



4 Day Zoning Ordinance Update Workshop Recommendations Article 1

1 message

Tara Mccann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

Thu, Jul 19, 2012 at 10:45 AM

To: bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, lou.rain@edcgov.us, planning@edcgov.us, charlene.tim@edcgov.us, kimberly.kerr@edcgov.us, Teri.daly@edcgov.us, roger.trout@edcgov.us, pierra.rivas@edcgov.us, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, peter.maurer@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: Cheryl and John McDougal <cheryl.mcdougal@yahoo.com>, Norman & Sue <arowett@pacbell.net>, "John W (IS) Hidahl" <John.Hidahl@ngc.com>, Jeff Haberman <jeff.h@ix.netcom.com>, John & Kelley <bugginu@sbcglobal.net>, Bill Welty <wmwelty@gmail.com>, Paul Raveling <paul.raveling@sierrafoot.org>, Ellison Rumsey <aerumsey@sbcglobal.net>, Kitty & Rich Stewart <kitty_and_rich@sbcglobal.net>, Rich Stewart <rich_stewart@sbcglobal.net>, Dave and Susan Comstock <dandscomstock@comcast.net>, alex lebeaux <alabeaux@yahoo.com>, paul gratt <psgratt@aol.com>, soldbytami@gmail.com, Sanjay Varshney <varshney@saclink.csus.edu>, claire labeaux <claire_labeaux@yahoo.com>, sharonschei@sbcglobal.net, Doreen Barton <dkbarton@pacbell.net>, tccronin66@yahoo.com, Kala & Growri Kowtha <kkowtha@yahoo.com>, readysetgo@pacbell.net, Ron Mikulaco <ron@gotmik.com>

4 Day Zoning Ordinance Workshop July 16 - July 20, 2012 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARTICLE 1

1. 17.10.020 D Where an inconsistency exists between General Plan and Zoning General Plan shall govern.

The overriding flaw of this newly created 462 pg draft Zoning Ordinance Update is it calls for unilaterally changing all "inconsistent" zoning to be consistent with the 2004 General Plan that was expanded to broaden the Community Regions without site specific land use analysis. Many existing land uses in the Community Regions are not compatible to high density as defined in the General Plan as the desire to locate the highest intensity densities. This would put these areas of highest intensity densities, bordering existing rural, low density residential, next to senior housing and agriculture. This would significantly and irrevocably impact many existing land uses in the Community Regions. In attending many local meetings the overriding recommendation from residents of the Community Region of El Dorado Hills is to change this definition of the Community Region to High Density areas designated for reasonable smart growth where the test of Compatibility and Mitigable Impacts can be met. Do not assume all zoning should be changed to meet the designation of High Density with a definition of "the desire to place highest intensity densities". A broad brush planning approach to the Community Region to push highest intensity densities into so the remainder of the County can remain rural would be legally inequitable and burdensome for the areas defined as Community Regions. The community Region should not be blanketed with generalized planning language as high density identified to absorb highest intensity density's. This is extremely problematic and could easily lead to Class Action Lawsuit as in doing this broad brush approach cumulative impacts and incompatibility were not considered in the 2004 General Plan.

Recommendations from residents of El Dorado Hills (Community Region) : We want this changed to state if Zoning and General Plan are inconsistent the compatibility and cumulative impacts must be evaluated for each parcel. If high density is non compatible with existing land uses and/ or significant non- mitigable impacts exist the Zoning should not be changed, the General Plan Designation should be changed.

2. 17.12.10 A Official Zones

Recommendation: We want El Dorado Hills to be analyzed for a Community Plan as Meyers is. This could be one of the mechanisms of dealing with inconsistency of the zoning where the General Plan was expanded to broaden the Community Region (High Density designation) back in 2004 and caused the zoning to then be incompatible. Create an El Dorado Hills Community Plan and work with El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory committee, EDAC, Business Alliances and other interested community members to establish zoning compatibility with existing uses and consider cumulative impacts.

3. 17.12.010 B Minimum Lot Size Designation

Only gives two choice for residential

"R1" for 6000 sf (approx. 6 lots per acre)

"R20K" 20000sf (approx. 2 lots per acre)

These should not be the only two option for residential.

Recommendation: We want a broader range such as to allow minimum lot size of 3 per acre and possibly 4 per acre. 6 per acre is rarely compatible or non significantly impacting in the Community Regions of El Dorado County.

4. 17.12.010 D

El Dorado Hills may benefit from designation as Design Review Community (DC).

Recommendation: Analyze El Dorado Hills as a formalized Design Review Community.

Tara Mccann, P.E.

 4 Day Zoning Ordinance WorkshopArticle1.docx
17K

4 Day Zoning Ordinance Workshop July 16 - July 20, 2012 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Article 1

1. 17.10.020 D Where an inconsistency exists between General Plan and Zoning General Plan shall govern.

The newly created 462 pg draft Zoning Ordinance Update calls for unilaterally changing all "inconsistent" zoning to be consistent with the 2004 General Plan that expanded the Community Regions without site specific land use analysis. Many existing land uses in the Community Regions are not compatible to high density as defined in the General Plan "as the desire to locate the highest intensity densities". This would put these areas of highest intensity densities, bordering existing rural, low density residential, next to senior housing and agriculture. This would significantly and irrevocably impact many existing land uses in the Community Regions. In attending many local meetings the overriding recommendation from residents of the Community Region of El Dorado Hills is to change this definition of the Community Region to High Density areas designated for reasonable smart growth where the test of Compatibility and Mitigable Impacts can be met, where necessary infrastructure can be provided and at occupancy public safety are conditioned by the County for the developer to complete prior to occupancy permits issued.. A broad brush planning approach for the Community Region to push highest intensity densities into so the remainder of the County can remain rural would be legally inequitable and burdensome for the areas defined as Community Regions. The Community Region should not be blanketed with generalized planning language as high density identified to absorb highest intensity density's. The 2004 General Plan lacks the full analysis of impacts to existing lands in the Community Region, the Environmental cumulative Impacts and the Infrastructure Impacts for making this general designation. At this time County is stating they don't have the money needed for the traffic infrastructure required by some of these large proposed projects yet they want the Community Regions to absorb highest intensity density's and in some areas clustered so the impacts are magnified in a smaller area. This is extremely problematic and could easily lead to Class Action Lawsuit as in doing this broad brush approach as cumulative impacts and incompatibility were not considered in the 2004 General Plan.

Recommendations from residents of El Dorado Hills (Community Region) : We request this changed to state if Zoning and General Plan are inconsistent the compatibility and cumulative impacts must be evaluated for each parcel. If high density is not compatible with existing land uses and/ or significant non- mitigable impacts exist the Zoning should not be changed, the General Plan Designation should be changed. We want the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to work with the local Area Planning Advisory Committees in each area to evaluate the rezoning of existing land uses to be consistent with the General Plan based on compatibility of adjacent and adjoining uses, environmental impacts, degree of mitigation and quantity of mitigations required, degree of the change to Community Identity to come up with reasonable and equitable Zoning Designations not a unilateral " desire of areas for highest intensity densities". This should be done by doing a thorough Environmental

Impact Report analyzing all parcels in the Community Region for acceptability as areas of highest intensity densities, based on all impacts, compatibility with existing land uses and available and timely public resources and infrastructure, not a blanket statement that will be added to a 10 or 20 year Capital Improvement Program. There should be project specific timelines of needed infrastructure and services before a project defined to satisfy highest intensity densities is approved. All projects in the Community Regions will have very different and specific needs to offsite infrastructure and a blanket condition of satisfying them by putting them in a 10 or 20 year Capital Improvement Program does not address a quantitative way to evaluate when those improvements are critical and needed. It is my opinion that the Traffic Impact Analysis required for a project are not adequately dealing with this as the ones I have reviewed site the Significant Impact but state it is mitigated by putting it in a 10 year Capital Improvement Program. Some of these traffic improvements must be done at occupancy or public safety would be a significant issue. We request a method of identifying quantitatively the needs of a projects and staging those needs to realistic and appropriate timelines and volume triggers for the area. We request the options of Zones Designations in the Community Regions be expanded for more options ranges of minimum lot sizes for the R1 designation not just two options of "R1" for 6000 sf (approx. 6 lots per acre) and "R20K" 20000sf (approx. 2 lots per acre).

2. 17.12.10 A Official Zones

Recommendation: We want El Dorado Hills to be analyzed for a Community Plan as Meyers is. This could be one of the mechanisms of dealing with inconsistency of the zoning where the General Plan was expanded to broaden the Community Region (High Density designation) back in 2004 and caused the zoning to then be incompatible. Create an El Dorado Hills Community Plan and work with El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory committee, EDAC, Business Alliances and other interested community members to establish zoning compatibility with existing uses and consider cumulative impacts.

3. 17.12.010 B Minimum Lot Size Designation

Only gives two choice for residential
"R1" for 6000 sf (approx. 6 lots per acre)
"R20K" 20000sf (approx. 2 lots per acre)
These should not be the only two option for residential.

Recommendation: We want a broader range such as to allow minimum lot size of 3 per acre and possibly 4 per acre. 6 per acre are rarely compatible or non significantly impacting in the Community Regions of El Dorado County.

4. 17.12.010 D

El Dorado Hills may benefit from designation as Design Review Community (DC).

Recommendation: Analyze El Dorado Hills as a formalized Design Review Community.

Tara Mccann, P.E.