowed. The AL designation may be applied in Rural Regions only.

Rationale: The project parcel has an AL General Plan land use designation and is located within a Rural Region. The site is currently developed with an existing wireless communication facility ancillary to the site's existing agricultural uses. Policy 8.1.1.8 is discussed in more detail in section 2.11

below. The project, as proposed and conditioned, is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.1.2.

**2.2 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.2.8.**

According to Policy 2.2.2.8, the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay shall be set forth in Policy 7.4.2.9. Where the -IBC overlay is applied to lands that are also subject to the Agricultural District (-A) overlay or that are within the Agricultural Lands (AL) designation, the land use restrictions associated with -IBC policies will not apply to the extent that the agricultural practices do not interfere with the purpose of the -IBC overlay.

Rationale: The project parcel has an AL General Plan land use designation and an -IBC overlay. The site is currently developed with an existing wireless communication facility ancillary to the site's existing agricultural uses. Policy 7.4.2.9 is discussed in more detail in Section 2.10 below. The project, as proposed and conditioned, is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.2.2.8.

**2.3 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: Agricultural, rural residential, recent mining land uses, and vacant agricultural lands surround the project parcel (Staff Report Exhibit E). The project site is adjacent to a water storage facility located on a separate parcel that is surrounded on all sides by the project parcel. Although the project will result in an expansion of a commercial use, it has been designed to visually blend with the surroundings (Staff Report Exhibits F-7 and H), will require vehicle trips only for construction and monthly maintenance, and involves the lease and use of an access drive and an 18-by 18-foot lease area within an existing wireless communication facility on a 76-acre parcel. The project will be compatible with surrounding uses. In addition, the project will provide improved wireless telecommunication capacity and coverage within the service area. The site is will improve inadequate capacity in the area due to high cell phone usage along Cedar Ravine Road and will improve service in the City of Placerville and surrounding rural residential areas.

**2.4 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 County Transportation and Environmental Management Divisions, and the El Dorado County Fire Protection District

for adequate public services capacity. The project will connect to existing electrical facilities and public services currently within the parcel. Verizon Wireless proposes to utilize the current electrical and telco feeds located approximately 115 feet south west of the tower. The facility will require no water or sewer as it is an unmanned facility with no proposed landscaping. No new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required. Operation and continued maintenance of the cell tower and ground equipment shelter would not generate solid waste.

**2.5 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 existing wireless facility, including the area for the proposed tower and lease area, would be located within a high fire hazard area. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District and Cal Fire were given the opportunity to comment and provided no conditions of approval requiring the need for additional supply for fire protection. However, standards for construction and vegetation maintenance will apply during the construction and operation phases of the project. The facility will not require the use of potable water or wastewater, as it is an unmanned facility. Therefore, the project is in compliance with this policy.

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

Policy 6.2.3.2, Adequate Access for Emergencies, requires that 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: In compliance with Policy 6.2.3.2, emergency access to the project would utilize a proposed on-site gravel driveway taking access off of Harris Court. Access to the site would be provide by a proposed 12-foot wide non-exclusive Verizon Wireless access easement containing an approximately 2,200-foot long existing gravel driveway taking access off Harris Court. The access road terminates at the existing facility and includes an existing turn around that will be improved to a hammerhead design to better accommodate vehicular turnaround. The El Dorado County Fire Protection District has recommended conditions that the project to include turnouts, at locations to be identified during building permit review, along the access road. The site plan was reviewed for emergency ingress and egress capabilities, and building plans will be reviewed by the El Dorado County Fire Protection District for compliance with county and fire codes. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the General Plan Policy.

**2.7 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 6.5.1.7.**

Policy 6.5.1.7, Noise Standards, require that noise created by new proposed non-transportation noise sources shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 6-2 for noise-sensitive uses.

Rationale: The noise produced as a result of this project would comply with the standards in the General Plan. Noise will result from the operation of up to four outdoor electronic base transfer stations (BTS or cabinets) and a back-up generator. Originally, the project included a pre-fabricated equipment shelter with HVAC unit. The maximum noise level from the air conditioner is 65.0 dB when measured at a distance of 10 feet in front, and the maximum noise level for the generator is 63.0 dBA, measured at a distance of 23, according to the sound level evaluation for this site and proposed equipment. The predicted noise levels of the combined operation of the air conditioner with the generator at the north (closest) property line is 41.4 dBA, meeting the County's daytime and evening rural noise limits (Hammett, 2015; Attachment 5). However, the project has been revised to include four outdoor equipment cabinets which do not require the HVAC units and create significantly less noise. The generator is only used during daytime hours for testing and maintenance and extended power outages. The expected noise levels would be well below the maximum and average county limits for rural areas for daytime, evening, and nighttime noise standards (Attachment 5 of Staff Report Exhibit J). A standard condition limiting the days and time of generator maintenance will further lessen this impact. The proposed project will not expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan.

**2.8 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 7.1.2.1.**

General Plan Policy 7.1.2.1 directs that development or disturbance shall be prohibited on slopes exceeding 30 percent unless necessary for access.

Rationale: The proposed facility will not disturb any areas on slopes exceeding 30 percent. The proposed wireless telecommunications site is located in a relatively flat area. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the General Plan Policy.

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

According to policy 7.4.4.4 of the General Plan, all new development projects that would result in soil disturbance on parcels that are over an acre and have at least 1 percent total canopy cover shall adhere to the tree canopy retention and replacement standards.

Rationale: The project site is proposed to be located within an existing 50- by 50-foot lease area absent of vegetation from previous construction activities. Construction would require boring and/or trenching within the utilities lease area and utilities easement in an area previously disturbed by

construction activities and adjacent to an existing driveway. No trees or significant vegetation will be removed as a result of the project. The project is consistent with policy 7.4.4.4 of the General Plan.

**2.10 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.2.9.**

According to policy 7.4.2.9 of the General Plan, the Important Biological Corridor (-IBC) overlay shall apply to lands identified as having high wildlife habitat values because of extent, habitat function, connectivity, and other factors. Lands located with the overlay district shall be subject to the following provision except that where the overlay is applied to lands that are subject to Agricultural Districts overlay (-A) or that are within the Agricultural Lands (AL) designation, the land use restrictions associated with the -IBC policies will not apply to the extent that the agricultural practices do not interfere with the purpose of the -IBC overlay. The specific provisions include:

- Increased minimum parcel size;
- Higher canopy-retention standards and/or different mitigation standards/thresholds for oak woodlands;
- Lower thresholds for grading permits;
- Higher wetlands/riparian retention standards and/or more stringent mitigation requirements for wetland/riparian habitat loss;
- Increased riparian corridor and wetland setbacks;
- Greater protection for rare plants (e.g., no disturbance at all or disturbance only as recommended by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/California Department of Fish and Game);
- Standards for retention of continuous areas/large expanses of other (non-oak or non-sensitive) plant communities;
- Building permits, discretionary, or some other type of “site review” to ensure that canopy is retained; and
- No hindrances to wildlife movement (e.g., no fences that would restrict wildlife movement).

Rationale: The project site is proposed to be located within an existing 50- by 50-foot lease area absent of vegetation from previous construction activities. Construction would require boring and/or trenching within the utilities lease area and utilities easement in an area previously disturbed by construction activities and adjacent to existing driveway. No wetlands or riparian corridors exist in the project vicinity. No trees or significant vegetation will be removed as a result of the project. The project is consistent with policy 7.4.2.9 of the General Plan.

**2.11 The project is consistent with General Plan Policy 8.1.1.8.**

According to policy 8.1.1.8 of the General Plan, lands assigned the Agricultural Land (AL) designation shall be of sufficient size to sustain agricultural use and should possess one or more of the following characteristics:



- A. Are currently under a Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zone Contract;
- B. Contain the characteristics of choice agricultural land (i.e., contain choice agricultural soils and/or contain Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Locally Important Farmland); or
- C. Are under cultivation for commercial crop production or are identified as grazing land;

And one of the following:

- 1. Are located in the county's Rural Region; or
- 2. The County Department of Agriculture has determined that the land is well suited for agricultural production.

Rationale: The project site has an AL General Plan land use designation and is of sufficient size to sustain agricultural use, is currently under a Williamson Act Contract with Agricultural Preserve Number 7, contains Locally Important Farmland, is currently under agricultural cultivation, and is located in the Rural Region. The project was routed to the El Dorado County Agricultural Commission and no comments were provided that identified any issues regarding the conversion of agricultural land or the current Williamson Act Contract. The proposed project would not affect the ability of the site to sustain agricultural use. The project is consistent with policy 8.1.1.8 of the General Plan.

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

According to policy 8.1.4.1 of the General Plan, the County Agricultural Commission shall review all discretionary development applications involving land zoned for or designated agriculture and shall make recommendations to the reviewing authority. Before granting approval, a determination shall be made by the approving authority that the propose use:

- A. Will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and
- 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
- C. Will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.

Rationale: The portion of the parcel where the existing wireless telecommunication facility and proposed tower and lease area are located is zoned Exclusive Agricultural (AE) and has an AL General Plan land use designation. The proposed project would be contained within an existing wireless communication facility. The project was routed to the El Dorado County Agricultural Commission and no comments were provided that identified any issues regarding the proposed use. The proposed project would not result in intensification or addition of new conflicts between adjacent

residential areas and agricultural activities, create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands would be negatively affected, or significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands. The project is consistent with policy 8.1.4.1 of the General Plan.

### **3.0 ZONING FINDINGS**

#### **3.1 The project is consistent with Title 130.**

The portion of the parcel where the existing wireless telecommunication facility and proposed tower and lease are located is zoned Exclusive Agricultural (AE). The project has been analyzed in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 130.36.090 (Development Standards) for minimum lot size, building coverage, lot widths, and building setbacks.

Rationale: The project, as proposed and conditioned, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance because the project will comply with building setbacks and other applicable design standards for wireless telecommunication facilities within the Exclusive Agricultural zone.

#### **3.2 The project is consistent with Section 130.14.210(B).**

To minimize the number of communication facilities through encouraging the joint use of towers, service providers are encouraged to employ all reasonable measures to site their antenna equipment on existing structures, to co-locate where feasible, and develop new sites that are multi-carrier.

Rationale: The project would replace an existing 53-foot tall monopole with an 82-foot monopine. The new monopine tower will allow for replacement of existing carrier equipment from the existing monopole to the proposed monopine, co-location of new Verizon equipment, and potential future co-location of an additional carrier. The applicant has also provided coverage maps identifying the existing and increased cellular service resulting from the proposed facility (Staff Report Exhibit I-1 through I-3).

#### **3.3 The project is consistent with Section 130.14.210(D)(5)(b).**

In all zone districts, other than industrial, commercial, and research and development zone districts, new towers or monopoles shall be subject to approval of a special use permit by the Planning Commission.

Rationale: The existing wireless telecommunications facility was approved through a special use permit by the Planning Commission (S93-0004). The applicant has submitted an application for a special use permit for the replacement of the monopole by a monopine, replacement of existing

carrier equipment from the existing monopole to the proposed monopine, and co-location of Verizon wireless tower equipment and related ground equipment to be reviewed by and subject to the approval of the Planning Commission.

3.4 **The project is consistent with Section 130.14.210(E-J).**

Section 130.14.210 B, E-J of the Zoning Ordinance requires that all wireless communication facilities meet certain criteria. Below is an analysis of these standards:

*E. Visual simulations of the wireless communications facility (including all support facilities) shall be submitted. A visual simulation can consist of either a physical mock-up of the facility, balloon simulation, computer simulation or other means.*

Rationale: Photo-simulations of the facility are provided in Exhibit H of the Staff Report. These photos demonstrate how the facility will blend with the surrounding area thereby minimizing its visual impacts.

*F. Development Standards: The following provisions shall apply in all zone districts. All facilities shall be conditioned, where applicable, to meet the following criteria:*

*1. Screening. All facilities shall be screened with vegetation or landscaping. Where screening with vegetation is not feasible, the facilities shall be disguised to blend with the surrounding area (trees, barns, etc.) The facility shall be painted to blend with the prevalent architecture, natural features or vegetation of the site.*

Rationale: The project has been designed to blend in with the natural features and vegetation as directed by Section 130.14.210 of the Zoning Ordinance. The project would replace an existing wood pole with a monopine. The facility outdoor equipment will be painted non-reflective natural colors. The monopine tower would be designed to resemble a pine tree with the tower pole painted flat brown to match the bark color of a pine tree, antennas located in faux branches resembling pine tree limbs, and antennas and mounting equipment painted to match the branch color with pine needle socks installed around them to reduce visual impact. The monopine is designed to camouflage the facility and blend in with the surrounding vegetation as illustrated in the photo simulations, site plan, and elevations (Staff Report Exhibits H, F-4, and F-7).

*2. Setbacks. As set forth in each applicable zoning district, except where locating the facility inside those setbacks is the most practical and unobtrusive location possible on the proposed site. Setback waivers shall be approved through the minor use permit process.*

Rationale: The AE Zone requires a 30-foot front, side, and rear setback from property lines for all structures. The proposed monopine tower would replace an existing monopole in the same location, and along with proposed ground related equipment, would be located inside a previously approved (S93-0004) existing wireless telecommunications facility compound within an existing 50- by 50-foot lease area. Setbacks would be greater than 150 feet to the northern, eastern, and western property lines. The existing approved lease area is located approximately 10 feet north of an existing parcel containing a water storage facility. That parcel is entirely surrounded by the project parcel. Locating the proposed monopine tower and related ground equipment within the existing wireless telecommunications facility compound is the most practical and unobtrusive location possible on the proposed site. Therefore, the project is consistent with setback standards of the AE Zone and Section 130.14.210 F.2 of the County Zoning Ordinance. (Staff Report Exhibit F-4).

3. *Maintenance. All improvements associated with the communication facility, including equipment shelters, towers, antenna, fencing, and landscaping shall be properly maintained at all times. Colors of towers and other improvements shall be maintained to ensure the appearance remains consistent with approved conditions relating to color.*

Rationale: Maintenance personnel would visit the site approximately one to two times per month, at which time the facility would be inspected to ensure proper operation. Conditions are recommended to ensure that the colors and materials of the equipment building, tower, and ground support equipment will be maintained at all times and will be consistent with the features depicted in the visual simulations and elevations.

*G. Radio Frequency (RF) Requirements: Section 130.14.210.G of the County Code requires that the applicant submit a report or summary of the estimates of non-ionizing radiation generated by the facility and maximum electric and magnetic field strengths at the edge of the facility site, as regulated by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC).*

Rationale: A submitted RF analysis report (dated April 21, 2015) confirms compliance with the applicable FCC Regulations regarding maximum permissible exposure limits (Attachment 4 of Staff Report Exhibit J).

*H. Availability. Section 130.14.210.H requires that all communication facilities be available to other carriers as long as structural or technological obstacles do not exist.*

Rationale: The monopine would be constructed with the ability to accommodate the relocation of the existing carrier's equipment from the existing monopole

to the proposed monopine, the proposed Verizon equipment, and future potential collocation of an additional carrier. However, the specific location or quantities of future antennae have been not identified. Any separate future co-location would require a revision to this special use permit, subject to review by the County.

- I. Section 130.14.210.I of the Zoning Ordinance requires that all obsolete or unused communication facilities be removed within six months after the use of that facility has ceased or the facility has been abandoned.*

Rationale: The project has been conditioned to comply with this requirement.

- J. Section 130.14.210.J of the Zoning Ordinance states certain notification requirements for projects located within 1,000 feet of a school or on residentially zoned lands governed by CC&Rs.*

Rationale: The project parcel is not within 1,000 feet of a school or located on residentially zoned land governed by CC&Rs. Therefore, these notification requirements do not apply to this project.

#### **4.0 SPECIAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS**

##### **4.1 The issuance of the permit is consistent with the General Plan.**

Rationale: As discussed above in Section 2.0 General Plan Findings, the special use permit is consistent with the applicable policies and requirements in the El Dorado County General Plan.

##### **4.2 The proposed use would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or injurious to the neighborhood.**

Rationale: At 11.0 percent or less of the public safety standard established by the FCC, the risk of RF emissions to the surrounding public is remote. The use will not significantly conflict with surrounding uses. The facility will be visible from certain vantage points. However, the tower antennas will be concealed by monopine branches. As discussed in Section 2.0 and 3.0 above, the project is consistent with applicable General Plan Policies and conforms to the requirements of the County Zoning Ordinance. As designed and conditioned, the project is not anticipated to result in significant environmental, visual, or noise impacts to the surrounding residents.

##### **4.3 The proposed use is specifically permitted by Special Use Permit.**

Rationale: As discussed in Section 3.3 above, the proposed use is specifically

permitted in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 130.14.210(D)(5)(b) subject to approval of a special use permit by the Planning Commission. The applicant has submitted an application for a special use permit to be reviewed by and subject to the approval of the Planning Commission.

**Conditions of Approval**

**Development Services Division - Planning Services**

1. Special Use Permit S15-0011 supersedes S93-0004. The building permit for the new monopine tower will be issued while the existing tower is still in operation. Within 90 days of the building permit for the new monopine tower being finalized, the existing monopole shall be removed and existing antennas shall be relocated to the new tower. Once the demolition permit for the existing tower is finalized S93-0004 will be expired.

The Special Use Permit is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, the following hearing exhibits, and conditions of approval set forth below:

Exhibit A.....	Location Map
Exhibit B.....	Assessor's Parcel Number Map
Exhibit C.....	General Plan Land Use Map
Exhibit D.....	Zoning Map
Exhibit E.....	Aerial Photo
Exhibit F-1.....	Title Sheet and Project Information, Sheet T-1
Exhibit F-2.....	Project Enlargement Area and Tower Diagram, Sheet C-1
Exhibit F-3.....	Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Sheet C-2
Exhibit F-4.....	Overall Site Plan and Site Plan, Sheet A-1
Exhibit F-5.....	Enlarged Site Plan and Antenna Plan, Sheet A-2
Exhibit F-6.....	Grading Plan, Sheet A-3
Exhibit F-7.....	Elevations, Sheet A-4
Exhibit F-8.....	Generator Specs, Sheet A-5
Exhibit G.....	Project Support Statement; Date Stamped June 19, 2015
Exhibit H.....	Photo Simulations; Date Stamped June 19, 2015
Exhibit I-1.....	Coverage Map, Existing Verizon 4G Coverage as of March 2015; March 2015
Exhibit I-2.....	Coverage Map, Verizon 4G Coverage with Proposed Cedar Ravine Site; March 2015
Exhibit I-3.....	Proposed Verizon Cedar Ravine Site; March 2015
Exhibit J.....	Proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study

Any deviations from the project description, exhibits, or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows:

Special Use Permit allowing the construction and operation of a new 86-foot tall monopine tower to replace an existing 53-foot monopole within an existing wireless communication facility on the 76-acre parcel identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 051-430-27, and consisting of the following:

- a. An existing 50-by 50- lease area and 10- by 20-foot equipment shelter, related tower antenna/equipment to be replaced on new monopine tower at an approximate elevation of 53 feet or greater, and related ground equipment within an existing approximately 25- by 50-foot compound surrounded by 6-foot high chain link fence with access gate and three rows of barbed wire on top;
- b. Six antennas with nine remote radio heads and two surge protectors on three sectors mounted at 80-feet;
- c. Up to four outdoor equipment cabinets on a 10- by 18-foot concrete pad;
- d. A 30kw back-up diesel generator on a 5- by 10-foot concrete pad; and
- e. Improvements to the existing gravel driveway off Harris Court including modification to hammerhead turn-around and potential turnouts.

The grading, development, use, and maintenance of the property, the size, shape, arrangement, and location of structures, parking areas and landscape areas, and the protection and preservation of resources shall conform to the project description above and the hearing exhibits and conditions of approval below. The property and any portions thereof shall be sold, leased or financed in compliance with this project description and the approved hearing exhibits and conditions of approval hereto. All plans must be submitted for review and approval and shall be implemented as approved by the County.

2. In Compliance with County Code Section 130.22.250, implementation of the project must occur within 24 months of approval of this Special Use Permit, otherwise the permit becomes null and void. It is the responsibility of the applicant to monitor the time limit and make diligent progress toward implementation of the project and compliance with conditions of approval.
3. The applicant shall assume full responsibility for resolving television reception interference or other electrical interference caused by the operation of this facility. The applicant shall take corrective action within 30 days of the receipt of any written complaint.
4. For co-location purposes, no further review by the Planning Commission shall be required provided that the project is not determined to constitute a substantial change of the physical dimensions of the tower or base station as identified by the criteria set forth in section 6409 of the Spectrum Act (codified at 47 U.S.C. 1455).
5. All equipment shelters, cabinets or other auxiliary structures shall be painted in a matching color to comply with the screening requirements of Section 130.14.210.F of the County Code. The pole shall have simulated bark, and the radio frequency antennas shall

be painted with non-reflective paint and maintained to match the color of the branch needles. All antennas shall be covered with antenna socks that shall match the color and texture of the branch leaves. The branches shall be installed with random lengths that create an asymmetrical appearance conforming to the shape of a natural Pine tree. No antenna shall project out past the branch tips. Planning Services shall verify the painting of all structures prior to final inspection and approval of the facility.

6. All improvements associated with the communication facility, including equipment shelters, antennae, and fencing shall be properly maintained at all times. Colors of the panels, equipment enclosure, and other improvements visible to the public shall be maintained to ensure the appearance remains consistent.
7. Any routine maintenance that requires running the generator or automatic recycling of the generator shall be performed between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.
8. Prior to issuance of a building permit or commencement of any use authorized by this permit, the applicant shall provide a written description, together with appropriate documentation, showing conformance of the project with each condition imposed as part of the project approval. The applicant shall also schedule an inspection by Planning Services prior to Building Permit final for any Building Permit for verification of compliance with applicable Conditions of Approval.
9. All obsolete or unused communication facilities shall be removed within six months after the use of that facility has ceased or the facility has been abandoned. The applicant shall notify Planning Services at the time of abandonment and all disturbance related to the communication facility shall be restored to pre-project condition.
10. Due to the ever-changing technology of wireless communication systems, this Special Use Permit shall be reviewed by the County Development Services Division every five years. At each five-year review, the permit holder shall provide the Development Services Division with a status report on the then current use of the subject site and related equipment to include dated photos of the tower and equipment. Development Services shall review the status and determine whether to:
  - a. Allow the facility to continue to operate under all applicable conditions; or
  - b. Hold a public hearing to determine whether to modify the conditions of approval in order to reduce identified adverse impacts; or initiate proceedings to revoke the special use permit, requiring the facility's removal if it is no longer an integral part of the wireless communications system.

By operation of this condition, it is the intent of County to reserve the right to modify or add new conditions, consistent with the language specified above. The failure of the County to conduct or complete a five-year review in a timely fashion shall not invalidate the Special Use Permit. The applicant shall pay a fee determined by the Development



Services Director to cover the cost of processing a five-year review on a time and materials basis.

11. The operator (lessee) and property owner (lessor) are responsible for complying with all conditions of approval contained in this Special Use Permit. Any zoning violations concerning the installation, operation, and/or abandonment of the facility are the responsibility of the owner and the operator.
12. The following shall be incorporated as a note on the grading/improvement plans:

In the event archeological resources are discovered during grading and construction activities, the applicant shall ensure that all such activities cease within 50 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist can examine the find in place. If the find is determined to be a “unique archeological resource”, contingency funding, and a time allotment sufficient to allow recovering an archeological sample or to employ one of the avoidance measures may be required under the provisions set forth in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code. Construction work could continue on other parts of the project site while archeological mitigation takes place.

If the find is determined to be a “unique archeological resource”, the archaeologist shall determine the proper method(s) for handling the resource or item in accordance with Section 21083.2(b-k). Any additional costs as a result of complying with this section shall be borne by the project applicant. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken or the site is determined a “nonunique archeological resource”.

Planning Services shall verify the inclusion of this notation on the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

13. The following shall be incorporated as a note on the grading/improvement plans:

In the event of the discovery of human remains, all work shall cease and the County coroner shall be immediately notified pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. The coroner shall make his or her determination within two working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and

conferred, as prescribed in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of their notification by the Native American Heritage Commission. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials or other proper method(s) for handling the remains in accordance with Section 5097.98(b-h). Any additional costs as a result of complying with this section shall be borne by the project applicant. Grading and construction activities may resume after appropriate measures are taken.

Planning Services shall verify the inclusion of this notation on the grading plans prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

14. All outdoor lighting shall conform to Section 130.14.170 of the Zoning Ordinance, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. Any light fixture that does not have a specification sheet submitted with the building permit that specifically states that fixture meets the full cutoff standards, shall require a fixture substitution that meets that requirement.

Should final, installed lighting be non-compliant with full shielding requirements, the applicant shall be responsible for the replacement and/or modification of said lighting to the satisfaction of Development Services.

15. In accordance with California Fish and Game Code Section 711.4, the project is subject to a fee of \$ 2,210.00 after approval, but prior to the County filing the Notice of Determination (NOD) on the project. This fee plus the \$50.00 filing fee, is to be submitted to Planning Services and must be made payable to El Dorado County. The payment is forwarded to the State Department of Fish and Wildlife and is used to help defray the cost of managing and protecting the State's fish and wildlife resources. A \$50.00 filing fee for the NOD is required and the NOD must be filed within five working days from the project approval. The filing of the NOD begins the statute of limitations time period for when litigation may be filed against the County's action on the project. If the NOD is filed the statute of limitations ends 30 days from its filing. If no NOD is filed, it ends 180 days from the date of final action by the County.
16. In the event of any legal action instituted by a third party challenging the validity of any provision of this approval, the developer and landowner agree to be responsible for the costs of defending such suit and shall hold County harmless from any legal fees or costs County may incur as a result of such action.

The developer and land owner shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless El Dorado County and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against El Dorado County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of El Dorado County concerning a special use permit.

417. Any and all requirements of the El Dorado County Fire Protection District shall be completed prior to obtaining a building permit.
218. All installations, fuel tanks, electrical installations, etc. will require a building permit from the El Dorado County Development Services Division-Building Services Department.
319. The proposed pole and antennas shall conform to any and all requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).
420. All operations shall be in compliance with all FCC requirements.
5. ~~The project shall be built according to the approved site plan. The Planning Director may approve minor modifications to the site plan. Major modifications, as determined by the Planning Director, shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.~~
6. ~~The applicant is responsible for installing a standard street sign at the intersection of Harris Road and Big Cut Road, to be approved by the Department of Transportation.~~
7. ~~The use shall be started and diligently pursued within one year from the date of the approval of this special use permit or it shall be null and void.~~
8. ~~If it is determined that this project creates a nuisance or changes the character or the neighborhood, this project shall be considered for revocation by the Planning Commission pursuant to Section 17.22.110(A)(4).~~

#### **Development Services Division – Building Services**

21. The applicant shall obtain all necessary grading and building permits prior to construction of any structures or commencement of any use authorized by the Special Use Permit.

#### **Environmental Management Division – Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials**

22. Under the Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPA) program, if the operation will involve the storage of reportable quantities of hazardous materials (55 gallons, 500 pounds, 200 cubic feet) for backup power generation, a hazardous materials business plan for the site must be submitted online at the California Environmental Reporting System Website (<http://cers.calepa.ca.gov/>) and applicable fees paid to the Community Development Agency / Environmental Management Division.

#### **Air Quality Management District**

23. Asbestos Dust: Current county records indicate this subject property is located within the Asbestos Review Area. An Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) Application with appropriate fees shall be submitted to and approved by the AQMD prior to project

- construction if a grading permit is required by the County, or if the project moves more than 20 cubic yards of soil (Rules 223 and 223.2). The project shall adhere to the regulations and mitigation measures for fugitive dust emissions asbestos hazard mitigation during the construction process. Mitigation measures for the control of fugitive dust shall comply with the requirements of Rules 223 and 223.2.
24. Paving: Project construction may involve road development and shall adhere to AQMD Rule 224 Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials. (Rule 224)
  25. Painting/Coating: The project construction may involve the application of architectural coating, which shall adhere to AQMD Rule 215 Architectural Coatings.
  26. Construction Emissions: During construction, all self-propelled diesel-fueled engines greater than 25 horsepower shall be in compliance with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fueled Fleets (§ 2449 et al, title 13, article 4.8, chapter 9, California Code of Regulations (CCR)). The full text of the regulation can be found at ARB's website here: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm>. An applicability flow chart can be found here: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/faq/applicability\\_flow\\_chart.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/faq/applicability_flow_chart.pdf). Questions on applicability should be directed to ARB at 1-866-634-3735. ARB is responsible for enforcement of this regulation.
  27. New Point Source: Prior to construction/installation of any new point source emissions units (i.e., emergency standby engine greater than 50hp, etc.), Authority to Construct applications shall be submitted to the AQMD. Submittal of applications shall include facility diagram(s), equipment specifications and emission factors. (Rule 501 and 523)
  28. Portable Equipment: All portable combustion engine equipment with a rating of 50 horsepower or greater shall be under permit from the California Air Resources Board (CARB). A copy of the current portable equipment permit shall be with said equipment. The applicant shall provide a complete list of heavy-duty diesel-fueled equipment to be used on this project, which includes the make, model, year of equipment, daily hours of operations of each piece of equipment.

#### **El Dorado County Fire Protection District**

29. The applicant shall submit a payment of \$246.00 for the civil site plan review. Payments shall be submitted to the El Dorado County Fire Protection District at 4040 Carson Road, Camino, CA 95709.
30. Access road shall have turnouts placed throughout the road to provide a way for vehicles to pass. Turnouts can be omitted if the road width is increased to 18-feet in width with on-foot shoulders on each side. Turnouts shall be a minimum of 10 feet wide and 30 feet long with a minimum of 25 foot taper at each end.

31. Access road shall be paved with an all-weather surface on all portions with a 16 percent or greater grade. All other portions of the access road shall have a surface able to support 40,000 pounds. Minimum recommended surfacing on 90 percent minimum compacted soil is 6-inch aggregate base.
32. All gates that are locked shall be equipped with a Knox Lock. Applications for this lock can be obtained through the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.
33. Vegetation control is required inside the fence perimeter.
34. A person who owns, leases, controls, operates or maintains a building or structure in, upon, or adjoining a mountainous area, forest-covered lands, brush-covered lands, grass-covered lands or land that is covered with flammable material shall maintain defensible space of 100 feet from each side and from the front and rear of the structure. Defensible space shall conform to the Applied Forest Management Report, PRC 4291 fire safe clearances.
35. Twelve inch address numbers shall be installed so they are visible from both directions of Harris Court. An additional address sign shall be installed at the split of the road to identify the road to the cell tower site.
36. The applicant shall provide a fire extinguisher with a minimum 2A20BC rating. The extinguisher must be within 75 feet of the generator and mounted in weatherproof cabinet.
37. A Knox Box shall be installed on the exterior side fence. Applications for the Knox Box can be obtained through the El Dorado County Fire Protection District.
38. The Applicant shall submit a plan for the installation of the fuel tank.
39. A designated shutoff switch shall be installed to disconnect the generator supplying power to the building.
40. All breakers shall be labeled to function.
41. A California Department of Transportation (DOT) placard shall be placed on the cabinet door identifying the sulfuric acid in the batteries.
42. Applicant shall submit a full set of building plans to the El Dorado County Fire Protection District upon Special Use Permit being granted by El Dorado County Planning Department. Additional review fees will apply.

**3. 15-1409** Hearing to consider a request submitted by Dennis Smith appealing the approval of Design Review DR14-0005-S/Dollar General Georgetown to permit a new 9,000 square foot commercial building on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 061-362-01, 061-362-02, and 061-362-04. The property totals 1.2 acres and is located on the southeast side of Main Street between the intersections with Orleans Street and Harkness Street, in the Georgetown area; and staff recommending the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff;
- 2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15074(d), incorporating the Mitigation Measures as presented; and
- 3) Deny the appeal, thereby upholding the approval of Design Review DR14-0005-S by the Development Services Division Director on October 28, 2015, based on the Findings (Attachment C) and subject to the Conditions of Approval (Attachment D). (Supervisory District 4)

The Planning Commissioners' reminded the applicant of previous announcement in regards to requesting a continuance.

Rob Peters distributed a public comment received December 10, 2015 to the Commission and presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation to deny the appeal, thereby upholding the approval by the Development Services Division Director on October 28, 2015.

Commissioner Pratt stated that he has done three site visits with the applicant as well as attended several public outreach meetings/gatherings.

Chair Stewart questioned Rob Peters on the building design and façade. Rob Peters noted the façade and design is within the Design Guidelines, the main entrance door would be made of glass and steel while the remaining doors are actually false doors and will have the appearance of a barn-style rustic door.

Sabrina Teller, Applicant Legal Representative, spoke to the Commissioners. Sabrina Teller thanked staff for their work and assistance with this project. Sabrina Teller stated that Transportation Division and the Fire Department have approved the project Conditions as-is. Sabrina Teller addressed the appellants concerns from the appeal and requested the Planning Commissioners to deny the appeal and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Commissioner Pratt stated that he appreciates the applicant's willingness to work on designs. Commissioner Pratt noted his three main concerns of the project as:

- Orientation of the project building in the perspective of the full-life cycle of the building with additional layout/design issues including: location of the building, dumpster/truck loading area, off-street parking, building gables and signage;
- Septic capacity concerns including questions related to: per tests, standing water concerns and septic capacity for current project or will it work down the road; and,
- Traffic concerns due to access off of Main Street.

Discussions ensued in regards to the project building design, building location, dumpster/truck loading area, off-street parking, sewer capacity, traffic concerns, project building gables and covered canopy walkway.

Dennis Smith, Appellant, spoke to the Commission of his appeal and his concerns with the project as follows:

- Concerns for the need for additional handicap accessible sidewalks to be added across the street;
- Addition of crosswalk signage for school crosswalk zone safety;
- Traffic concerns due to lack of signage;
- Building design/layout; and
- Surface runoff concerns.

Dave Spiegelberg, Transportation Division, noted that he met with Dennis Smith and the appellants' concerns are not within the project parameters.

Leon Alevantis, resident, made the following comments:

- Opposes the project for the historical feel of the community but does not want to fight the project but try to improve it,
- Project location is correct based on project documents/layouts provided,
- Supports staff recommendations, and
- Appeal has no value.

Tara Gauthier, resident, made the following comments:

- Support staff recommendations to deny appeal as noted by Leon Alevantis's comments, and
- Appeal application has no value.

Commissioner Pratt questioned Tara Gauthier as to her opinion on how a business would benefit with a dumpster on Main Street. Tara Gauthier stated she is pro for recycle/trash enclosure requirements and discussed the projects landscaping/setback designs. Tara Gauthier also noted that she wants to compromise with the project, not fight it.

Dave Souza, resident, made the following comments:

- Property owners have the right to sell;
- Applicants have improved their designs but the peaks/gables need to go;
- Does not want to see a Dollar General in town, it will take away from local businesses;
- The project will not bring more jobs;
- Concerns with trash location; and
- Concerns with septic capacity.

Laurel Brent-Bumb, Chamber of Commerce, noted the project will bring economic development and jobs. Laurel Brent-Bumb also noted she supported staff's recommendation.

Chair Stewart closed public comment.

Sabrina Teller, Applicant Legal Representative, stated she was able to contact the applicant and they agreed to reduce gables, continue covered canopy along Main Street sidewalk but, they cannot move the building closer to Main Street which means the loading zone/dumpsters will stay as is.

Commissioner Pratt discussed the building location and noted that no matter where the building is placed on the lot, it will still be in view.

Chair Stewart questioned the project property wetlands and if they are seasonal.

Rob Peters discussed the project property has intermittent drainage and delineation is being done with Army Corp of Engineers. Rob Peters also noted in order to fulfil the project Conditions of Approval the project requires approval of a delineation permit.

Chair Stewart noted with the loading zone/dumpsters street side, the runoff would be away from wetlands. Rob Peters reviewed Exhibit F-5 showing the trash enclosure elevations.

Chair Stewart questioned a crosswalk at Orleans Street. Dave Spiegelberg, Transportation Division, noted that Transportation Division can review requirements for a crosswalk at Orleans Street.

Commissioner Pratt commented on the project spirit of design and how it is appropriate for the foothills area. Commissioner Pratt continued with commenting that future projects in similar areas should use something similar in design/layout. Commissioner Pratt continued with stating that he refuses to accept a Main Street business with dumpsters on the street/walkway.

Commissioner Miller noted that any building on this lot would have to go through these constraints. Commissioner Pratt noted concerns due to the use of the entire lot and noted that the building may be too big for the parcel.

There was no further discussion.



**Motion #1:**

Commissioner Miller moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, and motion failed (2-2), to take the following actions: 1) Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; 2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15074(d), incorporating the Mitigation Measures as presented; and 3) Deny the appeal, thereby upholding the approval of Design Review DR14-0005-S by the Development Services Division Director on October 28, 2015, based on the Findings (Attachment C) and subject to the Conditions of Approval (Attachment D) as modified: (a) the continuance of covered patio sidewalk along Main Street side of building, (b) lowering of all three gables to maximum extent feasible, and (c) requirement for Transportation Division to evaluate the need for a crosswalk on Orleans Street. Motion FAILED.

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

**Motion #2:**

Chair Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Pratt, and carried (4-0), to continue this item to the January 14, 2016 meeting.

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

**4. 14-1617** Hearing to consider the Dixon Ranch project [General Plan Amendment A11-0006/Rezone Z11-0008/Planned Development PD11-0006/Tentative Map TM11-1505/Development Agreement DA14-0001] for the following requests: 1) Certification of Environmental Impact Report and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; 2) General Plan Amendment amending the land use designations from Low Density Residential and Open Space to High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Low Density Residential, and Open Space; 3) Zone Amendments amending the existing zones from Exclusive Agriculture and Estate Residential Five-Acre to an overall Planned Development Zone District combined with the following six base zone districts: One-Family Residential, One-Acre Residential, Single-Family Three-Acre Residential, Estate-Residential Five-Acre, Recreation Facility, and Open Space; 4) Development Plan for Phase 1 of the project to allow efficient use of the land and flexibility of development under the proposed tentative subdivision map to include gated private roads, and a Conceptual Development Plan for Phase 2; 5) Tentative Subdivision Map consisting of: A) Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Map (Phase 0) creating 33 large lots for financing and phasing purposes; B) Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map for Phase 1 creating a total of 411 single family residential lots, one public park lot, one clubhouse lot, eight open space lots, 10 landscape lots, six road lots, and one sewer lift station lot; and C) Conceptual approval of the Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Map for Phase 2 creating the remaining 194 single family residential lots, one neighborhood park, and the remaining open

space, landscape, and road lots, and 6) Design waivers from Standard Plan 101B on property identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 126-020-01, 126-020-02, 126-020-03, 126-020-04 and 126-150-23, consisting of 280.27 acres, located in the Community Region of El Dorado Hills, submitted by Dixon Ranch Ventures, LLC; and staff recommending the Planning Commission make the following recommendation to the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) Adopt Resolution 2016-xxx certifying the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH No. 2012062023) for the proposed Dixon Ranch Residential Subdivision, subject to CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations;
- 2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP), in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097(a), (Exhibit F);
- 3) Adopt Resolution 2016-xxx amending the General Plan from Low Density Residential (LDR, 278.99 acres) and Open Space (OS, 1.28 acres) to High Density Residential (HDR, 186.26 acres), Medium Density Residential (MDR, 21.40 acres), LDR (5.02 acres), and OS (67.59 acres) (General Plan Amendment A11-0006), based on the Findings;
- 4) Adopt Ordinance No. XXX rezoning property from Exclusive Agriculture (AE, 279.95 acres) and Estate Residential Five-acres (RE-5, 0.32 acres) to One-family Residential (R1-PD, 177.04 acres); One-acre Residential (R1A-PD, 5.52 acres); Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A-PD, 15.88 acres); Estate-residential Five-acre (RE-5-PD, 5.02 acres); Recreation Facility (RF-PD, 9.22 acres); and Open Space (OS-PD, 67.59 acres) (Zoning Ordinance Amendment Z11-0008), based on the Findings;
- 5) Approve the Phase 1 Development Plan containing several residential lot types, including age-restricted units. Residences will be served by gated private roads. The development will provide a public park, open space, and landscape areas totaling 62.84 acres; internal pedestrian/bicycle circulation consisting of sidewalks, pedestrian pathways, open space trails, and multi-use trails; and a public Class 2 bike lane from Green Valley Road to the on-site public park. (Exhibits G1-2) (Development Plan PD11-0006), based on the Findings and Conditions of Approval;
- 6) Approve the Large-Lot Tentative Subdivision Map creating 33 large lots for financing and phasing purposes (TM11-1505) (Exhibit H1);
- 7) Approve the Phase 1 Tentative Map consisting of 411 residential lots, one public park lot, eight open space lots, 10 landscape lots, six road lots, and one public utility lot (TM11-1505) (Exhibits H1,2,and 3), based on the Findings and subject to the MMRP and Conditions of Approval;
- 8) Approve Design Waivers 1 through 12 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval;
- 9) Conceptually approve Phase 2 of Development Plan PD11-0006 in compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 130.040.010.A (Exhibit I); and
- 10) Adopt Ordinance No. XXX approving the Dixon Ranch Development Agreement (DA14-0001) (Exhibit J).  
(Supervisory District 1)

Chair Stewart recused himself from this item and left the room.

Commissioner Pratt reminded the applicant of previous announcement in regards to requesting a continuance.

Joel Korotkin, Applicant Agent, requested the Commission for a continuance to January 14, 2016.

Barbara Jensen requested the project to be heard today as she took time off to be here today.

Matt Gugan requested for the project to be heard today as he used a vacation day to be here today.

Janna Buwalda requested the project to be heard today.

Ellen Van Dyke questioned if it was possible to hear from those today that think they won't be able to come back that day.

Mary Williams requested for the project to be heard today.

Joel Korotkin, Applicant Agent, requested to not open the public hearing today.

Commissioner Pratt closed public comment.

Commissioner Pratt noted that public comment can be made in person or in writing and encouraged for comments to be submitted.

There was no further discussion.

**Commissioner Heflin moved, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried (3-0), to continue this item to January 14, 2016.**

**AYES: Miller, Heflin, Pratt**

**NOES: None**

**RECUSED: Stewart**

**ABSENT: Shinault**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

**APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

Authenticated and Certified:

---

Rich Stewart, Chair