

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention
ROI 182-2011

Policy	Change Proposed	Notes
LU map	Camino/PP CRL's change to Rural Centers	Overdue, and may happen earlier outside of LUPPU
2.1.1.3 & 2.1.2.5	Comm'l/Mixed Use residential density increase from 10 up to 20units/ac in CR's(2.1.2.5 RC's, up from 4 to 10 res units)	Intended to 'achieve CEQA streamlining benefits', because additional density allows reduced review. 'Reduced review' is not always best for impacted residents
Table 2-1 & 2.2.1.2	Amend table to allow for Commercial (C) and Industrial (I) use in Rural Regions	Table amended in draft TGPA to allow Comm'l in the RR; no longer restricted to CR's/RC's
2.2.1.2	Comm'l/Res. mixed use - allow 'C' component to precede 'R'	Comm'l no longer req'd to be the dominant use & residential can now precede comm'l development on the site(matrix Table 2-1).
2.2.1.2 (I)	Delete restrictions on 'I' to allow expansion into Rural Regions, and eliminate reqm't that those uses be support purposes only	Restrictions on Comm'l in the Rural Regions are removed as well, and incompatible uses are not prohibited, but just ' <i>discouraged</i> '
2.2.1.2 (MFR)	Allow density increase from 24 up to 30 units/acre; amend MFR to allow for 'C' as part of mixed use; amend MFR to allow single family (SF) detached without a PD	1) 30 Units "req'd" for compliance with CGC 65583.2(c)(iv) for MSA or "allowed"? 2) allowing SFR will minimize available apt./condo space. 3) PD's are appropriate for HD developmnt 4) APAC opposes this change
[2.2.5.4]	Delete reqm'n't for PD in HDR with 3 or more units/acre	Policy 2.2.5.4 <i>is deleted entirely</i> , not limited to >3/ac (applications with potential for over 50 parcels currently require a PD with 30% open space)
2.2.1.2 (OS)	Amend open space to make reference to objective 7.6.1	"Objective 7.6.1: Importance of Open Space" reference not added, and policies proposed reflect a lack of importance.
Table 2-2	Amend C/Mixed Use to increase density from 16 up to 20 units/ac; amend MFR from 24 to 30units/acre	More density not needed; Measure Y issues.
2.2.1.5 & Table 2-3	Delete Table 2-3; put regulation of building intensities under the ZO (moved to what section?)	Floor Area Ratio; this could be a huge density increase & bldg height issue in the Bus Park. Where is this in the ZOU?
2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2, 2.2.5.4	Reduce 30% open space reqm'n't in CR's and RC's; allow in-lieu fees. Actual proposal is more than a reduction; see notes.	1) In-lieu fees would effectively eliminate open space in CR/RC-where it is <i>really</i> needed; 2) Reduced to 15% for HDR; 3)Exemptions - no open space req'd - for multi family, mixed use/comm'l, infills, condos; 4) also, per 2.2.4.1 open space is no longer req'd to be of 'public benefit' as currently req'd 5) APAC opposes

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 182-2011

Policy	Change Proposed	Notes
Table 2-4	Amend table to reflect new & deleted zones of updated ZOU	New zones include changing of Recreational to 'High' & 'Low' thruout the county without notifications of changes (ie: Bass Lake 115-400-12)
2.2.4.1	<i>"Consider amending the Density Bonus policy which allows incentive for the creation of open space as part of residential projects, and implement policy specifics through Zoning Ordinance"</i>	1) was the <i>intent</i> to delete open space req'ts, and where is it in the ZOU? Better for residents, or developer give-away? 2) APAC opposes. Amounts to land use change in MDR/LDR ; 3) the open space is no longer req'd to be of public benefit, & can have private access only
2.2.5.4	Delete. [This is the policy requiring a PD application with 30% open space on projects of over 50 units]	1) Effectively eliminates the open space reqm'n't- developers benefit, not residents 2) APAC opposes
2.2.5.8	Existing policy allows for service uses (library, fire station, day care, etc)	Currently written as 'shall be permitted' and not 'required' as indicated under the ROI; Why remove it?
2.2.5.10	Allow Ag support services without SUP; move to ZO	Where is it in the ZOU, and how changed?
2.4.1.3	Amend to recognize El Dorado/DiaSprings historical townsites	
2.9.1.2, 2.9.1.3, 2.9.1.4	Change CR/RC boundary revisions to allow amendment by the Board as needed	Presumption has been that an EIR is needed in order to amend; not so in the future?
New	Identify and set criteria for infill sites & opportunity areas with substantial incentives to encourage development. Set criteria for CEQA 'streamlining' opportunities	1) APAC opposed. Inadequate infrastructure risk that has not been corrected in the proposed verbiage. 2) Frightening proposition.
TC-1a, -1b, Table TC-1	Revise to allow for narrower streets & roads	1) False Claim of support for development of affordable housing. 2) APAC opposes: sacrificing safety for developer costs
Language clean up:		
TC-1m	"...maximize use of federal funds including maintenance of effort requirements:--"	APAC questions the intentions here
TC-1n(B)	"...severity of accidents crashes"	APAC questions the intentions here
TC-1w	"...ensure neighborhood quality to the maximum extent possible..."	APAC questions the intentions here
Table 2C-2	Amend and/or delete table, & amend related policies. Maintain the LOS F road list outside the General Plan	1) This is the table listing roads allowed to operate at LOS F - Red flags - where is it proposed to be located? 2) APAC opposes

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention ROI 182-2011

Policy	Change	Notes
TC-Xb	Amend to match amended Table TC-2	Relates to development not exceeding road capacity
TC-Xd	Amend to match amended Table TC-2	LOS limitations
TC-Xb(C)	Amend to reference TC-1 (road standards)	
TC-Xg	Development is req'd to construct & fund roads	amendment is to add 'design'
TC-Xi	Regional projects become exempt from meeting schedule requirements of the General Plan	intent is to improve coordination, but verbiage requiring compliance w/GenPlan for widening of Hwy 50 is removed
TC-4a, TC-4d, TC-4f	Non-specific 'language cleanup' related to bikeways	
TC-4i, TC-5a,b,c	Non-specific amendments for flexibility regarding sidewalks & when they are required	
New goal	Non-specific 'streamlining' of CEQA, per CGC 65080(b)(2I)	1) 'streamlining' usually means 'skip it'. Worrisome.
New policy	Non-specific policies regarding multi-modal roads	
Table 5-1 5.1.2.2	Amend to increase flexibility; currently requires new development to have no impact on service/utilities of existing residents	Would an amendment leave existing residents to bear the impact of new development? Left open ended with "may need to be revised.."
5.2.1.3/ 5.3.1.1	Amends current requirement for public sewer/water in CR's; verbiage changed from 'shall' to 'may'	1) APAC opposes 2) High density to be permitted on septic with wells in CR
6.4.1.4, -.5	Amend to allow new parcels in dam inundation zones	Unclear why we would allow this.
6.5.1.11/ Tables 6-1 thru 6-5	Revise noise standards for night construction & other	The noise standards appear to be being entirely removed; it doesn't sound like that was the goal. See ZOU, chapter 17.37, for standards retained.
6.7.1/ 6.7.5	Amend to allow adoption of a separate air quality plan, not dependent on the CA Air Resources Board (unclear?)	cannot amend if there is no other policy in place, as they did with oak trees (see ZOU 17.38); where is the new air quality plan?
7.1.2.1	Amend to allow grading/development on slopes over 30%; move to Zoning Ord.	1) open space calc based on this, effectively reduces open space 2) APAC opposes; keeping in GP allows CEQA review too
7.6.1.3B	Specific references to be deleted refer to open space requirements relative to Ag lands, that are being proposed for change in the ZOU	It's not clear what the ZOU change is that would require deleting from this section
8.1.3.2	Reduce Ag setbacks within Comm Regions (sim to 8.4.1.2)	Instead, 1) revise CR's to exclude Ag parcels; 2) maintain zones for buffer/transition

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention ROI 182-2011

Policy	Change	Notes
8.2.4.2	Eliminate Special Use Permit reqmnt for camping, stables, lodging facilities, campgrounds, recreational fishing	Special Use Permit's are protections for neighboring properties. Lodging facilities, etc, SHOULD be required to obtain one.
8.2.4.4	Eliminates 'compatability review' for wineries and visitor-serving uses on ag parcels	No SUP and no compatability review leaves neighboring parcels with no protection and few options.
2.2.1.2	increase HDR from 5 units/ac to 8/acre	1) Infrastructure issues; 2) APAC opposes; density bonus give-away
2.1.1.1/ 2.1.2.1	Analyze adding, amending, or deleting the existing CRL's	1)APAC issues include EIR necessity, and community review; 2) Should be in the draft EIR (confirmed in staff memo 9/30/13), but staff is resisting follow thru.
TC-1y	Delete EDH Bus Park employment cap limits, including TC-1v	The -1y cap was set in order to maintain road capacity standards, also -1v is for transit service -delete?
TC-Xd, TC-Xe, TC-Xf	Revise for redefinition of 'Worsen'	Red flag warning to the Measure Y committee
7.2.1.2 (map change)	Mineral Resource mapping	changing potentially compatible zones? Changing the overlay?

Note: Where the comment "APAC opposes" is noted, see separate document for additional APAC notes

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 183-2011

Policy	Change	Notes
map	Conform the zoning map to GP land use designations	Includes blanket RE20 changes to RE5/10, and AE to RE (countywide densification of rural/transition areas)
general	Eliminate conflicting provisions (consistency effort; Table 2-4)	Table vs. Text changes: 1) R1A added to MDR in the matrix; 2) 20-60 acre residential was eliminated from LDR in the matrix, rather than revising text. Result is to 'densify' many parcels throughout the county with automatic rezone via LUPPU; 3) Transition areas are a current problem that have not been addressed: LDR in the Community Region as a 'holding zone' leaves neighbors <i>and</i> developers in limbo of uncertainty, and NOT in keeping with 2.1.1.2
Add zoning to implement General Plan implementation measures:		
LU-A		
HO-6		
HO-16		
HS-K		pg276 of current General Plan
CO-A		
AF-A		
ED-N		
ED-P		
ED-II		
ED-JJ		
ED-KK		
ED-QQ		
general	Consistency with state & federal laws	
general	Reorganize for ease of use; utilize more tables, provide glossary & rules for interpretations	
general	Create new zones for RL, FR, Ag Grazing, Neighborhood Service, Limited Ag	Recreational is being changed to either 'high' or 'low' Recreational, without noticing to neighborhoods impacted. <i>Example: Bass Lake, 115-400-12, natural open space upped to high intensity</i>
general	Delete obsolete zones: Unclassified, Agriculture, Residential-Ag, PlannedCommercial	
general	Create overlay zones to more effectively implement GP policies	

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 183-2011

Policy	Change	Notes
general	Expand uses in Ag and rural zones for ag support, recreation, rural commerce & ranch marketing	
general	Provide range of intensities for home occupations, based on size and zoning of parcels, addressing use of accessory structures, customers, & employees	17.14.160 Home Occupation proposal is blurring the lines between residential and commercial uses. This is NOT how it is done in other jurisdictions, and in fact our ordinance was previously more in keeping. Residential neighborhoods lose character protection completely with this re-write, and road issues (capacity/parking) have been overlooked.
general	Modify WillmsnAct zoning to reflect GP designations	opposite done? AE eliminated
general	"Revise the zoning map to conform to standardized rule sets for zoning modifications based on GP land use designations"?	Auto-change of all RE20's to RE10/RE5 if they are in LDR designation, etc, whereas a revision to the LDR description is more appropriate
general	New commercial zones to specify/direct the type design & location of C uses	reasonable intent, questionable execution; examine uses in rural regions and transition zones.
general	Create Rural Commercial zone for Rural Regions	transition zones not protected (2.1.1.2); revise LDR def.
general	Expand uses in Rural Regions for Ag support, recreation, home occupation, tourism, commercial uses	Home Occupation a mess for transition zones and higher density CR's; protection for parcels adjacent to Ag problematic
general	Create mixed-use master plans for streamlining approval process to protect Commercial viability of a site	Streamlining/Comm'l protections could be a problem for neighboring residential parcels.
MFR	Add SF detached residential and 15% commercial use for mixed use in MFR	Comm'l in RM (Multi Res) is ministerial under matrix 17.24.020; also allows Mixed Use under 17.40.180A. Have not found 15% limitation yet.
I	Break Industrial into multiple zones for different 'I' uses	Industrial being allowed to expand into RR's; problematic on smaller parcels
open space	Provide alternative to open space requirements in PD's for flexibility and incentives on infill development. Focus on recreation in CRs and RCs	Draft 17.28.050(B)2b allows counting private backyards toward open space requirement as an 'alternative'.
H-overlay	Amend zoning maps to add historical overlay to El Dorado and Diamond Springs, relative to historical townsites	
Wetlands	Codify standards for wetland/riparian setbacks	check draft for this; not yet done. Must be complete before TGPA adoption and not left behind AGAIN

Note: Where comment "[APAC opposes](#)" appears, see separate APAC document for notes

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 184-2011, Plus..

Policy	Changes	Notes
general	Authorization to include provisions for residential and recreational uses on Timber Production Zone land compatible with timber management and harvesting	
Other Changes in ZOU/TGPA (not specifically listed in the adopted ROI's):		
2.1.2.5	Mixed use encouraged in CR's (C/Res)	1) Residential units should not be exempt from MeasureY req'ts in mixed use developmnt; 2) APAC questions infrastructure & areas to be ID'd in the zoning ord.
17.22.010C6	(CG)Commercial, General, definition; includes auto repair and acknowledges residential uses would generally conflict	Home Occupation chapter includes allowances for auto repair within residential zones.
17.40.380B2	"The maintenance, repair, & storage of motor vehicles on lots allowing residential uses by right shall be prohibited UNLESS: ...2) Retail sale or storage of vehicle parts are in compliance w/ Section 17.40.60 (Home Occupations) "	Auto repair business would be allowed in residential zones on lots greater than 1-acre with a 'use' permit. (Think 'Kneisels' in Shingle Springs)
17.52.020B.1&2	Reviewing Authority for 'use' permits	1) says the authority is the Zoning Administrator OR the Planning Commission; 2) says the Zoning Administrator and calls it ministerial, but public notice is req'd. How does that work? Section is totally not clear on when a Planning Commission review is necessary - likely that is intentional for 'flexibility', which is problematic.
Table 17.24.020	matrix showing uses allowed in Res. Zones is inaccurate, and misleading	inconsistent with text: 1) daycare is allowed in all R zones per 17.40.110; 2) Home occupation section 17.40.160 allows many commercial uses (<i>with</i> employees) ie: auto repair, RV storage, welding & machining, commercial kennels, more 3)Kennels in all R zones with correct permit, per 17.40.080 4) Comm'l allowed in res. per 17.40.180A (RM zone only?)
17.22.010C1	CPO-Commercial, Professional Office	
17.40.160C 1,2,8abc	Home occupation- vehicles/services within view	1)"no display of goods visible" is removed, and commercial vehicle parking is not req'd to be screened from neighbors-only from ROW; 2)Street & driveway can be used for com'l parking
17.40.160A	Removes reqm't that occupation is "incidental"	policy disregards "maintain the residential character"

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 184-2011, Plus..

Continued - other Changes proposed in ZOU/TGPA, not specifically listed in the adopted ROI's:		
Policy	Changes	Notes
17.40.160.2	Home occupation- Employee 'limits' matrix	Other jurisdictions do not allow employees in residential zones for home occupations (San Bernadino); mixing comm'l into existing residential is problematic for road capacity, parking, & neighborhood character (change to TDM input needed as part of draft review)
17.40.180	Mixed Use	This section points to table 17.22.020 for which Comml zones may have residential included for mixed use; the table points back to this section (17.40.180) - ie: it is not actually spelled out anywhere
17.27.040 A-C	Dam inundation zones (for Flood provisions in existing ordinance see 17.25.030B)	1)Under B, they are now to be designated by the Board 2) public expenditures protections are removed under A; 3)disclosure requirements eliminated under C
17.25.040 & .050	Flood plains	where did this section go? Deleted? And why?
6.4.1.4	Dam inundation zones eliminated from the 'prohibited areas' list for new parcels	This is contrary to FEMA guidelines. Legal? Per Shawna, it's a Homeland Security issue, which makes no sense & we couldn't find.
17.30.010	Reference made to LDM (Land Development Manual): " <i>Standards pertaining to the creation of new lots, new projects or the modification of existing lots are found in the LDM or DM as applicable.</i> "	The LDM not available for review when last requested; essential the update is not completed without the LDM being completed as well [update: draft LDM now posted]
17.37.020	Noise standards exemptions- categorical exemptions for Agriculture, bells & chimes for religious purposes, park/school activities	San Bernadino was presumably a guideline for us, and they do not have any such categorical exemptions.
17.37.070 B	This policy allows self-monitoring for concerts utilizing amplified sound.	self-monitoring should not be counted on for anything that we actually want enforced.
17.37.070 A	Existing GP policies 6.5.1.3 & 6.5.1.5 have been modified to allow use of soundwalls along high volume roadways.	Previous language: " <i>The use of noise barriers shall be considered...only after all other measures have been integrated into the project and the noise barriers are not incompatible with the surroundings.</i> " and " <i>Noise walls...shall be discouraged in favor of less intrusive noise mitigation along other high volume roadways.</i> "

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 184-2011, Plus..

Continued - other Changes proposed in ZOU/TGPA, not specifically listed in the adopted ROI's:		
Policy	Changes	Notes
Chapter 17.37	GP noise standards moved here, but it does not incorporate a number of existing GP noise element policies, including policy GP 6.5.1.9. Many protections are struck out.	existing GP 6.5.1.9 language: " <i>Noise created by new transportation noise sources... shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified in Table 6-1 at existing noise sensitive land uses.</i> "
Table 17.37.060.2	Table gives 60dB limit; text below under 17.37.060.2B(c) gives a 5 dB bump	65 dB should be in the table if that is the intention, or better yet, revise to retain the 60dB limits.
Table 6-3, 6-4, 6-5	Tables for allowable levels and hours for construction noise have been deleted	Construction should be held accountable for noise levels; this section should not be deleted.
17.30.030G3d	Reduces the current wetland/stream setback requirement from 50'/100' down to 25'/50'. Allowances written in for zero setback (see 3a)	Currently a biological report by scientific experts are required for reductions, and further reduced setback are often allowed. ZOU Revisions are gutting what little is left of this reqmnt. <i>Example: ARCO setback in EDH allowed at 10' could become the norm.</i>
17.30.030G3a	Allowances are written in to avoid any setback to wetlands: " <i>Where avoidance and minimization are not feasible, the county shall make findings based on documentation provided by the project proponent, that avoidance and minimization are infeasible.</i> "	If setbacks are not feasible, " No " should be the response. Original verbiage in 7.3.3.4 referred to the buffer areas, rather than an apparent free-for-all for development within the setback
17.30.030G1	References made here to GP policies 7.3.3.4 & 7.4.2.5	These do not exist in the TGPA; as they exist in the current GP they are inconsistent with the ZOU. These policies must be updated, NOT deleted.
17.30.030G4	Exceptions (uses allowed) within the riparian setback include: Fencing, roads/driveways, landscaping, utilities, boat ramps & docks, <i>agriculture(!?pesticides?)</i> , and more.	This needs to be changed as it does not currently preclude development within a setback.
17.30.030G5a	A Minor Use permit (that's zoning administrator authority) can approve any use permitted in the applicable zone within the required setback	Over-the-counter-approval of development within a setback should not be given to any individual.
2.2.4.1	Density bonus requirement that open space be for "public benefit" is being removed.	Open space benefit may be private; no public access req'd. Proposed 2.2.3.1 allows private backyards to be counted toward open space
6.7.1	Delete reqm't for an EDC Clean Air Act plan	That can't be for county resident benefit.

Changes proposed under Adopted Resolution of Intention

ROI 184-2011, Plus..

Continued - other Changes proposed in ZOU/TGPA, not specifically listed in the adopted ROI's:		
Policy	Changes	Notes
7.1.2.1	Change proposed to allow building on 30% slopes.	Alters the density bonus calculation to allow add'l units without having to actually build on 30% slopes. Higher density for free
10.2.1.5	Verbiage changed for PFFP (public facilities financing plan) req't; no longer assures no net cost burden on existing residents	verbiage change from "shall" to "may be" req'd.
2.2.5.10	Finding of " <i>no adverse affect</i> " no longer required for establishment of agricultural support services.	parcels adjacent to ag may have conflicts
2.9.1.4	Allows the Board to revise the CR boundaries.	
Table 17.24.020 & 17.40.120C1	Change to allow Ag housing for up to 6 in R1 and R20K (all residential zones)	That's essentially multi-family housing; inappropriate in those zones
17.40.150B2	Guest housing defers to 'Article 8'	Article 8 is not defined anywhere.
17.38	Oak Woodland Conservation section removed	<i>we cannot</i> move forward without this completed.
p29, LU Forecast	includes "constraints of wetlands, endangered species..will be overcome by engineering..."	"overcome"?
17.21.030	Reduction of Ag set backs	
LDM 4.2.2F	LandDesignManual-Grading Policies -Agriculture is categorically exempt	This manual is to replace the DISM, which does NOT exempt Ag from grading/erosion control
17.40.390.2	Wind turbines	extreme example: parcels as small as 1 acre could have an 80' tall egg-beater style turbine. Think Malcolm-Dixon type neighborhood (R1A)
17.30.010 & .020	Standards regarding creation of new parcels (Chapter 17.30 is new & does not correlate to the existing code; 17.30 was previously Res. Agriculture)	Three different locations must be searched to retrieve complete requirements: .010 sends you to the LDM; section .020 gives add'l basics; individual zone sections provide specifics. Open to inconsistencies, and difficult to nail down req'mnts.
LDM	Land Development Manual is "intended to replace the DISM". Draft was not available as late as June '13. It's posted now (Nov); not sure when it arrived-not much public review time.	1) Draft LDM has multiple references to the DISM it is intended to replace, but once replaced, those standards will not exist any longer. 2) the DISM was not a planning doc, but the LDM is multi-discipline(including Planning); covered in draft EIR?