

# DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COUNTY OF EL DORADO

<http://www.edcgov.us/devservices>



**PLACERVILLE OFFICE:**  
2850 FAIRLANE COURT PLACERVILLE, CA 95667  
BUILDING (530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 FAX  
[bdgdept@edcgov.us](mailto:bdgdept@edcgov.us)  
PLANNING (530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 FAX  
[planning@edcgov.us](mailto:planning@edcgov.us)

**LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:**  
3368 LAKE TAHOE BLVD. SUITE 302  
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150  
(530) 573-3330  
(530) 542-9082 FAX  
[tahoebuild@edcgov.us](mailto:tahoebuild@edcgov.us)

TO: Board of Supervisors Agenda of: July 25, 2011  
FROM: Roger Trout, Director  
DATE: July 21, 2011  
RE: Targeted General Plan Amendment

---

## INTRODUCTION

On April 4, 2011 the Board adopted a Resolution of Intention (ROI 051-2011) for a Targeted General Plan Amendment, a County initiated amendment following findings from the first five-year review of the General Plan. The Board directed staff to work with the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) and its Regulatory Reform Sub Committee to address issues in regards to meeting the County's adopted goals and objectives through implementation of General Plan policies, Zoning Ordinance and the Land Development Manual.

## BOARD DIRECTION

**Targeted General Plan Amendment:** As part of the first comprehensive review cycle of the General Plan, the Board of Supervisors directing staff to set a public hearing to address proposed General Plan amendments relating to the development of housing affordable to the moderate-income earner, the creation of jobs, and improving sales tax revenues. In addition, staff is to consider amendments related to supporting the agriculture and natural resource industries in the County. On April 12, 2011, the Board directed staff to return on July 25, 2011 with a scope of work and draft project description for discussion.

Based on findings of the 5-year review, the Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA) will encompass a variety of policy refinements in the General Plan document. Planning Services has been working with EDAC Regulatory Reform Committee weekly and more often as needed, to determine which elements and policies, tables and implementation measures within the General Plan are to be recommended for amendment.

The following General Plan Amendment components address the four objectives identified in the 5-year review and address recent changes in State laws, recent changes in market demand and development patterns, and the availability of new information. The following issues, by Element of the General Plan, are recommended for revision:

## **1. Land Use Element:**

- a. Community Region & Rural Center policies and boundary amendments
- b. Agriculture District boundary expansion
- c. Commercial/Mixed-Use and Multi Family Development
- d. Rural Commerce use policies
- e. Planned Development policies
- f. Density Bonus policies
- g. Industrial use policies
- h. Floor Area Ratio Policies and Table
- i. Infill and Opportunity Site Development
- j. Agricultural and rural land support

## **2. Transportation and Circulation Element:**

- a. Regional Planning coordination
- b. Land development standards
  - i. Complete Streets
  - ii. Possible Others as part of TIM Fee Program Review
- c. El Dorado Hills Business Park employment cap limits

## **3. Public Services and Utilities Element**

- a. Water and Sewer Hook-up requirements

## **4. Public Health, Safety and Noise Element**

- a. Air Quality objectives and Adopted Plans
- b. Noise standards for public transportation and infrastructure projects

## **5. Conservation and Open Space Element**

- a. 30% Slope limitations in Community Regions
- b. Open Space constraints on Agriculture

## **6. Agriculture & Forestry**

- a. Agriculture setbacks in Community Regions
- b. Enabling of Ranch Marketing Programs on Livestock Operations
- c. Agricultural support services

## **TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT PROPOSED PROJECT COMPONENTS**

Key issues for the Targeted General Plan Amendment process include preserving and promoting rural commerce, housing for moderate-income families, preservation and development of traditional neighborhoods, and employment and local commercial opportunities while meeting new State requirements including Regional Housing Needs Allocation and climate change. Three significant issues (1-3 below) support ROI objectives of increasing tax revenue and jobs, supporting the development of moderate housing and the protection and preservation of agriculture, but propose greater fundamental changes to the General Plan. The remaining issues (4-16 below) are amendments to the General Plan but have been discussed in detail at both the Planning Commission and the Board, whereby staff has been given direction as to the potential amendments desired.

### **Summary of Significant Issues**

#### **Issue 1: State Compliance**

The Board of Supervisors retains ultimate authority over land use decisions in the unincorporated area of the County. While the State has little direct impact on local land use decisions, numerous

state programs governing taxes, infrastructure funding, highways, and community investment indirectly exert a strong influence on land use decisions.

Recent changes in regional population densities and changes in State law require the Board to consider amendments to the General Plan. The implementation of these amendments as to how and where they are applied remains with the local decision makers. If the following amendments are accepted, the County retains its compliance with State regulations and its eligibility to participate in State funding programs.

- a. Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA): California Government Code 65583.2(c)(iv) and (e) requires jurisdictions within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) of populations greater than 2,000,000 to allow for up to 30 units per acre when determining sites to meet the low and very low housing allocation categories. The 2010 census confirmed the Sacramento Metropolitan Statistical Area, of which El Dorado County is a part, has exceeded the 2,000,000 population threshold. Increasing the maximum density for Multi-family lands from 24 to 30 units per acre would allow the County to remain in compliance with State law and eligible for housing and economic development grant funds. To ensure developments with higher densities are comparable with other county development objectives, the 2013 Housing Element Update will include an analysis within the Vacant Land Inventory (VLI) required to show compliance with RHNA at levels below maximum density. This is how the 2008 VLI was accomplished and certified by the State. To ensure the remaining multi-family sites can be developed in accordance with community design objectives, staff recommends amending the Multi-Family land use to encourage a full range of housing types including small lot design. This supports the Housing Element goal of housing for all income levels.

Options:

1. Include as part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment process an increase in allowable densities on Multi-Family lands from 24 to 30 units per acre and expand the range of housing types permitted in the MFR land use designation.
  2. Defer changes in density to address RHNA numbers until the Housing Element update in 2012.
- b. SB375 Density Thresholds and Mixed Use Development (i.e. MUD II) – SB375 seeks to incentivise three distinct planning areas into one comprehensive program; regional housing needs, transportation infrastructure development, and statewide air quality goals. The law builds upon existing regulatory structures and, through required General Plan updates, encourages local jurisdictions to support compact development and project review streamlining targeted to reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The new law explicitly states that local plans do not have to conform to SB 375's provisions. The practical matter is that because transportation funding and housing elements will be tied to SB 375, local jurisdictions are encouraged to support regional planning efforts and comply when updating any land use plans. Additionally, many of the objectives of SB375 are adopted objectives of the County's General Plan, including many of the plans mixed use policies.

The Board adopted an amendment on 12/08/2009 allowing mixed-uses projects on commercial lands to develop vertically and/or horizontally, eliminated the requirement for

the project to be predominantly commercial and increase the allowable residential units per acre from 10 units to 16 units in Community Regions. Mixed-use allows for development that incorporates a range and variety of uses within a single development site. The General Plan allows for and encourages mixed-used development on Commercial lands.

Upon adoption of the amendment, the Board directed staff to begin a more comprehensive analysis for utilizing mixed-use development as a tool to further achieve goals established within the General Plan. Goals of the General Plan include the support for compact urban form within established communities, similar to historical development patterns and infill development in areas other than commercial.

Recent adoption of State laws such as SB375, recognized the benefits of encourage mixed-use as one option for achieving state air quality objectives. One of the primary incentive is the opportunity for certain CEQA streamlining opportunities afforded to mixed use projects that allow for 20 dwelling units to the acre and developments in support of transit priority areas.

The General Plan should also encourage the development of transit priority areas. This supports existing General Plan goals to allow for a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts and the option for utilizing these CEQA streamlining benefits. A new goal, TC-8 and related policies in the Transportation and Circulation Element would need to be created recognizing the requirements for the regional MTP to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy and define how the county intends to utilize this strategy in achieving General Plan goals.

When the mixed use ordinance was adopted, it was determined that any mixed use project was to be processed as a Planned Development until the adoption of MUD II. As density requirements increase, the desire and need for stronger design standards increase. The creation of an "Atlas" of different types of mixed-use development forms for use as part of a mixed use project on commercial or multi-family lands (i.e. Standard Plans, Design Guidelines, Form Base Codes, etc.) will exhibit up front how higher density developments will be integrated into existing communities. This allows targeted designs to be applied to specific neighborhoods, thereby achieving community design visions and goals. The "Atlas" of different types of mixed use development standard plans would be used in lieu of a Planned Development application, providing more predictability and streamling of the entitlement process.

#### Options:

1. Include in the Targeted General Plan Amendment a change to allow for mixed use development on Multi-family lands as well as for densities on Commercial lands to be increased from 16 units per acre to 20 units per acre. Create a new goal and associated policies recognizing the requirements for the regional MTP to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy and define how the county intends to utilize this strategy in achieving General Plan goals.
2. Create standards in the Zoning Ordinance update for mixed use and TND development to provide streamlined approval process for such development.

c. AB32 and SB97– Energy Conservation and Green House Gas Reduction Plan

All jurisdiction undertaking general plan or other land use planning document amendments are heavily focused on the greenhouse gas issue because of emerging CEQA requirements as related to AB32 and SB97. New laws are based on the assumption that at least some greenhouse gas emissions reductions will have to come from changes in land use development patterns, which presumably means an overall reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

On March 25, 2008, El Dorado County took a significant step toward proactively addressing energy conservation by adopting Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 29-2008, the “Environmental Vision for El Dorado County.” The Resolution sets forth goals for County departments to address positive environmental changes for: Transportation, Traffic and Transit; Planning and Construction; Waste; Energy; Air Quality; and Education, Outreach and Awareness. The Environmental Vision will result in each County department developing programs to address these environmental topics, including energy conservation. For example, in response to a Grand Jury request the Department of DOT prepared an El Dorado County Energy Usage for County Facilities study provided to the Grand Jury on February 22, 2010. Information compiled is a major component of a comprehensive inventory analysis necessary for completion of a Climate Action Plan.

The County’s General Plan encourages energy conservation and air quality improvement standards for energy-efficient site development and construction. The majority of the Elements of the General Plan have policies and implementation measures supporting these objectives. A primary objective of the General Plan is the concept of concentrating development into Community Regions and Rural centers, conserving our rural lands and agriculture industry. The General Plan 5-year review confirmed that 80% of all new development since 1999 had occurred in Community Regions, achieving this objective.

The concept for mixed use development to provide for a more balanced land use that reduces vehicular trips is also a primary component of the General Plan. Implementation Measure HO-31 requires an analysis of the traffic benefits of mixed uses with the intention of reducing the Traffic Impact Mitigation (TIM) fees commensurate with the traffic benefits of mixed use development. Implementation Measure HO-26 includes additional tools that the County will utilize to encourage energy conservation in land use planning, new construction, and existing housing units. Finally, Implementation Measure HO-18 provides for the use of CDBG funds to assist affordable housing developers to incorporate energy efficient designs and features into their developments.

While specific requirements for local jurisdictions have not been set, many cities and counties have taken the lead on developing local Green House Gas reduction plans, otherwise called Climate Action Plans or Energy Plans. This approach has afforded them the opportunity to set local inventorying emissions baselines and goals. The adoption of a local plan provides for future public or private projects to have the benefit of tiering off the analysis completed, thereby saving time and costs associated with the entitlement process.

Option for collaborating with the Sierra Business Council for completion of this task is being reviewed. The Green Communities/Sierra Nevada is a collaboration between Pacific Gas

and Electric Company (PG&E) and Sierra Business Council to provide innovative energy efficiency and climate change solutions for local governments and communities in the Sierra Nevada within PG&E service areas. The program is funded by California utility customers and administered by PG&E under the auspices of the California Public Utilities Commission. Participation in this program would provide the County with a comprehensive Green House Gas and Emissions Inventory a major component of a Greenhouse Action Plan. Current County's participating in the study are Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Placer, Amador and Alpine and a variety of cities within.

Local adopted plans can set local feasible mitigation measures for projects to minimize future emissions growth. Although the local jurisdictional implementation of AB32 and SB97 and related laws has been less than specific, many state and federal funding sources are tied to achieving its objectives. Therefore, those communities who have taken the lead and developed plans outlining practical measures for reaching local and State objectives, have seen cost benefits through energy cost reductions, streamlining of the permit process and have remained eligible for funding programs.

Options:

1. Amend General Plan Objective 6.7.1 to reflect updated air quality plan opportunities that supports the adoption of a separate Air Quality - Energy Conservation Plan, thereby allowing the County to set its own baseline and reduction target criteria for local developed and for achieving State and local objectives while ensuring funding eligibility and project tiering opportunities for CEQA streamlining benefits
2. Include in the General Plan as a part of the TGPA a Climate Action Plan.
3. Defer action on greenhouse gasses, climate change, and similar issues related to AB32 and SB 97 to a later, separate amendment.

**Issue 2: Rural Commerce**

Historically rural lands have sustained economic viability through a mix of uses on a single site, including but not limited to commercial, residential, industrial, mining, tourism/recreation and other revenue generating activities that benefit the property owner, the local community and the County.

The 2004 General Plan limited the expansion of commercial and industrial uses in the Rural Region. Issues have been raised regarding the economic sustainability of the rural areas of the County. Specifically the General Plan precluded the expansion of Industrial lands in the Rural Regions, allowing only those uses that support on-site agriculture, timber resource production, mineral extraction, or other resource utilization. Table 2-1 and policy 2.2.1.2 limited the ability for new commercial lands to be designated in the Rural Region. Limitations on tasting rooms, eating establishments, and lodging within the Rural Region limits meeting visitors needs and expectations from the County's nearby agricultural operations.

EDAC has suggested that commercial and industrial zoning be permitted in the Rural Region, which would require a General Plan amendment to Table 2-1 and Policy 2.2.1.2. If it is determined that the General Plan will be amended to allow for commercial and industrial uses in

the Rural Region, no amendments will be made to the land use map. Upon adoption of the amendment, a project specific application for a General Plan Amendment and Rezone would be required for commercial and industrial uses in the Rural Region. This could lead to unintended consequences, potentially adversely affecting commercial land in the Rural Centers and undermining the provisions of the winery and ranch marketing ordinances. Additionally, it could lead to unrealistic expectations that such an amendment would be approved, when such requests typically elicit significant community opposition.

One of the fundamental components of the General Plan is the planning concept areas of Community Regions, Rural Centers, and the Rural Region. Growth and development is intended to be directed to the areas with sufficient public services and access to support the development. Support services for the Rural Region were to be provided in the Rural Centers. Although EDAC representatives have expressed concerns that more opportunities to promote economic development in the Rural Region need to be provided, no specific proposals have been presented to the County where such opportunities could not be accommodated. Potential for additional uses can be accommodated in the Zoning Ordinance update in the Agricultural and Resource zones, by utilizing the Recreational Facilities zones, or rezoning lands within the Rural Centers to provide more opportunities for commercial development.

Options for additional rural commerce:

1. Consider as an option in the EIR expansion of the Rural Centers to accommodate greater opportunities for agricultural support and rural commerce needs of the County.
2. Increase potential uses by right, administrative permit, or conditional use permit in the draft comprehensive Zoning Ordinance update to provide additional agricultural support, recreation, home occupation, and other rural residential and tourist serving uses on zones in the Rural Region.
3. Consider an optional review as part of the TGPA process to amend General Plan Table 2-1 and Policy 2.2.1.2 to allow for commercial and industrial uses in the Rural Regions.

**Issue 3: Community Region & Rural Center Boundary Revisions**

The General Plan land use map delineates areas for higher density growth and urban/suburban like activities. These areas are reflected within Community Regions and Rural Centers. General Plan policy 2.9.1.4 provides for the boundaries of Community Regions and Rural Centers to be modified as a result of findings from the 5-year review process. The 5-year review highlighted the limited commercial lands available to meet all County objectives for jobs, revenue growth and moderate housing.

The Board approved on May 19, 2009 a Resolution of Intention to amend the Comino/Pollock Pines Community Region boundary. The Board recommended there be three Rural Centers created in the place of a single Community Region. This allows for separate and distinct opportunities for each of the communities.

Any proposed modification to Community Region and Rural Center boundaries must be reviewed for potential growth inducing outcomes above what was analyzed in the 2004 General Plan EIR. Any proposed modifications must remain internally consistent with all related and

applicable General Plan policies. Final recommendations will support General Plan Goal 2.4 to “Maintain and enhance the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life, economic health, and community pride of County residents”.

Options:

1. Community Region and Rural Center boundaries be analyzed for potential modification to support community identity and future local economic opportunities as a part of the TGPA. Staff anticipates only 3-5 Community Region or Rural Center boundaries will be modified as part of this process. Amend 2.9.1.4 to allow the Board more flexibility in modifying Community Region and Rural Center boundaries to better achieve Community Identity. Include the already initiated change to Camino-Pollock Pines in the TGPA.
2. Address only the Camino-Pollock Pines Community Region Boundary change as a part of the TGPA, deferring changes to other Community Regions and/or Rural Centers until such time as community design guides or community plans for additional communities are considered.

**Additional Draft Project Components**

**Issue 4: 30% Slope limitations in Community Regions**

General Plan Policy 7.1.2.1 and Mitigation Measure 5.9-4(b) prohibit development or disturbance on slopes exceeding 30% unless necessary for access. The primary issue, as analyzed in the General Plan EIR, is the risk of erosion associated with an increase in the rate of development, particularly in areas with high erosion potential. Current Interpretation of the policy is that development must avoid any portion of the site that exceed 30% slope. If the purpose of the mitigation is to reduce erosion, options for erosion control could be considered to meet reasonable use of the site. All projects are subject to the County’s Grading Ordinance. The purpose of the Ordinance is to safeguard life, limb, health, property and public welfare, erosion control and prevent the pollution of watercourses. The Grading Ordinance ensures that the intended use of a graded site is consistent with the El Dorado County General Plan, any Specific Plans adopted thereto, the adopted Storm Water Management Plan, California Fire Safe Standards and applicable El Dorado County ordinances including the Zoning Ordinance and the California Building Code.

Options:

1. Amend Policy 7.1.2.1 to clarify the objective for restriction of development on 30% slope. Standards for reasonable use shall be established in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.
2. Consider as an option in the EIR amending Policy 7.1.2.1 to raise the threshold for grading limitations in Community Regions.



### **Issue 5: Planned Development policies**

On October 7, 2008, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution of Intention No. 274-2008 to amend Policies 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2, 2.2.5.4, and 2.2.5.13. These policies relate in one way or another to the requirement of processing a Planned Development application for certain types of projects and the mandatory 30 percent open space requirement for all residential planned developments. The Board found that these policies were causing difficulties in developing smaller, infill projects, townhouse and mixed use projects, and condominium conversions. All of these have the potential to create greater affordability thereby meeting the General Plan Housing Element Goal HO-1: Provide for Housing that meets the needs of existing and future residents in all income categories.

As currently implemented these policies are precluding many projects from achieving General Plan goals and objectives by the requirement to set aside 30 percent of the site for open space. This percentage of the site in many cases ends up not providing usable open space and simply drives up the costs associated with the projects. ROI 274-2008 included the intent to maintain the 30 percent requirement in the General Plan. With the adoption of the TGPA ROI, the Board has the option of modifying the 30 percent to allow for more flexibility providing more certainty the objective can be reached.

#### Options:

1. Maintain the requirement in General Plan policies for 30 percent open space as part of a Planned Development, but revise the policies to allow for implementation and flexibility for meeting the 30 percent requirement through the Zoning Ordinance where criteria would be set to allow for on-sight, off-site and in lieu fee options or even a waiver of this requirement if certain conditions are met.
2. Revise General Plan policies to support the creation of open space within communities through a Planned Development but eliminate the specific requirement as to the percentage of open space required. Amend the policies to eliminate the specific criteria for planned developments when creating 50+ parcels. Specifics for implementation of the policy would be moved to the Zoning Ordinance where criteria would be set to determine required percent of open space by project type and allow for on-sight, off-site and in lieu fee options or even a waiver of this requirement if certain conditions are met.
3. Process as a stand alone plan amendment and ordinance revision, based on prior Board direction, subject to separate CEQA analysis.
4. Eliminate the Planned Development policies as a whole in lieu of subsequent development of community identity guidelines, form based codes, or other methods of land design patterns.

### **Issue 6: Density Bonus policies**

Concerns that General Plan provisions for Density Bonus have unintentionally incentivized unplanned development and densities in the Rural Regions, providing additional units outside of areas the Land Use Element intended for growth to occur, have been expressed by Board members and the public. There are State incentives for local jurisdictions to support Transit Oriented Design density bonuses and each jurisdiction is required to allow for Affordable

Housing Density Bonuses, therefore, staff recommends rolling each of these density bonuses up into a comprehensive Density Bonus Ordinance, but delineating respective outcomes to achieve desired goals.

Options:

1. Retain the Density Bonus policy in the General Plan but amend the language to be general in support of density bonuses as an incentive to creating open space on specific residential land uses planned for higher densities. Specifics of the policy would be moved to the Zoning Ordinance where criteria would be set as to where and how this policy shall be implemented to more efficiently meet General Plan objectives.
2. Include changes to the density bonus policy as an option to be considered in the EIR.
3. Make no changes to the density bonus policy and incorporate the standards in the zoning ordinance.

**Issue 7: El Dorado Hills Business Park (EDHBP) employment cap limits**

The EDHBP employment cap was implemented as a result of General Plan EIR mitigation measure 5.4-1(b) requiring the County to add growth control implementation measure to avoid potential violations of LOS thresholds thereby reducing the impact to less than significant. The EIR supported a number of methods that could have been used to implement the program, including a detailed traffic monitoring and forecasting program, incentives to reduce peak hour trips, specific limits on growth, even a transportation demand management program for commercial uses. The General Plan EIR anticipated that employment growth from the EDHBP would outpace residential development in the area. The General Plan 5-year review identified that the EDHBP has not grown as expected and in fact residential growth outpaced employment growth in the El Dorado Hills Area. A concern has been that the employment cap is one constraint that has limited the park's growth potential causing prospective applicants to question the predictability of the entitlement process. As part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment process, a new traffic study, Capital Improvement Plan and TIM Fee Program may be under review. As part of this process, should it be determined that the impact identified in the EIR can be addressed without setting an employment cap on the EDHBP while reaching the same objectives, the amendment or elimination of this policy should be considered in support of achieving a better jobs/housing balance.

Options:

1. Consider as an option in the TGPA the elimination or modification of General Plan Policy TC-1y.
2. Include as a part of the project description the elimination of the employment cap set forth in Policy TC-1y.

**Issue 8: Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirements**

Floor area ratio is used as a measure of the intensity of the site being developed. It represents the mathematical formula of dividing the building area (measured in square feet) by 43,560 (number of square feet in an acre) to generate a ratio (expressed in a percentage) of building space to the

land area. General Plan Policy 2.2.1.5 and Table 2-3 provides building intensities for commercial, industrial and research & development land uses. Traditionally, FAR is used in the analysis of development impacts. However, there are now better analytical tools and FAR is no longer considered necessary for this purpose. Other traditional design standards (height, lot coverage and setbacks or build-to lines) enable local jurisdictions to make reasonably accurate predictions, recognize violations, and can be secure in findings of an analysis on development impacts. Recent state laws and related funding programs have increased their support for higher density developments that can be constrained by FAR if adopted in General Plans. Some have raised the concern that FAR inhibits desired physical form, therefore should not be used when the objective is to conserve and enhance communities and neighborhood character.

Options:

1. Delete Policy 2.2.1.5 and Table 2-3 as a part of the Targeted General Plan amendment and instead implement the adopted FAR through the Zoning Ordinance. Develop flexible standards in the Zoning Ordinance to meet specific historic or community design criteria.
2. Retain the FAR policy.
3. Consider changes to FAR as an option in the TGPA EIR.

**Issue 9: Water and Sewer Hook-up requirements**

General Plan policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1 requires that all medium-density residential, high-density residential, multifamily residential, commercial, industrial and research and development projects connect to public water and wastewater systems when located in a Community Region. The General Plan supports the expansion of the County's public water and wastewater systems. The issue is that this policy does not provide the flexibility required for some projects that do not require a hook-up. The County's Community Regions total more than 47,000 acres and reach in to areas of the County that are remote in nature and may not in the near future have available water and sewer systems. Small businesses may be prohibited from investing in the expansion of these systems due to costs, thereby limiting the creation of jobs and potential revenue for the County.

Options:

1. Amend General Plan policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1 to provide flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when located in Community Regions.
2. Retain the policy to ensure the logical expansion of public infrastructure in Community Regions.

**Issue 10: Noise standards for public transportation and infrastructure projects**

DOT construction projects often require periodic nighttime work for selected construction activities that cannot be accomplished during the day due to traffic and/or safety conflicts. At times, this night work exceeds the General Plan noise thresholds resulting in significant impacts with regard to noise that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. These thresholds are more stringent than other local jurisdictions, DOT is requesting as part of the TGPA to

consider revising existing noise standards by establishing realistic noise thresholds with regard to temporary nighttime construction activities.

Options:

1. Consider as an option in the TGPA EIR a revision to the noise standards to allow for periodic night work on public transportation and infrastructure projects.
2. Retain the noise threshold in the policy to provide full disclosure and analysis of potential noise impacts of public works projects.

**Issue 11: Land development standards**

Assembly Bill 1358 “The Complete Streets Act” places the planning, designing, and building of complete streets into the larger planning framework of the general plan by requiring jurisdictions to amend their circulation elements to plan for multimodal transportation networks. These networks are required to allow for all users to effectively travel by motor vehicle, foot, bicycle, and transit to reach key destinations within their community and the larger region. Adding a policy support the development of standards in the General Plan meets state requirements.

Options:

1. Include in the TGPA a policy that supports the development of complete street standards to address the state requirement.
2. Provide as an optional analysis in the EIR a policy amendment to address complete streets.

**Issue 12: Historic Townsites**

Resolution of Intention to amend the Zoning Map to include a Historic Design Combining Zone District on selected parcels within the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region was adopted on November 18, 2010. The item before the Board included a map depicting the historic townsites of El Dorado and Diamonds Springs. As part of the zoning map discuss with the Community Advisory Committee, it was requested that the Board consider as part of the action a General Plan amendment to Policy 2.4.1.3 to recognize the historic townsites of El Dorado and Diamond Springs. Consideration of this as part of the TGPA process would save time and costs in processing the item. The Committee has also adopted targeted sites within the historic townsites for inclusion into a Historic Design Combining Zone District that could be adopted if approved by the Board as part of the Zoning Ordinance Update.

Options:

1. Amend policy 2.4.1.3 as a part of the TGPA to add El Dorado and Diamond Springs to the list of historic townsites.
2. Consider as an option in the TGPA EIR the addition of El Dorado and Diamond Springs to Policy 2.4.1.3.

**Issue 13: Infill Development Criteria and Identification of Opportunity Areas**

To achieve General Plan as well as State infill objective, adding policies and an implementation measure to the Land Use Element identifying infill opportunity sites or at minimum site criteria

within CR and RC will provide a framework for an infill incentive program. Criteria would focus on sites designated for mixed-use, higher density residential and commercial development. Any new development on identified sites would be required to remain visually compatible with the surrounding area. Infill sites would be small in size and located within communities like El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, Camino, Missouri Flat, and El Dorado/Diamond Springs.

The General Plan identifies areas anticipated for growth but has adopted lower intensity land use designations and zoning until adequate infrastructure is available to accommodate a higher density/intensity land uses. Policies do not provide clear goals or expectations for these areas or for achieving General Plan objectives. As part of the TGPA process, sites currently lacking adequate infrastructure but anticipated for high density/intensity land uses would be identified as Opportunity areas. Opportunity areas would consist of larger undeveloped areas where future development is expected and should be directed. Opportunity areas would be established based on several criteria, including strategic locations within the General Plan Planning Areas, proximity to services, ability to advance General Plan goals, compatibility with adjacent uses, environmental resources, and geographic features. Opportunity areas would require subsequent detailed master planning including circulation patterns and financing issues prior to development. By establishing policies within the General plan as part of the TGPA process, initial analysis can be incorporated into technical studies providing some level of CEQA streamlining benefits for future planning of these areas. Staff anticipates approximately 6-10 Opportunity areas in total to be identified as part of the TGPA.

As part of the TGPA and subsequent EIR, establishing a vision for change and revitalization for identified infill sites and Opportunity areas would provide “incentives” substantial enough to encourage the development of these vacant/underutilized areas. This amendment would set criteria for CEQA streamlining opportunities but does not intend to go beyond existing EIR growth projections or densities set by the General Plan. These policies would support the use of vetted and adopted Traditional Neighborhood Design guidelines, Standard Plans, Mixed Use, and Form Base Code.

#### Options:

1. Include as part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment process by adding a policy and implementation measure to Land Use Element supporting the implementation program to promote infill development in existing communities.
2. Defer changes in density to address RHNA numbers until the Housing Element update in 2012.

#### **Issue 14: Agriculture setbacks in Community Regions and Rural Centers**

Ag & Forestry policy 8.4.1.2 allows for a reduction to forest land buffers to a minimum of 50 feet in Community Regions and Rural Centers. Ag & Forestry policy 8.1.3.2 does not include the same language for agricultural setbacks. The BOS adopted the administrative relief to agricultural setbacks by Resolution 079-2007 on April 27, 2007. The administrative relief to setbacks allows the Agricultural Commission to reduce the 200 foot setback up to 75% (or 50 feet) if certain criteria are met. One of those criteria is if the “subject parcel is located in a Community Region or Rural Center as designated in the General Plan”. Adding language similar to 8.4.1.2 to 8.1.3.2 would bring the two buffering policies, forest resources and agriculture lands, in line with one another. This amendment would eliminate the need for

projects to go before the Agricultural Commission when there are no true impacts to adjacent agricultural lands. All other protections remain intact as approved by the BOS, as recommended by the Agricultural Commission, and as implemented by the Agriculture Dept.

Options:

1. Amend Policy 8.1.3.2 to provide a limited buffer for lands within a Community Region.
2. Include amending the agricultural buffer policy for lands within the Community Regions as an option in the TGPA EIR.

**Issue 15: Enabling of Ranch Marketing Programs on Livestock Operations**

The Economic Development Element (Policy 10.1.5.4) and Agriculture & Forestry Element (AF-D and AF-E) encourage agri-tourism activities on productive agriculture lands as incentives for staying in agricultural production while providing another means of revenue for the agriculturist. Section 8.2.2 encourages the use of Ranch Marketing, or direct farm sales, on agricultural crop lands and sets the criteria for allowing these accessory uses to enhance the income opportunities for agriculturists. Although ranching operations are not specifically excluded from these uses, they are not included and therefore an amendment to policy 8.2.4.4 addressing grazing lands and Ranch marketing is recommended.

Options:

1. Amend policy 8.2.4.4 and any related policies allow ranch marketing activities on grazing lands.
2. Consider amendments to allow ranch marketing activities on grazing lands as an option under the TGPA EIR.
3. Defer amendments and ordinance provisions regarding grazing lands until after Implementation Measure AF-E is completed.

**Issue 16: Agriculture zoning reference to Conservation and Open Space Element**

Objective 7.6.1 addresses the importance of Open Space and identifies land use management that can, in cooperation, achieve the county's goal to maintain Open Space lands. In 7.6.1.3.B., specific agricultural Zoning Designations are listed that help meet the Open Space goals. These should be changed to delete references to zoning. Policy 7.6.1.3(B) states that certain agricultural uses are consistent with meeting the Open Space objectives identified in Policy 7.6.1.1. The zoning designations may change with the zoning ordinance revisions and it would simplify, and make consistent, these references without the zoning designations.

Options:

1. Amend Policy 7.6.1.3(B) to delete references to zoning.
2. Retain existing policy language.

**Issue 17: Agriculture District Boundary Expansion**

General Plan Objective 8.1 supports the conservation of Agricultural Lands and sets objectives for conserving Agricultural lands from projects encroaching on existing operations. Policy 8.1.1 sets the criteria for identification of Agricultural Lands and specifies how the criteria are applied in identifying lands suitable for agriculture and inclusion in Agricultural districts. Implementation Measure AF-B requires periodic review of other suitable lands to be considered for inclusion into the Agricultural Districts. There are approximately 4,000 acres of crop lands located primarily within 50,000 acres of agricultural districts. These districts are proposed to be expanded to 70,000 acres. The Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution 013-2011 on January 25, 2011 to begin the process of amending the Agriculture District Boundaries.

Options:

1. Continue processing the General Plan amendment to expand the Agriculture Districts and continue analysis and mapping changes as scheduled and that the amendment be implemented prior to or no later than the targeted GPA.
2. Include the changes to the Agricultural Districts in the TGPA and include the analysis of those changes in the EIR.

## PROPOSED TARGETED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (POLICIES ONLY)

Below are proposed targeted General Plan policies (map amendments not included) recommended for amendment based on the discussion above. Policy language would be refined as part of the draft project description and finalized upon the certification of the EIR and adoption of the final amendment. These are not final recommended amendments to the policies and through the review process additional policies may be affected as they relate to the objective for the amendment.

### LAND USE ELEMENT

Policy 2.1.1.3 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Community Regions. Within Community Regions, the mixed-uses may occur vertically and/or horizontally. In mixed use projects, the maximum residential density shall be ~~16~~ 20 {Note: 20 for SB375 or 30 for RHNA} dwelling units per acre within Community Regions. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provided concurrent with development.

Policy 2.1.2.5 Mixed use developments which combine commercial and residential uses in a single project are permissible and encouraged within Rural Centers. Within Rural Centers, the mixed uses may occur either vertically and/or horizontally. The maximum residential density shall be ~~four~~ 20 {Note: 20 for SB375 or 30 for RHNA} dwelling units per acre in Rural Centers in identified mixed use areas as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The residential component of a mixed use project may include a full range of single and/or multi family design concepts. The maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre may only be achieved where adequate infrastructure, such as water, sewer and roadway are available or can be provided concurrent with development.

### OBJECTIVE 2.2.1: LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

An appropriate range of land use designations that will distribute growth and development in a manner that maintains the rural character of the County, utilizes infrastructure in an efficient, cost-effective manner, and further the implementation of the Community Region, Rural Center, and Rural Region concept areas.

**Policy 2.2.1.1** The matrix contained in Table 2-1 provides for the relationship and consistency between the General Plan planning concept areas and the land use designations.



<b>TABLE 2-1 PLANNING CONCEPT AREAS AND LAND USE DESIGNATION CONSISTENCY MATRIX</b>			
<b>Land Use Designations</b>	<b>Concept Areas</b>		
	Community Regions	Rural Centers	Rural Regions
Multifamily Residential*	•	•	
High-Density Residential*	•	•	
Medium-Density Residential*	•	•	
Low-Density Residential	•	•	•
Rural Residential			•
Agricultural Lands			•
Natural Resource			•
Commercial*	•	•	<u>•</u>
Research & Development	•	•	
Industrial	•	•	•
Open Space	•	•	•
Public Facilities	•	•	•
Tourist Recreational	•	•	•
* <del>May be applied in Rural Regions to reflect existing development when combined with the Platted Lands (PL) overlay land use designation.</del>			

**Policy 2.2.1.2**

Commercial (C): The purpose of this land use category is to provide a full range of commercial retail, office, and service uses to serve the residents, businesses, and visitors of El Dorado County. Mixed use development of commercial lands within Community Regions and Rural Centers which combine commercial and residential uses shall be permitted. ~~The residential component of the project shall only be implemented following or concurrent with the commercial component.~~ Commercially designated parcels shall not be developed with a residential use as the sole use of the parcel unless the residential use is either (1) a community care facility as described in goal HO-4 or (2) part of an approved mixed use development as allowed by Policy 2.1.1.3 and 2.1.2.5. Numerous zone districts shall be utilized to direct specific categories of commercial uses to the appropriate areas of the County. ~~Except as provided in Policy 2.2.2.3, t~~This designation is considered appropriate ~~only~~ within Community Regions, ~~and~~ Rural Centers and Rural Regions.

Multifamily Residential (MFR): This land use designation identifies those areas suitable for high-density, single family and multifamily design concepts structures such as apartments, single-family attached dwelling units (i.e., air-space condominiums, townhouses) and multiplexes), and small-lot single-family detached dwellings subject to the standards set for in the Zoning Ordinance and which meet the minimum allowable density.

Mobile home parks, as well as existing and proposed manufactured home parks, shall also be permitted under this designation. Lands identified as MFR shall be in locations with the highest degree of access to transportation facilities, shopping and services, employment, recreation, and other public facilities. Mixed use development within Community Regions and Rural Centers which combine commercial and residential uses shall be permitted. The minimum allowable density is five [optional review for minimum of eight] dwelling units per acre, with a maximum density of ~~24~~ 30 dwelling units per acre. ~~The provision of single-family detached attached dwelling units in the MFR land use designation is subject to the use of planned development design concepts which may result in zipper lot zero lot line, cottage type, or comparable developments.~~ Except as provided in Policy 2.2.2.3, this designation is considered appropriate only within Community Regions and Rural Centers.

High-Density Residential (HDR): This land use designation identifies those areas suitable for intensive single-family residential development at densities from one to five [optional review would include up to 8] dwelling units per acre. Allowable residential structure types include single-family attached (i.e., air-space condominiums, townhouses) and detached dwellings and manufactured homes. Except as provided in Policy 2.2.2.3, this designation is considered appropriate only within Community Regions and Rural Centers. ~~Standard residential subdivisions shall maintain a density range from one to two dwelling units per acre. Residential subdivisions utilizing the planned development concept shall maintain a density range from one to five dwelling units per acre. Residential development of single-family attached dwelling units are to be designed to satisfy the upper range of the allowable density under this designation. Proponents of single-family detached or manufactured home projects consistent with the HDR designation shall not be subject to the Planned Development combining zone if their projects meet the criteria set forth in Policy 2.2.5.4. (Res. No. 298-98; 12/8/98)~~

Industrial (I): The purpose of this land use category is to provide for a full range of light and heavy industrial uses. Types of uses that would be permitted include manufacturing, processing, distribution, and storage. Incompatible, non-industrial uses, excluding support services, shall be ~~prohibited~~discouraged. ~~Industrial uses shall be restricted to industrial lands within, or in close proximity to, Community Regions and Rural Centers. Industrial lands in Rural Regions shall be constrained to may have uses which support on-site agriculture, timber resource production, mineral extraction, or other resource utilization. In the Rural Regions, no additional land shall be designated for industrial uses.~~ This designation is considered appropriate within Community Regions, Rural Centers and, subject to the limitation described above, Rural Regions.

**GOAL 2.1.4: Opportunity Areas**

**OBJECTIVE: ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT WITHIN DESIGNATED OPPORTUNITY AREAS WITH A MIX OF USES THAT SUPPORT THE COUNTY'S JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE.**

Policy 2.1.4.1 Facilitate increased density and intensity of development and revitalization in identified Opportunity Areas.

Policy 2.1.4.2 When setting priorities for public infrastructure spending, give particular attention to improvements that will support development and redevelopment within designated Opportunity Areas.

Policy 2.1.4.3 Utilize incentives to promote infill development, redevelopment, rehabilitation, and mixed-use projects in designated Opportunity Areas.

Policy 2.1.4.4 Require that projects within Opportunity Areas develop at or above the midpoint of the allowed density unless one or more of the following findings are made:

- o The proposed project does not include residential development.
- o Residences are integrated vertically in a mixed-use project.
- o Site considerations such as parcel size, configuration, environmental resources, or other features make achieving the midpoint infeasible or undesirable.
- o Infrastructure constraints make achieving the midpoint impractical.

Implementation Measure: Establish a program including appropriate criteria for designating Opportunity Areas. The program shall include setting priorities for public infrastructure and funding support. [Policies 2.1.4.1, 2.1.4.2, 2.1.4.3, and 2.1.4.4]

**Policy 2.2.1.3** The General Plan shall provide for the following range of population densities in the respective land use designation based upon the permitted range of dwelling units per acre and number of persons per acre as shown in Table 2-2 below.

<b>TABLE 2-2 LAND USE DENSITIES AND RESIDENTIAL POPULATION RANGES</b>			
<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Units Per Acre</b>	<b>Persons Per Housing Unit<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Persons Per Acre</b>
Multifamily Residential	5 – <del>24</del> <u>30</u>	2.3	11.5 - <del>55</del> <u>269</u>
High-Density Residential	1 – 5	2.8	2.8 - 19.6
Medium-Density Residential	1 – 0.2	2.8	2.8

Low-Density Residential	0.20 - 0.1	2.8	0.56 - 0.28
Rural Residential	0.1 – 0.025	2.8	0.28 - 0.07
Agricultural Lands	0.05	2.8	0.14
Natural Resource	0.025 – 0.00625	2.8	0.07 - 0.0175
Commercial	<u>16/4<sup>2</sup>20</u>	<u>2.3/2.8 2.3</u>	<u>36.8/11.2 46</u>
Research & Development	–	–	–
Industrial	–	–	–
Open Space	–	–	–
Public Facilities	–	–	–
Tourist Recreational	–	–	–
<b>Notes:</b>			
<sup>1</sup> 1990 U.S. Census			
<sup>2</sup> <u>Maximum of 16 units per acre in Community Regions; maximum of 4 units per acre in Rural Centers</u>			

**Policy 2.2.1.5** — The General Plan shall provide for the following building intensities in each land use designation as shown in Table 2-3:

<b>TABLE 2-3 BUILDING INTENSITIES</b>	
<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Floor Area Ratio*</b>
Multifamily Residential	
High Density Residential	
Medium Density Residential	
Low Density Residential	
Rural Residential	
Natural Resource	
Commercial	.85
Research & Development	.50
Industrial	.85
Open Space	
Public Facilities	
Tourist Recreational	
* Ratio of allowable floor area (square footage) to site area (square footage). The FAR can be calculated over an entire integrated development rather than on a project-by-project basis under the following circumstances: 1) the aggregate average FAR within applicable land use designations does not exceed the General Plan maximum; or 2) satisfactory evidence is provided that demonstrates on a site-specific basis that measures will be imposed to keep traffic at levels associated with the applicable FAR threshold.	

### OBJECTIVE 2.2.3: PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

Provide for innovative planning and development techniques and further fulfill the Plan Strategy by encouraging balanced growth to better reflect the character and scale of the community in which it occurs while minimizing impacts on the surrounding areas, to provide more efficient utilization of land, and to allow for flexibility of development while providing for general public benefits.

Policy 2.2.3.1 The Planned Development (-PD) Combining Zone District, to be implemented through the zoning ordinance, shall allow residential, commercial, and industrial land uses consistent with the density specified by the underlying zoning district with which it is combined. Primary emphasis shall be placed on furthering uses and/or design that (1) provide a public or common benefit, ~~both on- and or off-site, by~~ (2) clustering intensive land uses or lots to conform to the natural topography, (3) minimize impacts on various natural resources, (4) avoid cultural resources where feasible, (5) minimize public health concerns, (6) minimize aesthetic concerns, (7) avoid conflicts with adjacent land uses, and (8) promote the public health, safety, and welfare. A goal statement shall accompany each application specifically stating how the proposed project meets these criteria.

~~A. The major components of a Residential Planned Development in residential projects shall include 1. Commonly owned or publicly dedicated open space lands of at least 30 percent of the total site. Within a community area, the commonly owned open space can be developed for recreational purposes such as parks, ball fields, golf courses, or picnic areas. Commonly owned open space does not include space occupied by infrastructure (e.g., roads, sewer, and water treatment plants) nor space intended for the sole use of individual residents within the planned development (e.g., private patios and balconies). In the Community Regions and Rural Centers, in lieu fee payment or off site land or easement dedication shall be permitted for all or part of the commonly owned 30 percent on-site requirement, as established in the Zoning Ordinance.~~

~~2. Clustered housing units or lots designed to conform to the natural topography.~~

~~B. Non-residential planned developments shall be accomplished through the Zoning Ordinance.”~~

### OBJECTIVE 2.2.4: DENSITY BONUS

**Provide for incentives which encourage the utilization of the Planned Development concept and further the provision of public benefits as a component of development.**

Policy 2.2.4.1 Planned Developments shall be provided additional residential units (density bonus) on residential zones consistent with Multi-Family, High Density, Medium Density and Low Density Residential land uses as established in the Zoning Ordinance {Note: General Plan language would be moved to the

Zoning Ordinance and modified to achieve General Plan objectives.} in accordance with A through C, for the provision of otherwise developable lands set aside for public benefit including open space, wildlife habitat areas, parks (parkland provided in excess of that required by the Quimby Act), ball fields, or other uses determined to provide a bona fide public benefit. (See example below.)

Move to  
Zoning  
Ordinance

~~A. Maximum Density: The maximum density created utilizing the density bonus provisions shall not exceed the maximum density permitted by the General Plan land use designation as calculated for the entire project area except as provided for by Section B.~~

~~B. In addition to the number of base units, one and one half (1.5) dwelling units may be provided for Planned Developments within a planning concept area for each unit of developable land dedicated to public benefit. In calculating the maximum density permitted by the General Plan land use designation, the County shall include acreage of undevelopable land, except as excluded in Policy 2.2.3.2.~~

~~C. Public Benefit: Lands set aside for public benefit, as used herein, shall be those lands made available to the general public including but not limited to open space areas, parks, and wildlife habitat areas.~~

~~**Policy 2.2.5.4** — All development applications which have the potential to create 50 parcels or more shall require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district. However, in no event shall a project require the application of the Planned Development combining zone district if all of the following are true: (1) the project does not require a General Plan amendment; (2) the project has an overall density of two units per acre or less; and (3) the project site is designated High Density Residential.~~

~~**Policy 2.2.5.8** — The Neighborhood Service zoning district shall be permitted in all residential designations within Community Regions, Rural Centers, Medium Density and High Density Residential Platted Lands. Uses within the Neighborhood Service Zone District should provide a direct service to the family and/or community and may include educational facilities, day care services, places of worship, lodges, community or group meeting centers, fire stations, libraries, other public facilities, recreational facilities, and commercial uses. Development proposals shall include applications for pre-designating and zoning lands Neighborhood Service Zone at a ratio of up to two acres per 40 units within a new residential subdivision.~~

Policy 2.2.5.10: It is recognized that there are large Rural Regions within the County wherein agriculture is pursued, and these areas need certain support uses that are unique to agriculture and its related uses. While allowing for the establishment of such agricultural support services, this policy will protect the permitted uses of such agricultural areas by only allowing the establishment of such support services with a special use permit which will require a finding that the

establishment of the use will have no significant adverse effect on surrounding property or the permitted uses thereof through the Zoning Ordinance.

Uses which may be considered to be consistent with this policy are those which include but are not limited to feed stores, agriculture supplies and sales, veterinarian services, animal boarding, processing and/or sale of agriculture products, and the sale of firewood not produced or grown on the site. In addition to agriculture, the rural areas may allow other consistent uses in the form of but not limited to outdoor recreation and campgrounds and organized camps, retreats, fishing and hunting clubs, mineral extractions, and cemeteries. ~~The following uses are allowed by right and do not require a special use permit: processing and/or sale of agricultural products, the sale of handicrafts or goods, picnic areas, and any other use allowed by right as specified in the Zoning Ordinance (“Ranch Marketing Ordinance”) provided that these activities are conducted on a site with a bona fide agricultural operation.”~~

## **GOAL 2.4: EXISTING COMMUNITY IDENTITY**

**Maintain and enhance the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life, economic health, and community pride of County residents.**

### **OBJECTIVE 2.4.1: COMMUNITY IDENTITY**

**Identification, maintenance, and enhancement of the unique identity of each existing community.**

**Policy 2.4.1.3** All properties located within the historic townsite known as Clarksville, [El Dorado and Diamond Springs](#) shall be designated on the zoning maps as Design Historic (-DH) combining zone district.

**{Note: There is an implementation measure to create an Infill Ordinance in the Housing Element that includes a very brief description of what Infill is. By adding a more descriptive Policy and Implementation Measure in Land Use Element for analysis under an TGPA EIR, future project may tier off GP EIR providing CEQA Streamling benefits.}**

**Policy 2.4.1.5** The County shall implement a program to promote infill development in existing communities.

- a) Projects site must be consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
- b) Project sites may not be more than five acres in size and must demonstrate substantially development has occurred on 2 or more sides of the site.

- c) Project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
- d) Approval of a project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

### **Implementation Measure**

Promote Infill Development: The program shall be linked to land-use, housing, air quality, transportation and circulation strategies that support development within existing communities, reduce vehicle miles traveled, increase energy efficiency, and encourage the development of affordable housing. The program shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) Adopt criteria to be used within existing communities with developed areas currently capable of being served by public water and public or private sewer;
- b) Provide incentives for residential and commercial infill development including financial incentives for pedestrian-oriented and transit-friendly design features;
- c) Amend the zoning code to include a new Traditional Neighborhood Design zone within Commercial and Multi-Family Land Uses;
- d) Support medium and high density residential or mixed use development along commercial and transportation corridors;
- e) Develop and utilize approved standard plan types (i.e. zer-lot line, duplex with carriage house unit over garage, z-lot, bungalow, etc.) to streamline the approval process for infill projects. Standard plans shall include various housing and commercial types and styles. Standard plan(s) approved as part of a project shall be compatible with neighboring residential or commercial district patterns for which the development is located; and
- f) Develop or update, as considered necessary, applicable community plans, specific plans and design guidelines to incorporate pedestrian-oriented, transit-friendly, and or energy efficient configurations design as primary goals.

**[Objectives 2.1.4 and 2.4.1]**

**Policy 2.9.1.4** The boundaries of Community Regions and Rural Centers may be changed and/or expanded every five years through the General Plan review process as specified in Policy 2.9.1.2 or as the Board of Supervisors deems necessary to achieve objective 2.4.1.

## **TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION ELEMENT**

~~**Policy TC-1y** — Development through 2025, within Traffic Analysis Zones 148 and 344, shall be conditioned so that a cap of 10,045 full-time employees is not exceeded, unless it can be demonstrated that a higher number of employees would not violate established level-of-service standards.~~

## **REGIONAL PLANNING**

**GOAL TC-8 Support the coordination of local, regional and State transportation planning**



[Background - California Chapter 728, known as Senate Bill 375 “the Anti-Sprawl Bill”, requires each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy in its regional transportation plan (RTP) or to adopt an Alternative Planning Strategy, for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, aligning planning for transportation and housing needs, and creating incentives for the implementation of the strategies, such as CEQA streamlining and transportation funding. Policies in this section provide for coordination with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) in preparing its RTP for consistency with the Sacramento Area Council of Government (SACOG) strategies and with the County’s planning efforts to facilitate and streamline the development of residential mixed-use projects and “Transit Priority Projects.”]

Policy TC – 8a      The County shall work with EDCTC and SACOG to develop and periodically update the Sustainable Communities Strategy as part of the Regional Transportation Planning process.

Policy TC – 8b      The County shall review the EDCTC’s Regional Transportation Plan and SACOG’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan, including the Sustainable Communities Strategy each time it reviews and updates the General Plan and any master plan, strategy, and zoning, to ensure overall consistency among all of these plans and strategies to allow for CEQA streamlining and to ensure eligibility for State transportation and housing funding.

Policy TC – 8c      The County shall work with SACOG to ensure that cumulative impacts for any Regional Transportation Plan are analyzed pursuant to CEQA so that applicable projects may benefit from CEQA streamlining as provided by State law.

Policy TC – 8d      The County shall identify community level Transit Priority Areas (TPA) in areas planned for residential and mixed use projects that are consistent with land use designations, densities, building intensities, and all other applicable policies. To the extent feasible, TPA’s shall achieve California Public Resource Code §21155 objectives, and may be adopted as part of a Regional Sustainable Communities Strategy pursuant to Government Code §65080 which support CEQA streamlining benefits as part of planned project reviews.

### GOAL: SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPLETE STREETS

[Background - Chapter 657, the Complete Streets Act of 2008, requires cities and counties to include complete streets policies as part of their general plans so that roadways are designed to safely accommodate all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, children, older people, and disabled people, as well as motorists.]

OBJECTIVE:      NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY IMPROVED ROADWAYS SHALL SAFELY ACCOMMODATE ALL USERS, INCLUDING BICYCLIST, PREDESTRIANS, TRANSIT RIDERS, CHILDREN, OLDER PEOPLE, AND DISABLED PEOPLE, AS WELL AS MOTORIST.

**Policy:** Incorporate the concept of “complete” streets in new developments as appropriate, particularly in Community Regions.

**Implementation Measure:** Update the Land Development Manual to incorporate Complete Streets design where appropriate for new higher-density developments.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

**Policy 5.2.1.3** All medium-density residential, high-density residential, multifamily residential, commercial, industrial and research and development projects ~~shall~~may be required to connect to public water systems if reasonably available when located within Community Regions and to either a public water system or to an approved private water systems in Rural Centers.

**Policy 5.3.1.1** High-density and multifamily residential, commercial, and industrial projects ~~shall~~may be required to connect to public wastewater collection facilities if reasonably available as a condition of approval. ~~except in Rural Centers and areas designated as Platted Lands (-PL). In the Community Region of Camino/Pollock Pines, the long term development of public sewer service shall be encouraged; however, development projects will not be required to connect to wastewater collection facilities where such connection is infeasible, based on the scale of the project.~~ (Res. No. 298-98; 12/8/98)

## **PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND NOISE ELEMENT**

### **OBJECTIVE 6.5.1: PROTECTION OF NOISE-SENSITIVE DEVELOPMENT**

[Background - DOT construction projects often require periodic nighttime work for selected construction activities that cannot be accomplished during the day due to traffic and/or safety conflicts. At times, this night work exceeds the General Plan noise thresholds resulting in significant impacts with regard to noise that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. These thresholds are more stringent than other local jurisdictions, DOT is requesting as part of the TGPA to consider revising existing noise standards by establishing realistic noise thresholds with regard to temporary nighttime construction activities.]

**Policy 6.5.1.11** [To be modified] The standards outlined in Tables 6-3, 6-4, and 6-5 shall apply to those activities associated with actual construction of a project as long as such construction occurs between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends, and on federally-recognized holidays. Exceptions are allowed if it can be shown that construction beyond these times is necessary to alleviate traffic congestion and safety hazards.

### **OBJECTIVE 6.7.1 EL DORADO COUNTY CLEAN AIR PLAN**

~~Adopt and enforce the El Dorado County Clean Air Act Plan in conjunction with the County Air Quality Management District.~~ Air Quality standards to reduce the health impacts caused by harmful emissions.

Policy 6.7.1.1 Improve air quality through land use planning decisions.

Policy 6.7.1.2 Support local and regional air quality improvement efforts.

IM HS-X Coordinate air quality planning efforts with other local and regional agencies. (Policy 6.7.1.1 and 6.7.1.2)  
Responsibility: Planning Department  
Timeframe: Ongoing

### **OBJECTIVE 6.7.3 TRANSIT SERVICE**

Policy 6.7.3.2 Transit Service – The County shall promote infill development that is compact, mixed use, pedestrian friendly, and transit oriented in areas identified as Transit Priority Project Areas.

### **OBJECTIVE 6.7.4: PROJECT DESIGN AND MIXED USE**

Policy 6.7.4.3 – \_\_\_\_\_ New development on large tracts of land near ~~the rail~~ Transit Priority Areas {Need to Add Definition in GP Glossary} corridor shall, to the extent practical, be transit supportive with high density or intensity of use.

General Plan Glossary Definition of Transit Priority Area???

### **Conservation & Open Space**

### **OBJECTIVE 7.1.2: EROSION/SEDIMENTATION**

Minimize soil erosion and sedimentation.

**Policy 7.1.2.1** Development or disturbance of slopes over 30% shall be restricted. ~~prohibited on slopes exceeding 30 percent unless necessary for access.~~ Standards for The implementation of this policy, including but not limited to exceptions for access, reasonable use of the parcel, and agricultural uses shall be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance.

- ~~• Reasonable use of the property would otherwise be denied.~~
- ~~• The project is necessary for the repair of existing infrastructure to avoid and mitigate hazards to the public, as determined by a California registered civil engineer or a registered engineering geologist.~~
- ~~• Replacement or repair of existing structures would occur in substantially the same footprint.~~

Move to  
Zoning  
Ordinance

- ~~• The use is a horticultural or grazing use that utilizes “best management practices (BMPs)” recommended by the County Agricultural Commission and adopted by the Board of Supervisors.~~

~~Access corridors on slopes 30 percent and greater shall have a site specific review of soil type, vegetation, drainage contour, and site placement to encourage proper site selection and mitigation. Septic systems may only be located on slopes under 30 percent. Roads needed to complete circulation/access and for emergency access may be constructed on such cross slopes if all other standards are met.~~

Policy 7.6.1.3

The County shall implement Policy 7.6.1.1 through zoning regulations and the administration thereof. It is intended that certain districts and certain requirements in zoning regulations carry out the purposes set forth in Policy 7.6.1.1 as follows:

- B. The Agricultural ~~(A)~~, ~~Exclusive Agricultural (AE)~~, ~~Planned Agricultural (PA)~~, ~~Select Agricultural (SA-10)~~, and Timberland Production Zone ~~(TPZ)~~ zoning districts are consistent with Policy 7.6.1.1 and serve one or more of the purposes set forth therein.

## AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY

~~Policy 8.1.1.6 — Parcels encumbered by a Williamson Act Contract, pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act, shall be zoned Exclusive Agriculture (AE).~~

### OBJECTIVE 8.1.2: GRAZING

#### Protection of range lands for grazing of domestic livestock.

Policy 8.1.2.1

The County Agricultural Commission shall identify lands suitable for sustained grazing purposes which the Commission believes should be maintained and managed as grazing lands. Once such lands have been identified by the Commission, the Board of Supervisors shall determine whether to initiate incentive based programs, including Ranch Marketing and other visitor serving uses, to retain such lands as productive grazing units.

### OBJECTIVE 8.1.3: PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS

#### Protection of agricultural lands from adjacent incompatible land uses.

**Policy 8.1.3.2**

Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural zoned lands shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet from the boundary of the agriculturally zoned lands.

Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned land outside of designated Agricultural Districts shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet on parcels 10 acres or larger.

Within a Community Region and Rural Center planning concept areas, agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned land shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet. The 50-foot setback shall only apply to incompatible uses including residential structures.

The implementing ordinance shall contain provisions for Administrative relief to these setbacks, where appropriate, and may impose larger setbacks where needed to protect agricultural resources.

**Policy 8.2.4.2**

~~A special use permit shall be required for v~~Visitor serving uses and facilities ~~providing they are shall be allowed in the Zoning Ordinance when~~ compatible with agricultural production of the land, are supportive to the agricultural industry, and are in full compliance with the provisions of the El Dorado County Code and compatibility requirements for contracted lands under the Williamson Act.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The Board has set as top priorities the update of the Zoning Ordinance and Land Development Manual, both of which are integral to the implementation of the General Plan and where anticipated to be completed and adopted prior to first General Plan 5-year review. The General Plan 5-year review confirmed that the County's General Plan is still within its growth projections and that basic Plan Assumptions, Strategies, Concepts and Objectives are still valid, or has not changed so drastically to require a comprehensive update. However, constraints to achieving the General Plan vision and goals were identified as part of the review. In order to address these constraints related to providing affordable housing available to moderate-income families, creation of jobs, retention of sales tax revenues, and maintaining the agriculture and natural resource based industries, the Board has approved going forward with a Targeted General Plan Amendment. Project components are discussed in this memo.

The critical decision is how these major tasks (LDM, Zoning Ordinance Update, and targeted General Plan amendment) will be accomplished. A key principle of CEQA is that the "whole of the project" be reviewed comprehensively, and that a project not be bifurcated into smaller parts, thereby reducing the degree to which potential impacts are analyzed. With this understanding of basic CEQA requirements, the County needs to consider how to process these different, but related projects, while keeping in mind the costs, timing, and prioritization of each individually and as a whole. At least three basic options exist: Combine all three into one large project with a single EIR, continue to process each separately, or prioritize the targeted General Plan amendment and wait on the others until the amendment is completed before adopting related planning documents. A complete discussion of the options and related benefits and constraints was discussed with the Board on April 12, 2011 (D- Staff Memo, Legistar Item 11-0356).

Any change to County standards requires a thorough analysis of the effects of those changes. The changes may be economic, physical, social, or environmental. Staff and EDAC members identified early on that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be the most appropriate document for any plan amendment. This gives decision makers the greatest flexibility in making decisions to balance the competing social, economic, and environmental needs of the County. It also affords the best protection in the event of legal challenges that might arise. An EIR is a time-consuming and expensive process, but necessary in this case. Although a plan amendment, Zoning Ordinance Update and Land Development Manual are independent documents and can be approved without approval of the other, they are required to be coordinated such that no conflicts between the planning documents will occur.

Should the board approve moving all three documents forward together under a single EIR or through separate but concurrent processes, staff has prepared a draft timeline (Attachment C) for consideration. The timeline outlines tasks associated with the adoption of program level EIR.

## **PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK**

Sixteen issues have been identified in this memo all recommending a General Plan Amendment. A major component of the Targeted General Plan Amendment process is to bring the General Plan in to compliance with State regulations as required by California Government Code Section 65000-66037. The other issues are a result of changes in development patterns, changes in the economy, imperfections and errors in the adopted plan, and opportunities for streamlining implementation of the General Plan. Some amendment options are more clear while others

require more discussion and analyses to determine best outcomes. Until a complete list of amendments is approved, a complete and comprehensive draft project description cannot be completed. Staff is recommending the Board discuss the issues above and recommended amendments. Determine which issues shall be address as part of this TGPA process and which can be address at a later time or through a separate process.

The approach for completing the Targeted General Amendment and Environmental Impact Report work program requires the project to be broken down into five major phases, reflecting integrated public participation and analytical processes. The five phases include; the collection and baseline analysis, initiation of the CEQA process including the preparation and 45 day public noticing of the project description, Preparation of the EIR and processing of the EIR. It is anticipated that if the process were to begin immediately it would take approximately 18 months to complete.

Once a draft project description is approved, staff can determine which technical studies will be required. Depending on the need and depth of these studies the cost and timeline for this process could vary significantly. Upon adoption the Resolution of Intention to amend the General Plan, the Board first received and filed a report accepting the finding of a 5-year review that identified that there had been no significant changes from the assumptions, goals or objectives of the General Plan since its adoption. The anticipated amendments would simply be a refinement of existing policies to better achieve overall objectives. In addition, the General Plan growth projections and land development patterns will remain substantially consistent with what was analyzed under the 2004 General Plan and EIR. Since the adoption of the General Plan the County has adopted Supplemental EIRs and completed additional studies that may provide necessary analysis reducing the need for additional technical studies, thereby reducing the overall cost and timeline of the work program.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide the following direction to staff regarding the Targeted General Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Report scope of work:

1. State Compliance
  - a. Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) - Include as part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment process an increase in allowable densities on Multi-Family lands from 24 to 30 units per acre and expand the range of housing types permitted in the MFR land use designation.
  - b. SB375 Density Thresholds and Mixed Use Development (i.e. MUD II) – Include in the Targeted General Plan Amendment a change to allow for mixed use development on Multi-family lands as well as for densities on Commercial lands to be increased from 16 units per acre to 20 units per acre. Create a new goal and associated policies recognizing the requirements for the regional MTP to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy and define how the county intends to utilize this strategy in achieving General Plan goals.
  - c. AB32 and SB97– Energy Conservation and Green House Gas Reduction Plan – Amend General Plan Objective 6.7.1 to reflect updated air quality plan opportunities that supports the adoption of a separate Air Quality - Energy Conservation Plan,

thereby allowing the County to set its own baseline and reduction target criteria for local development and for achieving State and local objectives while ensuring funding eligibility and project tiering opportunities for CEQA streamlining benefits.

2. Rural Commerce – Expansion of the Rural Centers should be considered, as an option in the EIR, to accommodate greater opportunities for agricultural support and rural commerce needs of the County. Increase potential uses by right, administrative permit, or conditional use permit in the draft comprehensive Zoning Ordinance update to provide additional agricultural support, recreation, home occupation, and other rural residential and tourist serving uses in zones in the Rural Region.
3. Community Region & Rural Center Boundary Revisions - Community Region and Rural Center boundaries be analyzed for potential modification to support community identity and future local economic opportunities as a part of the TGPA. Staff anticipates only 3-5 Community Region or Rural Center boundaries will be modified as part of this process. Amend 2.9.1.4 to allow the Board more flexibility in modifying Community Region and Rural Center boundaries to better achieve Community Identity. Include the already initiated change to Camino-Pollock Pines in the TGPA.
4. 30% Slope limitations in Community Regions - Amend Policy 7.1.2.1 to clarify the objective for restriction of development on 30% slope. Standards for reasonable use shall be established in the Zoning Ordinance and Grading Ordinance.
5. Planned Development Policies - Maintain the requirement in General Plan policies for 30 percent open space as part of a Planned Development, but revise the policies to allow for implementation and flexibility for meeting the 30 percent requirement through the Zoning Ordinance where criteria would be set to allow for on-sight, off-site and in lieu fee options or even a waiver of this requirement if certain conditions are met.
6. Density Bonus Policies - Retain the Density Bonus policy in the General Plan but amend the language to be general in support of density bonuses as an incentive to creating open space on specific residential land uses planned for higher densities. Specifics of the policy would be moved to the Zoning Ordinance where criteria would be set as to where and how this policy shall be implemented to more efficiently meet General Plan objectives.
7. El Dorado Hills Business Park (EDHBP) employment cap limits - Consider as an option in the TGPA EIR the elimination or modification of General Plan Policy TC-1y.
8. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirements - Delete Policy 2.2.1.5 and Table 2-3 as a part of the Targeted General Plan amendment and instead implement the adopted FAR through the Zoning Ordinance. Develop flexible standards in the Zoning Ordinance to meet specific historic or community design criteria.
9. Water and Sewer Hook-up requirements - Amend General Plan policies 5.2.1.3 and 5.3.1.1 to provide flexibility for the connection to public water and wastewater systems when located in Community Regions.



10. Noise standards for public transportation and infrastructure projects - Consider as an option in the TGPA EIR a revision to the noise standards to allow for periodic night work on public transportation and infrastructure projects.
11. Land Development Standards - Include in the TGPA a policy that supports the development of complete street standards to address the state requirement.
12. Historic Townsites - Amend policy 2.4.1.3 as a part of the TGPA to add El Dorado and Diamond Springs to the list of historic townsites.
13. Infill Development Criteria and Identification of Opportunity Areas – Include as part of the Targeted General Plan Amendment process by adding a policy and implementation measure to Land Use Element supporting the implementation program to promote infill development in existing communities.
14. Agriculture setbacks in Community Regions and Rural Centers - Amend Policy 8.1.3.2 to provide a limited buffer for lands within a Community Region.
15. Enabling of Ranch Marketing Programs on Livestock Operations - Amend policy 8.2.4.4 and any related policies allow ranch marketing activities on grazing lands.
16. Agriculture zoning reference to Conservation and Open Space Element - Amend Policy 7.6.1.3(B) to delete references to zoning.
17. Agriculture District Boundary Expansion - Continue processing the General Plan amendment to expand the Agriculture Districts and continue analysis and mapping changes as scheduled and that the amendment be implemented prior to or no later than the targeted GPA.