



Julie Saylor &lt;julie.saylor@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: Comments on Housing Element Draft**

1 message

**County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board** <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Thu, Jul 8, 2021 at 7:39 AM

To: Robert Peters <robert.peters@edcgov.us>, Jeanette Salmon <jeanette.salmon@edcgov.us>, Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>, Brendan Ferry <brendan.ferry@edcgov.us>, Breann Moebius <breann.moebius@edcgov.us>, "C.J. Freeland" <cynthia.freeland@edcgov.us>

Fyi

Office of the Clerk of the Board  
El Dorado County  
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667  
530-621-5390

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s), except as otherwise permitted. Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Andy Nevis** <andynevis@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Jul 7, 2021 at 9:03 PM

Subject: Comments on Housing Element Draft

To: C.J. Freeland &lt;cynthia.freeland@edcgov.us&gt;

Cc: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, <bostwo@edcgov.us>, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>, <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Edc Cob <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, <jvegna@edcgov.us>, <cheryl.bly-chester@edcgov.us>, <john.clerici@edcgov.us>, James Williams <james.williams@edcgov.us>, <aross@edcgov.us>, Donald Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>, <tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us>

Good evening,

Please see attached for my comments on the 2021-2029 draft housing element. I appreciate the opportunity.

Sincerely,  
Andy Nevis

---

 **Housing Element Comments.pdf**  
104K

July 7, 2021

Dear Ms. Freeland, Planning Commissioners, and Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft 2021 El Dorado County General Plan Housing Element. I appreciate the staff's hard work putting together the draft, and overall it appears that the element as drafted likely meets the state's regulatory requirements. That said, there are some missed opportunities that I encourage staff, Commissioners, and the Board to consider. These are my personal comments as a resident of El Dorado County who has observed the conflict over housing and are not made on behalf of any organization or other individuals.

**Document Should Discuss the Tension of our Need for More Housing with the Need to Respect the County's Rural Character**

There is little doubt that the Sacramento Region, including El Dorado County, needs more housing especially at the low-to-moderate income levels. At the same time, most residents of El Dorado County have chosen to reside here because of our lower housing densities, reduced traffic, and closer proximity to open space and recreational opportunities compared to urban Sacramento County and the Bay Area. Thus, most new development projects are met with skepticism at best and hostility at worst. Even if a project is ultimately approved, community opposition results in increased costs and delays that make it even harder for units to be affordable.

Successful development of affordable housing in El Dorado County requires an understanding of this dynamic and commitment to work with the community to encourage projects that respect the county's character. Unfortunately, it does not appear that in developing the draft the county consulted with organizations that often express concerns about development project. Pages 4-4 and 4-5 list the organizations staff invited to participate in consultation. None of the organizations listed are community groups that often express concern about development (for instance Save Our County, Shingle Springs Community Alliance, and the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee). These and similar organizations across the county have proven their organizing power over the last several years, thus there cannot be an inclusive discussion about housing and development without their participation.

This omission is apparent throughout the document, as there is minimal discussion of how we can encourage development projects that respect the community's concerns.

**Remove Policy HO 1.5 (Directing high density development to community regions and rural centers)**

Existing Policy HO 1.5, which is proposed to be retained, has resulted in significant confusion over the last decade. Communities have reported that developers have told residents that the county instructed them to build high density development in a particular community region even though the property was not zoned for high density. The confusion from this policy has caused some residents to push for boundary adjustments or the elimination of certain community regions, an act which could have significant unintended consequences.

Policy HO 1.5 is unnecessary. The county has a land use plan which designates where certain types of projects should be built. The county should encourage high density development in areas that are

zoned for high density development, regardless of community boundary or rural center lines. The policy serves only to confuse both developers and the public and should be repealed.

**Emphasize Community Planning/Design Standards**

The most important thing the county can do to facilitate development that is in line with the community's expectations is to sponsor the creation of design standards and other community planning initiatives. When communities have a conversation about the characteristics of future development, it gives developers a clear understanding of the community's expectations before they start their application and can reduce conflict. The county has embarked on such a project for multi-family and commercial design standards for Shingle Springs, Cameron Park, El Dorado Hills, and Diamond Springs/El Dorado, but progress has been slow. I am encouraged by the Board's recent allocation of \$350,000 to support such efforts.

In the context of this housing element, there should be an implementation measure focused on design standards for multi-family housing projects. Design standards are addressed as one bullet in Measure HO-13 but should be their own measure. The county should establish a goal of completing multifamily design standards for all community regions and rural centers by the end of the element's time horizon in 2029, if not sooner.

Thank you for your consideration of these items.

Sincerely,

Andy Nevis  
Shingle Springs resident (District 4)