



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

4 Day Zoning Ordinance Update Workshop Article 2

1 message

Tara McCann <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

Thu, Jul 19, 2012 at 1:22 PM

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>, readyssetgo@pacbell.net, Ron Mikulaco <ron@gotmik.com>

4 Day Zoning Ordinance Workshop July 16 - July 20, 2012

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ARTICLE 2

17.24.010 A. Residential Zones

Residential Zones need to be expanded further than just the two options given here as:

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

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

These are too limiting and force minimum lots size options to be either 6000 sf or 20,000sf.

Recommendation: There should be ranges between 6000 and 20000 and a matrix developed for appropriateness of each range of minimum lot size. Not often is 6000sf an appropriate minimum lot size in the Community Region with existing non compatible adjoining land uses and/ or the impacts associated with this type of density. Residential Zones

17.24.0101 a full analysis matrix evaluating compatibility, infrastructure public services should be included in the EIR of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update and the analysis done in cooperation and with assistance of the local Area Planning Advisory Committee.

17.24.010 A. 3. Changes to Development Standards need to be reviewed by each community Area Planning Committee and be based on sound Engineering analysis. If a design standard is to be removed, reduced or eliminated the author of such design change should state the reasoning and benefit for doing so. Sole cost reduction for a developer should not be a reason for changing a design standard. We want more transparency of Design Standard Changes and Land Development Manual Changes that are ongoing. Changes to Design Standards and

Land Use Development Manual LDM should be reviewed and analyzed concurrently and transparently in the TGPA & ZOU process. There are interrelated design standards and LDM proposals to reduce standards and requirements of developers that would drive policy if these changes were implemented.

Recommendation: All changes to the Design Standards and Land Development Manual, (LDM) must be clear and transparent and done concurrently within the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Update Process. No design standards or LDM changes shall be approved unless evaluated and analyzed in the TGPA & ZOU process.

17.24.010 C. 2. Single unit Residential

Minimum lot size of R1 and R20K are applied to this zone based on surrounding land use compatibility and physical and infrastructural constraints.

Recommendation: Include additional range other than these two options. There should be options for minimum lot size of ranges greater than 6000sf and lower than 20000. Rarely does an area in the Community region support a 6000 sf lot size without compatibility issues or significant impacts to environmental and infrastructure.

17.25.010 A. 6. Identify, protect and regulate scenic view sheds in the Community Regions.

Recommendation: Work with local Area Planning Advisory Committees in quantifying significant view sheds. The County designates scenic corridor or not in a scenic corridor. Analyze a method for quantifying significant view sheds that could be evaluated in the matrix of discretionary projects to determine appropriate densities and project viability.

17. 27.050 F. Establishment of Community Design Review Areas and Standards

Recommendation: Green Valley Design Review Area.

Recommendation: Community Design Guidelines for El Dorado Hills.

17.27.080 Ecological Preserve

A. B. C& D. Ecological Preserve Mitigations should not allow in lieu fees to be paid. It negates the intent of the ecological preservation. Additionally it gives developers a way to go around environmentally protected areas that are for public benefit. We strongly oppose the selling of ecological preservations. This policy does not establish a fair, balanced transparent way to mitigate offsite. What are the guidelines established by the County the Draft Zoning Ordinance Update is refereeing to? This is very subjective and gives too much latitude to the Board of Supervisors of who gets to disturb and remove rare plants and who gets protected. There are not enough specifics and not enough opportunity for public oversight. **Recommendation:** Do not allow off site mitigation without a full EIR analysis and a well thought out program to implement a scientific, balanced and transparent program that would not leave the decision of who gets to mitigate off site rare plants to a few people and allow those developers who can

pay the money to get around ecological preservation. This is unfairly removing ecological protections from the Community Region and should be analyzed from a legal perspective.

We recommend creating a committee made up of public, scientists and County staff. The Committee members shall have no interests in projects or interests determining locations of who gets off site mitigations. The intent of the committee would be to establish and quantify a fair and transparent off site mitigation program if deemed adequate, applicable and fair. One element might be only a certain % of land within a region is eligible for offsite mitigations and the degree of mitigations should be based on quantified scientific ecological analysis. This is a huge topic and should be analyzed thoroughly in the EIR. Do not allow off site mitigation without a full EIR analysis and a well thought out program to implement. This is a significant topic and critical to El Dorado County as El Dorado County has many ecological resources that need to be protected.

17.28.010 A. 3. Planned Development PD Combining Zone –

Clusted intensive land uses magnifies and densifies visual and physical impacts. Many in the community region strongly oppose clustering without a full EIR and analysis of magnified visual and physical impacts. For example one of many considerations is hydraulic runoff is concentrated and drainage design even more of a concern. Traffic patterns are denser, sound and noise becomes more of an issue. Quality of life in denser areas is reduced.

17.28.050 Residential Development Requirements Open Space

B. Recommendation: We absolutely oppose Alternatives to the On Site Open Space Requirement. We absolutely oppose in lieu of fees for open space. This does not benefit the onsite development future residents and it will certainly degrade the area by allowing denser developments without a balance of open space. This will penalize not only onsite development but will degrade the area by unfairly removing open space. This will significantly and irrevocable change the identity of areas that should be allowed the same benefits as every other resident of El Dorado County to maintain the quality of life by providing quality growth and equitable open space preservation. This would be legally challenged in the Community Region.

17.28.050 B. Open Space

Recommendation:

No in lieu fees

No offsite

No offsite Mitigation of Gabbro Soils

17.28.050 C Clustering

Clustering does not minimize impacts. It is a visual impact in that it gives the appearance of a much greater density.

Recommendation: Do not allow clustering of Discretionary projects unless evaluated fully within an EIR.

17.28.050 D Pedestrian Circulation

Recommendation: Pedestrian circulation plans should be required of all projects onsite and offsite as well as a Regional Area specific pedestrian plan done by the County for each area.

17.28.060 A. Residential Density Bonus

Recommendation: States base units for the project shall be based on the amount of gross acres this should not be allowed. It significantly misrepresents the density. For example a project of 6-7 lots per acre could use this to represent the project as 2 – 2.5 lots per acre.

These are only partial comments for Article 2. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors should have ongoing workshops on this Zoning Ordinance Update every 2 months as the Draft is revised and progresses. More Community input should be encouraged through education of the process. Workshops and updates should be held in each of the unincorporated areas of the County as well as online workshops. A virtual Government process should be explored as technology is expanding and the resources are now in place to allow for digital medium interaction. This would be a much more effective process and allow for much more interaction. The County should dedicate IT resources for exploring and analyzing efficient incorporation of technology to allow for the inclusion of more County residents in the planning and decision making process. As a 22 year resident of El Dorado Hills I appreciate all those who serve and call themselves public servants in their work to benefit the entire El Dorado County.

Tara Mccann, P.E.