

## **Findings**

### **1.0 CEQA FINDINGS**

- 1.1 Pursuant to CEQA Section 15162(b), it has been determined that no subsequent EIR is required because there is no substantial evidence that the conditions described in Section 15162(a) have occurred, including: (1) substantial changes to the project which would require major revisions to the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project has been undertaken which would require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects; or (3) a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of the previous EIR was adopted, shows the project will (a) have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR.

The proposed project is a minor amendment to an approved and recorded final Map (TM 97-1330-F) to a previously approved Tentative Map for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on January 15, 1999. The proposed project was reviewed against the environmental analysis presented in the EIR. It was determined that the project does not involve any substantial changes in circumstances that result in a new significant impact or significant impacts that are substantially more severe than those previously disclosed in the Environmental Impact Report. In addition, there is no new information of substantial importance showing that the project would have one or more significant effects not previously discussed or that any previously examined significant effects would be substantially more severe than effects shown in the EIR. Further, there is not new information of substantial importance showing (i) that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative or (ii) that mitigation measures or alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects, but the proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

- 1.2 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Planning and Building Department at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

## **2.0 MAP AMENDMENT FINDINGS**

### **2.1 That there are changes in circumstances which make any and all of the conditions of such a map no longer appropriate or necessary.**

The original Tentative Map was approved on December 15, 1998. Silver Springs, Unit No. 1 was recorded on September 28, 2006. In the intervening times, market forces and community preferences in size, shape and style of single family residences has changed significantly. The reconfigurations as proposed, allow the property owner to better satisfy these market forces and increase housing supply consistent with market and community preferences.

### **2.2 That the modifications proposed do not impose any additional burden on the present fee owner of the property.**

The amendment's reconfiguration would benefit, and not burden, the current owners of the property. The amendment's reconfiguration will allow the owners to respond to changes in the market, increase the value and utility for their future sale and/or use of the property(ies). The project actually de-intensifies the land use of the site. Accordingly, the amendments proposed would not negatively impact the adjacent lands, uses or roadways in the vicinity.

### **2.3 That the modifications proposed do not alter any right, title or interest in the real property reflected in the recorded map.**

The amendment's proposed reconfiguration is a minor change resulting in the reduction and reconfiguration in the number and shape of parcel of previously approved maps. The amendment actually de-intensifies the land use of the site. As such, the amendment will not alter any right, title, or interest in the real property reflected on the map.

## **3.0 SUBDIVISION MAP ACT FINDINGS**

### **3.1 The amending map or certificate of correction certified by the county surveyor shall be filed or recorded in the office of the county recorder in which the original map was filed.**

The tentative subdivision map (TM97-1330) was approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 15, 1998. Silver Springs, Unit No. 1 was recorded on September 28, 2006. Approval of this final map amendment will require a revised map to be filed and recorded with the El Dorado County Surveyor's Office and El Dorado County Recorder's Office, consistent with their requirements.

**3.2 That the map as modified conforms to the provisions of Section 66474 of the Government Code.**

The provisions of Section 66474 of the Government Code (Subdivision Map Act) list the findings for approval or denial of a parcel map. The findings include consistency with the General Plan, suitability of the site for the type and density of development, significant environmental effects or public health problems, and conflicts with public access easements. The proposed amendments do not affect any of the provisions of findings for approval of the Final Map. The amended Final Map remains suitable for the type and density of development, no physical change to the environment will occur that are inconsistent with discretionary and/or ministerial entitlements for development currently in existence, and the Final Map remains consistent with the General Plan.