Notes from Planning Commission Hearing on TGPA-ZOU

Meeting Dates August 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 2014

Working DRAFT (Revised 8/22/14 to address PC's comments from 8/14/14; See Item No. 7, yellow highlights; Revised 9/4/14 to address PC's comments from 8/27/14; see changes in red font)

## Planning Commissioner's Flagged Items for Further Discussion:

## 1. Revised project checklist:

- Items recommended for removal from the project
  - Dam Failure Inundation (DFI): Recommend removal of the General Plan amendment proposing to remove language referencing DFI areas and associated maps (Policies 6.4.1.4 and 6.4.1.5); DFI areas should remain publicly disclosed based on State law.
  - Multi-Family Residential (MFR): Recommend removal of the proposed General Plan amendment to increase maximum densities to 24-30 units/acre; the adopted Housing Element meets State requirements without a density increase.
  - High Density Residential (HDR): Recommend removing consideration of up to 8 dwelling units per acre; this was not reviewed as part of the Project EIR.
  - Traffic and infrastructure-related components recommended for removal from the Project - Review has been deferred for future incorporation into either the proposed (Roadway) Standard Plans or the major 5-year update of the CIP and TIM Fee Programs:
    - Reduce roadway widths, with the primary goal of conformance to the Housing Element of the General Plan as described in the Project ROI
    - Remove Table TC-1 (General Roadway Standards for New Development by Functional Class) and move it to another document (i.e., Standard Plans or LDM)
    - Paths and sidewalks: Amending Policies TC 4i, TC-5a, TC-5b, and TC-5c to provide more flexibility as to when sidewalks are required.

Notes from Planning Commission Hearing on TGPA-ZOU Meeting Dates August 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 2014

Working DRAFT (Revised 8/22/14 to address PC's comments from 8/14/14; See Item No. 7, yellow highlights; Revised 9/4/14 to address PC's comments from 8/27/14; see changes in red font)

- El Dorado Hills Business Park employment cap analysis: the El Dorado Hills Business Park employment cap would be analyzed and either amended or deleted, as appropriate.
- Clarify the definition of "worsen", under Policy TC-Xe, which impacts Policies TC-Xd and TC-Xf

#### 2. TPZ

- Size limits for recreational uses, including health resorts and retreat centers, on TPZ-zoned lands
  - AG-1a: Places size limits on Health Resort & Retreat Centers, similar to Bed & Breakfast Inns, for this use located on TPZ zone (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Limit size but do not align with B&B (e.g. floor area of structure(s) limited to percent of parcel or align with campground standards)
- o Industrial uses on TPZ-zoned lands:
  - Mining compatibility with TPZ zones
- o Compatible uses on TPZ
  - AG-4: Amend use matrix in ZOU to remove General Industrial uses, off-highway or off-road vehicle recreation areas and ski areas from the TPZ zone (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation to approve project without mitigation
  - LU-4b: Requires compatibility review by Ag Commissioner for Ranch Marketing activities adjacent to TPZ zone (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Clarify intent and that mitigation is to retain proposed language already included in the draft ZOU
- o Public Utility Service Facilities (TPZ and FR Zones)
  - AG-4: Amend the ZOU to remove Public Utility Service Facilities, Intensive from the TPZ zone
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Revise AG-4 to remove recommendation for Health Resort & Retreat Centers, General Industrial uses and off highway or offroad vehicle recreation.

Notes from Planning Commission Hearing on TGPA-ZOU Meeting Dates August 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 2014

Working DRAFT (Revised 8/22/14 to address PC's comments from 8/14/14; See Item No. 7, yellow highlights; Revised 9/4/14 to address PC's comments from 8/27/14; see changes in red font)

# 3. Agriculture/Rural Lands and Ag Commission comments from 8-13-14 not included in item 2 above (TPZ):

- o Recommend to strike certain MMs, retain or amend other MM's
  - AES-4: Revise outdoor lighting standards to include Ranch Marketing & Ag and Timber Resource Lodging (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation to approve project without mitigation
  - BIO-1c: Would restrict certain Ranch Marketing events to areas without special-status species habitat (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation to approve project without mitigation
  - BIO-2: Requires special event sites to be returned to "preevent conditions" after each use (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Clarify "pre-event conditions"
  - LU-4b: Requires compatibility review by Ag Commissioner for Ranch Marketing activities within Agricultural Districts or adjacent to PA, LA, AG, FR or TPZ zones (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Clarify intent and that mitigation is to retain proposed language already included in the draft ZOU
  - AG-1a: Places size limits on Health Resort & Retreat Centers, similar to Bed & Breakfast Inns, for this use located on PA, AG, RL, and FR zones (LTS)
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Limit size but do not align with B&B (e.g. floor area of structure(s) limited to percent of parcel or align with campground standards)
    - Consider amending Section 17.40.170 .E of the ZOU (Health Resort and Retreat Center): RE-10 <u>not</u> to be considered a residential use for purpose of health/retreat centers.
  - AG-1b: Amend the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to minor facilities in the PA, AG, and RL zones
    - Ag Commission Recommendation Adopt project with mitigation measure

Notes from Planning Commission Hearing on TGPA-ZOU Meeting Dates August 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 2014

Working DRAFT (Revised 8/22/14 to address PC's comments from 8/14/14; See Item No. 7, yellow highlights; Revised 9/4/14 to address PC's comments from 8/27/14; see changes in red font)

#### 4. Noise

- Nonconforming Off Road Vehicle uses:
  - Consider setback tracks from property lines
  - Consider options for addressing existing problems Sunset date and relate to Title 9
  - Consider requirement for grading permit?
- Nonconforming Animal Raising and Keeping (e.g. chickens/poultry)
  - Consider options for addressing existing problems Sunset date
- Clarification of the difference between proposed Noise Ordinance and related TGPA proposed amendment with other County policies related Noise and Nuisance.
- Noise related to outdoor concerts/events with amplified sound, not associated with Ranch Marketing or Winery uses:
  - Consider options to allow temporary events (e.g. Temporary Use Permit, administrative permit, exceptions for temporary uses, etc.)

## 5. Protection of Wetlands and Sensitive Riparian Habitat

Minor edits in the ZOU to clarify allowed uses and structures within defined riparian areas (17.30.030.G.5a): Staff recommends revising draft ZOU language to clarify "The uses, structures and activities allowed in the applicable zone are allowed within riparian areas with an approved Minor Use Permit" to: "The uses, and structures and activities allowed in the applicable zones are allowed within riparian areas with an approved Minor Use Permit"

## 6. Infill program/Opportunity Areas

- o General Plan Policies 2.1.4.1 through 2.1.4.4
- o DEIR Impact related to 5 acre size
- How the Zoning Ordinance should implement these Policies

Notes from Planning Commission Hearing on TGPA-ZOU Meeting Dates August 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 2014

Working DRAFT (Revised 8/22/14 to address PC's comments from 8/14/14; See Item No. 7, yellow highlights; Revised 9/4/14 to address PC's comments from 8/27/14; see changes in red font)

## 7. Planned Development (PD)/ Open Space requirements

- Make 2.2.3.1 and related ZO language consistent
- Clarify 15% public/15% private language bring back options for modifying, as needed
- Clarify density bonus does 30%+ slope count as open space/is it considered "developable"
- Flexibility on PD open space and/or hillside development standards:
  - Balancing PD open space with affordable housing needs
- Concern of no requirement for 30% open space if no PD

## 8. New Rural Commercial (CRU) Zone

- Discuss options for implementing commercial uses in the Rural Region, including:
  - Consider adding new language to the CRU Zone definition: "as well as surrounding residential uses". An example of how this language could be incorporated is shown below:

**Commercial, Rural (CRU)**. The CRU, Commercial Rural Zone is utilized to provide limited commercial uses to support agricultural, tourism, recreational and resource based industry, <u>as well as surrounding residential uses</u> in the Rural Regions.

## 9. Mixed Use Development Design Manual

Clarify the intent of the MUD manual in the Introduction section. The Introduction uses "manual" and "guidebook" interchangeably at times, and makes statements that the "guidelines are not binding" (pg. 3) and "compliance with the guidelines is strictly voluntary" (pg. 4). Page 16 and again on page 45 standards referenced in Chapter 2 are then cross-reference back to the draft Zoning Ordinance which states the standards are mandatory when used as part of a Mixed Use project. Otherwise the guidelines in Chapter 2 appear to be voluntary.

Notes from Planning Commission Hearing on TGPA-ZOU Meeting Dates August 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 20, 2014 Working DRAFT (Revised 8/22/14 to address PC's comments from 8/14/14; See Item No. 7, yellow highlights; Revised 9/4/14 to address PC's comments from 8/27/14; see changes in red font)

## 10. Standards within the Design Improvement and Standards Manual (DSIM)/Land Development Manual (LDM) or successor document

- o Revise draft ZOU for consistency, specifically when referencing the Proposed DISM/LDM or successor document for the following:
  - Landscaping requirements
  - Mobile/Manufactured Home Parks
  - Parking and Loading
  - Outdoor Lighting
  - Research and Development
- Clarify that DISM/LDM or successor document is not a part of TGPA-ZOU
  - The proposed LDM (or successor document) is not a part of the TGPA-ZOU. However, the ZOU references the creation of a comprehensive design and development manual (either a modification of the existing DISM or the creation of a new document proposed to contain countywide project-specific design and development standards).