## **Findings**

## 1.0 CEQA Findings

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Negative Declaration together with the comments received and considered during the public review process. The Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal.
- 1.2 The proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment.
- 1.3 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Department Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA, 95667.

## 2.0 General Plan Findings

- 2.1 The proposed Rezone to Select Agricultural (SA-10) Zone District would be consistent with the Rural Residential (RR) General Plan Land use designation.
- 2.2 In accordance with State law and pursuant to General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3, the County has evaluated the subject rezoning request based on the General Plan's general direction as to minimum parcel size or maximum allowable density and to assess whether changes in conditions are present that would support a higher density or intensity zoning district. The 19 specific criteria found within General Plan Policy 2.2.5.3 have been analyzed with regards to the above-referenced zone change request. Based on this analysis and the conclusions reached in the staff report, the site is found to be suitable to support the proposed use.

## 3.0 Agriculture Setback Exemption Findings

3.1 The following properties would be exempt from the 200-foot agricultural setback:

APN: 060-190-31 APN: 060-170-28 APN: 060-190-42 APN: 060-180-04 APN: 060-190-21 APN: 060-180-11

APN: 060-170-27

The listed properties range in size from 0.5 to 1.8 acres and due to their proximity in relation to the project parcel would be located entirely within the 200-foot setback. This limitation would negatively impact these properties and would require Agricultural Commission review of any future development on these parcels. This would be an unnecessary hardship for these parcels. Due to the potential location of expanded agricultural uses on the project site and the distance from the adjoining properties, there would be a low likelihood that the adjoining properties would negatively affect the agricultural potential of the site.