

**SECTION 5.1 GENERAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS  
NO PROJECT AND 1996 GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVES**

Page 3, delete the following footnote after the fifth paragraph:

~~Footnote: Additional information about the custom, culture, and economic stability of El Dorado County can be found in Volume II of the County's General Plan.~~

Page 8, the paragraph under **USING THE PLAN** is revised as shown:

In implementing the General Plan, it must be applied comprehensively. No single component (map, goal, objective, policy, or map) can stand alone in the review and evaluation of a development project. Conversely, the absence of a specific policy enabling a particular aspect of a project (exclusive of basic density consistency) is not to be grounds for a finding of General Plan inconsistency. Projects inherently raise policy issues. It is the task of the decision makers, consistent with State law, to weigh project benefits and consequences up against the General Plan as a whole. The merits of a project should ultimately be determined by its consistency with goals, objectives, and policies of all the elements and the land use map. Development standards as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and other County policies must be consistent with the standards in this Plan. The Plan standards represent a careful balancing of competing economic, social, and environmental interests. Background information concerning the planning issues addressed in the Plan is contained in the Environmental Impact Report certified by the Board of Supervisors in connection with adopting the Plan. Exclusive of specific plans, community plans, and planned developments, these policies shall not be implemented in a manner that will effectively shift the balance further in the direction of any one set of interests, except where the applicant for a land use approval advocates more environmental protection than required by the General Plan policies.

Page 9, the second paragraph under **INTRODUCTION** is revised as follows:

The General Plan land use ~~map~~ diagram is also a part of this element. The General Plan land use ~~map~~ diagram graphically represents the County's goals, objectives, and policies. All references in this General Plan to the land use map are references to the land use diagram.

Page 12, Policy 2.1.1.4 is revised as follows:

Policy 2.1.1.4 Community Region boundaries shall generally be ~~contiguous~~ coterminous with the Sphere of Influence boundaries of incorporated cities. Community Region...

Pages 14 through 18, delete Objective 2.1.4, Planned Communities, and all policies under that objective.

Page 21, the third and fifth sentences under Natural Resource (NR) are revised as follows:

Land under both public and private ownership that contain these resources, including wilderness areas and other lands managed for resource values and multiple use, are included in this category. This designation shall be applied to those lands which are 40 acres or larger in size and contain one or more important natural resource. Compatible uses on private land include agriculture...

Page 25, the footnote that appears in Table 2-3 is revised as follows:

\* Ratio of allowable floor area (square footage) to site area (square footage). An increased FAR is allowed as part of a Planned Development where a site-specific traffic impact study demonstrates that measures can be imposed to keep traffic at levels associated with the applicable FAR threshold. The FAR can be calculated over an entire integrated development rather than on a project-by-project basis, so long as the aggregate average FAR within applicable land use designations does not exceed the allowed maximum.

Page 31, Policy 2.2.2.6 is deleted.

Page 35, the subscript in the third line of the table titled **Land Characteristic Summary** is deleted as shown:

Slope<sup>3</sup>

Page 41, Policy 2.2.6.3 is revised as follows:

Any rezone of the property identified as Assessor's Parcel No. ~~112-100-44 411-110-44~~ (number valid as of ~~November 2002~~ September 1997) shall include the Planned Development (-PD) Combining Zone District.

Page 52, Policy 3.2.1.5 is revised as follows:

Before giving approval of any kind to a residential development project of five or more units or parcels of land, the County shall make a finding that the project complies with ~~the policies 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.5, 3.5.1.6.1, and 3.5.1.6.2 added by this~~

~~initiative~~. If this finding cannot be made, then the County shall not approve the project, or give final approval to a tentative subdivision map, until all these policy findings can be made, in order to protect the public's health and safety as provided by state law to assure that safe and adequate roads are in place as such development occurs.

Page 69, the first line of the title is revised as shown:

REVISED DRAFT

Page 73, the following text is added after the **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** section:

### **CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN**

The Housing Element is one of seven mandatory elements of the El Dorado County General Plan. The purpose of the Housing Element is to support and increase the supply of housing affordable to lower income households by providing guidance in the development of future plans, procedures, and programs and by removing governmental constraints to housing. To this end, the Housing Element has detailed goals, policies, and specific measures. However, under state law, the entire general plan is required to be "internally consistent" meaning that all elements of the plan have equal legal status and no policy within the General Plan can directly conflict with another. Without consistency, the General Plan cannot effectively serve as a guide to future development. The policies of this Housing Element have been reviewed for consistency with the remaining element of this General Plan. None of the policies in this element are inconsistent with any other policy. Where General Plan policies seek to achieve seemingly competing objectives, the policies have been designed to allow a balanced approach towards those objectives. For example, while some General Plan policies promote preservation of open space, others set land use designations that allow development of housing on some undeveloped land while leaving other land with a lower intensity of development.

Page 80, the following sentence is added at the end of the first paragraph under **SPECIAL NEEDS GROUP**:

To build support for housing solutions, local participation needs to be at the very core of the process. The County attends regular monthly meetings held by several organizations (One Stop/Job One Partners, Golden Sierra Job Training Agency Youth Council, and MAAT (Multi Area Agency Team) to discuss all factors of special needs groups, including housing, employment as it relates to housing issues, and homelessness.

Page 82, the first paragraph under **Seniors** is revised as shown:

According to Census 2000 (2002c), the unincorporated portion of the county's population of persons 65 and older increased from 11,762 to 15,749 (33.9 percent) from 1990 to 2000. On a state level, the over 65 population increased 14.9 percent in the same ten-year period. In El Dorado County, a large number of senior households own their home. There were 8,951 senior owner households and 1,138 senior renter households in 2000. Additionally, 7.3 percent of the total households in El Dorado County are made up of seniors who live alone (U.S. Census Bureau 2002c).

Page 83, the second paragraph under **Farmworkers** is revised as shown:

Although the enumeration profiles study indicates that the population of seasonal farmworkers is relatively small, there is still a demand for farmworker housing in the county. The 2001 *Annual Crop Report* shows the biggest agricultural industries as timber (\$23,692,400) and fruit and nut crops (\$11,636,700). Fruit and nut production requires some farmworker labor. The County has limited channels to address the need for farmworker housing. These include Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funding and HCD grants (e.g., Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program). Other organizations with local representation, such as the Rural Community Assistance Corporation, also offer farmworker assistance. *[End paragraph here]*

Farmworker housing is allowed with a special use permit in the Agricultural (A), Exclusive Agricultural (AE), Planned Agricultural (PA), and Select Agricultural (SA) zoning districts. There are approximately 3,800 parcels (558,361 acres) zoned A, AE, PA, or SA countywide. Because most of the land zoned A is federally owned (U.S. Forest Service land), it is assumed that those lands zoned AE, PA, or SA could best accommodate farmworker housing. These lands total 1,446 parcels (80,142 acres). Of these, 1,042 parcels are greater than or equal to 10 acres; a minimum of 10 acres must be in agricultural production for farmworker housing to be built (El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance Sections 17.36.080, 17.36.140, and 17.36.240). This number of potentially available parcels is adequate to meet the housing needs for farmworkers in El Dorado County. In addition, Efforts efforts to provide affordable housing generally and rental housing specifically will help address the housing needs of this group (see also Measure HO-S).

Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 states that "no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves 12 or fewer employees and is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone." The County has proposed Measure HO-NN to ensure that farmworker housing permitting procedures are in compliance with Health and Safety Code 17021.6 and that the procedures encourage and facilitate farmworker housing development.

Page 85, the **Homeless** heading is revised as shown:

**Homeless and Other Groups in Need of Temporary and Transitional Affordable Housing**

Page 86, the following text is inserted as new paragraph before the **Large Families and Households** section:

Many other groups are also in need of temporary and transitional affordable housing. The El Dorado County Community Action Committee believes that victims of domestic violence and at-risk or runaway youth should be priority populations in efforts to provide adequate affordable housing opportunities. The El Dorado County Community Action Committee has pointed out that the lack of affordable and/or subsidized housing prevents victims of domestic violence and their children from leaving violent situations. Lack of housing options and fear of escalating violence are recognized as the two primary reasons that victims of domestic abuse do not leave. Providing housing opportunities for these groups will reduce homelessness while ensuring that families move from crisis to safety within the community. These groups have been addressed in Policies HO-4d, HO-4e, and HO-4f.

Residential shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing can be permitted as Community Care Facilities pursuant to the County Zoning Ordinance. Community Care Facilities are defined as “Any facility, place or building which houses more than six people and is maintained and operated to provide nonmedical residential care, day care or homefinding agency services for children, adults, or children and adults, including, but not limited to, the developmentally disabled, physically handicapped, mentally disordered, or incompetent persons.” Currently, Community Care Facilities are allowed by right in the following districts, subject to the development standards of each:

- Commercial (C)
- Professional Office Commercial (CPO)
- Planned Commercial (CP)

Community Care Facilities are allowed subject to a special use permit in the following districts:

- Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)
- Multifamily Residential (RM)
- One-family Residential (R1)
- One-half Acre Residential (R-20,000)
- One-acre Residential (R1A)

- Single-family Two-acre Residential (R2A)
- Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A)
- Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)
- Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10)
- Tourist Residential (RT)

Special use permits are discretionary, so environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approval by the appropriate body (i.e., Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission) are necessary. Conditions of approval vary based on the specific nature of the proposal.

Community Care Facilities may be established on currently developed as well as undeveloped parcels. Table HO-9 summarizes the number of parcels, by zone district, assigned a designation that would allow a Community Care Facility either by right or subject to a Special Use Permit. The table is not intended to summarize where Community Care Facilities will be developed but rather how many parcels are currently zoned in a manner that could facilitate establishment of such facilities.

<b>TABLE HO-9 Parcels Upon Which a Community Care Facility Could be Established, by Zone District</b>	
<b>Zone District</b>	<b>Number of Parcels</b>
Commercial (C)	958
Professional Office Commercial (CPO)	72
Planned Commercial (CP)	506
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	1,843
Multifamily Residential (RM)	103
One-family Residential (R1)	35,477
One-half Acre Residential (R-20,000)	1,469
One-acre Residential (R1A)	4,808
Single-family Two-acre Residential (R2A)	4,337
Single-family Three-acre Residential (R3A)	1,326
Estate Residential Five-acre (RE-5)	11,374
Estate Residential Ten-acre (RE-10)	8,048
Tourist Residential (RT)	167

<b>TABLE HO-9</b> <b>Parcels Upon Which a Community Care Facility Could be Established, by</b> <b>Zone District</b>	
<b>Zone District</b>	<b>Number of Parcels</b>
<b>Note:</b> Includes both currently developed and vacant parcels.	
<b>Source:</b> El Dorado County (2003).	

Implementation Measure HO-GG of this Housing Element includes direction to the County to review and revise its Zoning Ordinance to clarify the placement of shelters and transitional housing.

Page 86, the first paragraph under **Large Families and Households** is revised as follows:

The State Department of Housing and Community Development defines large families and households as those having five or more members (2002c). The 1990 Census data indicate that the distribution of family size in El Dorado County did not change significantly between 1990 and 2000. According to the 2000 Census, 43.10 percent of family households in unincorporated El Dorado County were comprised of five or more persons. This has not changed significantly since 1990. Of the large family households, 3,839 were owners and 765 were renters. When nonfamily households (single individuals or unrelated individuals living together) are added into the analysis, the percentage of large households in unincorporated areas drops to remains at about 10 percent. Less than one percent of all nonfamily households have five or more individuals. Statewide the figures are much higher, 23 percent of family households (and 16 percent of all households) have five or more members. In El Dorado County, less than one percent of all nonfamily households have seven or more individuals. Figure HO-8 summarizes 2000 family size in unincorporated El Dorado County.

Page 87, Table HO-9 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-910

Page 87, the last sentence in the first paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-9 10 summarizes housing unit occupancy.

Page 87, the first sentence under **Housing Type** is revised as shown:

As shown in Table HO-~~10~~ 11, in 1990....

Page 88, Table HO-10 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~10~~-11

Page 89, the first sentence under **Physical Housing Conditions** is revised as follows:

Table HO-11 12 shows the results of a survey on housing conditions....

Page 91, Table HO-11 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~11~~12

Page 92, the second paragraph under **Crowding** is revised as follows:

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that, in 2000, 2.9 percent of countywide occupied housing units were overcrowded and 2.3 percent were severely overcrowded, resulting in a total overcrowding rate of 5.2 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2001b). This is considerably less than the 2000 statewide estimates of 6.1 percent overcrowded and 9.1 percent severely overcrowded (total of 15.2 percent living in overcrowded units). By tenure, the Census showed that 2.6 percent of owner-occupied houses in the County were overcrowded and 0.75 percent were severely overcrowded. In renter-occupied units, 4.0 percent were overcrowded and 2.6 percent were severely overcrowded. A comparison with the countywide 1990 Census estimates indicates that the percentages of overcrowded occupied units did not increase over the ten-year period (U.S. Census Bureau 1991); this is consistent with the California Research Bureau's findings that the 2000 statewide crowding rate is not significantly different from the 1990 rate (Moller et al. 2002).

Page 92, the second sentence of the last paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~12~~ 13 shows the 2002 County income limits....

Page 93, Table HO-12 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~12~~13

Page 94, Table HO-13 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~13~~14

Page 94, the first sentence of the first paragraph is revised as shown:

What the enumerated jobs-to-housing ratios shown in Table HO-13 14 do not...

Page 95, the second sentence of the third paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~14~~ 15 shows the FMRs for El Dorado County based on the number...



Page 95, Table HO-14 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~14~~15

Page 95, the third sentence of the last paragraph is revised as shown:

According to SACOG, however, the average market rents for one-, two-and three-bedroom units (including houses as well as apartments) are substantially higher than HUD's FMR determination (Table HO-~~15~~16) (SACOG 2002c).

Page 96, Table HO-~~15~~ 16 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~15~~16

Page 96, the second sentence of the second paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~16~~17 gives examples of affordable rents.....

Page 96, Table HO-16 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~16~~17

Page 96, the last paragraph is revised as follows:

~~According to the same Census data set, 31.5 percent of owner households and 40.8 percent of renter households paid more than 30 percent of household income for housing in El Dorado County. Overpayment statistics from the 2000 Census indicate that there were 3,553 lower-income renter households earning \$35,000 or less of which 2,372 paid 30 percent or more of their household income on housing, and 5,629 lower-income owner households earning \$35,000 or less of which 3,686 paid 30 percent or more of their household income on housing.~~ When this is combined with the fact that an individual must work 87 hours/week at minimum wage to afford FMR for a two-bedroom unit, it becomes apparent that overpayment is a serious concern for many residents. These high percentages of households overpaying for housing are not unique to El Dorado County; statewide estimates for rental overpayment range from 29 percent (HCD estimate) to 47 percent (National Low Income Housing Coalition estimate).

Page 97, the second sentence in the first paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~17~~18 contains examples of rent affordability....

Page 97, Table HO-17 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~17~~18

Page 97, the first sentence of the second to last paragraph is revised as shown:

Based on HCD's income limits, a two-person moderate income household earns between \$36,650 and \$55,000 annually (see Table HO-~~4213~~), which equates....

Page 97, the first sentence of the last paragraph is revised as follows:

Table HO-~~4819~~ summarizes housing affordability for one- and two-person....

Page 98, Table HO-18 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~4819~~

Page 98, the second assumption is revised as shown:

Affordable housing cost is 30 percent of monthly income and that an average rent for a two-bedroom unit is \$990 (see Table HO-~~4516~~)

Page 98, the last sentence is revised to read:

Figure HO-11 summarizes the median home price by postal ZIP code, and Table HO-~~4920~~ shows examples of home ownership...

Page 99, Table HO-19 is revised as shown:

Table HO-~~4920~~

Page 100, the second to last paragraph is deleted as follows:

~~There are many reasons why a property owner may choose to convert a government-assisted rental unit to a market-rate unit. These include a determination that the unit(s) can be operated more profitably as a market-rate development; difficulties in dealing with HUD oversight and changing program rules; the depletion of tax advantages available to the owner; and a desire to roll over the investment into a new property. Units at risk of conversion are those that may have their subsidized contracts terminated ("opt out") or that may "prepay" the mortgage, thus terminating the rental restrictions that keep the unit affordable to lower income tenants.~~

Page 100, the last paragraph is revised as shown:

In April 2001, the California Housing Partnership Corporation reported that El Dorado County has 745 federally assisted units (Table HO-~~20 -21~~) countywide. ~~Table HO-21 summarizes the risk of conversion of these units to market rate. Table HO-22 lists assisted housing developments in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County.~~

Page 101, Table HO-20 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~20~~21

Page 101, insert the following paragraph immediately after Table HO-21 (which was Table HO-20):

Units at risk of conversion are those that may have their subsidized contracts terminated (“opt out”) or that may “prepay” the mortgage, thus terminating the rental restrictions that keep the unit affordable to lower income tenants. There are several reasons why the property owner may choose to convert a government assisted unit for a market rate unit, including a determination that the unit(s) can be operated more profitably as a market-rate development; difficulties in dealing with HUD oversight and changing program rules; the depletion of tax advantages available to the owner; and a desire to roll over the investment into a new property.

Page 101, the first paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-22 identifies the level of conversion risk for assisted units. “Units at Risk” identified as being “at risk” in Table HO-21 are, for the most part, units with contracts that will expire between 2001 and 2005. The risk assessment does not measure the likelihood that a property owner will renew a contract; it cannot be assumed that those units identified as “at risk” will actually be lost. In El Dorado County, Section 8 contracts first began expiring in 1999. Between 1999 and April 2001, all of the expiring Section 8 contracts were renewed (i.e., none of the owners chose to opt out). Assuming this trend continues, a substantial loss of affordable housing due to conversion to market rate is not expected. Regardless, this Housing Element contains a number of policies that address conversion and conservation of affordable units.

Page 101, Table HO-21 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-~~21~~22

Page 101, the following paragraph is inserted immediately after Table HO-22 (which was Table HO-21):

Table HO-23 lists the assisted housing developments at-risk in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. As the table shows, the unincorporated County has 99 units with contracts at risk of expiring by 2005. Section 515 assistance was funded by the Farmer’s Home Administration (now Rural Development). The loans are for 40 years and may be prepayable in 20 years. Due the lack of available land, high construction costs, and limited resources, the County has determined that preserving at-risk units is more cost effective than replacing them. To this end, the County has proposed several

specific measures to monitor and preserve assisted housing developments (see Measures HO-BB and HO-CC). In addition, several other funding sources, such as the housing trust fund (Measure HO-K), could be used for the preservation of at-risk units once the trust fund is implemented.

Page 102, Table HO-22 is revised as shown:

<b>TABLE HO-22 -23</b>				
<b>Assisted Housing Developments in El Dorado County At Risk</b>				
<b>Development and Monthly Rate<sup>1</sup></b>	<b># of Assisted Units</b>	<b>Type of Assistance Received</b>	<b>Handicapped Accessible</b>	<b>Senior Complex</b>
<b>Cameron Park</b>				
<del>Camerado Gardens</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$690 and up</del>			✓	
<del>Cameron Oak Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$725</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$825</del>			✓	
<del>Garden Circle Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$665</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$765</del>			✓	
Glenview Apartments 2 Bedroom: \$413-\$532 3 Bedroom: \$469-\$606	88	Tax Credit	✓	✓
Cameron Park Apartments 1-3 Bedroom: 50-60% of Income	120	Tax Credit		✓
Green Valley Apartments 1 Bedroom: \$386 and up 2 Bedroom: \$448 and up 3 Bedroom: \$517 and up	40	Section 515	✓	
<b>Diamond Springs</b>				
Diamond Springs Apartments 1 Bedroom: \$393 2 Bedroom: \$458 and up 3 Bedroom: \$503 and up	23	Section 515	✓	
Diamond Springs Senior Apartments 1 Bedroom: 30% of Income	24	Section 515	✓	✓
<del>Diamond Terrace Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$416</del> <del>3 Bedroom: \$486</del> <del>4 Bedroom: \$533</del>			✓	
<b>Shingle Springs</b>				
<del>Barnett Village Apartments</del> <del>2 Bedroom: \$825 and up</del>			✓	
Shingle Terrace Apartments	12	Section 515	✓	

TABLE HO-22 -23 Assisted Housing Developments in El Dorado County <b>At Risk</b>				
Development and Monthly Rate <sup>1</sup>	# of Assisted Units	Type of Assistance Received	Handicapped Accessible	Senior Complex
2 Bedroom: \$417 3 Bedroom: \$485 4 Bedroom: \$535				
<b>Notes:</b> <sup>1</sup> Rental rates from November 2001.				
<b>Source:</b> El Dorado County Department of Community Services: <del>Apartments for Rent</del> (November 2001)				

Page 102, the first sentence on the page is revised as follows:

Table HO-23~~24~~ shows future housing needs in the unincorporated areas....

Page 103, Table HO-23 is revised as shown:

Table HO-23~~24~~

Page 105, the first sentence of the third paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-24~~25~~ shows the land use designations outlined in the Land Use Element.

Page 106, Table HO-24 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-24~~25~~

Page 107, the last sentence is revised as follows:

Table HO-25~~26~~ shows the maximum residential density permitted in each existing zoning district.

Page 108, Table HO-25 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-25~~26~~

Page 108, the following text and tables are inserted after Table HO-26 (which was Table HO-25):

Table HO-27 provides setback, coverage, and height requirements throughout the unincorporated portions of El Dorado County. Setbacks in multifamily residential zones are slightly less restrictive, providing the option for a larger footprint on the parcel. The setbacks, maximum coverage and height requirements are comparable to other communities throughout the state and are not considered a constraint to the development of affordable housing.

<b>TABLE HO-27 Zoning District Setbacks</b>					
<b>Zoning District</b>	<b>Front Setback</b>	<b>Side Setback</b>	<b>Rear Setback</b>	<b>Maximum Coverage</b>	<b>Maximum Height</b>
One-family Residential (R1)	20 feet	5 feet <sup>1</sup>	15 feet	35 percent	40 feet
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	20 feet	5 feet	15 feet	50 percent	40 feet
Multifamily Residential (RM)	20 feet	5 feet	10 feet	50 percent	50 feet
Tourist Residential (RT)	20 feet	5 feet	10 feet	50 percent	50 feet
Residential Agricultural Twenty-acre (RA-20)	50 feet on all yards	50 feet on all yards	50 feet on all yards	None	45 feet
<b>Note:</b> <sup>1</sup> Side yard will be increased one foot for each additional foot of building height in excess of twenty-five feet.					
<b>Source:</b> <i>El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (as amended through 2003).</i>					

Table HO-28 lists the off-street parking requirements for different residential uses in the County. The County's parking requirements are consistent with other communities and are not considered to unnecessarily burden affordable housing construction.

<b>TABLE HO-28 Schedule of Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements</b>	
<b>Use</b>	<b>Minimum Off-Street Parking</b>
Conventional single-family detached	2 spaces, not in tandem
Single-family with second unit	2 spaces, not in tandem plus 1 space for each additional unit
Single-family attached	2 spaces, not in tandem per unit
Apartments	

Studio/1 bedroom	1.6 spaces per unit
2 or more bedrooms	2 spaces per unit
Rooming house, boarding home, fraternity,	1 space per bedroom
Mobile Home	1 space per mobile home space plus one visitor space for every 5 units.
<b>Source:</b> <i>El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance (as amended through 2003).</i>	

Page 108, Table HO-26 is renumbered as shown:

Table HO-2629

Page 108, the first sentence of the paragraph under Table HO-26 (previously Table HO-25) is revised as shown:

Table HO-2629 outlines the extent of permitted housing types by zoning district.

Page 109, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

As shown on Table HO-26 ~~26~~29, some housing types require issuance of permits or other discretionary approval for development under the current Zoning Ordinance. While most housing types are allowed by right in most residential zone districts, others may be subject to site plan review, issuance of a special use permit, or approval of a planned development. Multifamily housing is permitted by right in the Multifamily Residential (RM), Limited Multifamily Residential (R2), and Tourist Residential (RT) zones.

Page 109, the following text is inserted between the **Special Use Permit** paragraph and the **Planned Development** paragraph:

The following outlines the approval process for a Special Use Permit:

1. **Prepare and submit application.** The applicant prepares required materials and submits his/her package to the Planning Department.
2. **Receive application.** The Planning Department reviews the application with the applicant. If the application is complete, the Planning Department accepts the project, assigns it to a planner, and distributes copies of application materials to affected agencies for review and comment.
3. **Process application.** The Planning Department processes the application in coordination with other departments and agencies as necessary. Processing normally includes:

- A site meeting with applicant and representatives of other appropriate County departments.
  - A “Technical Advisory Committee” meeting with the applicant and representatives of concerned County departments and agencies. The other County departments and agencies may state a requirement for additional information or studies at the meeting.
  - Preparation of a draft environmental document pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Depending upon the potential impacts of the project, a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may be required. If an EIR is required, the applicant is responsible for the costs of the EIR process.
  - Noticing of the public hearing for the project and environmental document in the local newspaper (notice shall include information regarding public review time frame).
  - Preparation of a staff report, which is presented to the decision-making body in advance of the project hearing. The applicant reviews the staff report a minimum of two weeks before the public hearing so that he/she understands staff-recommended conditions of approval.
4. **Hold public hearing.** A public hearing is held before the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission to make a decision on the proposed project. The hearing includes certification of environmental document and may result in conditions of approval that are different from staff recommendations. If the hearing body approves the project, the applicant may proceed pursuant to the conditions of approval. If the hearing body denies the project, the applicant may choose to modify the project and repeat the process.
5. **Post-decision procedure.** If any party wishes to appeal the decision of the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission, he/she must file appeal within ten working days after the decision. The appeal hearing, which is publicly noticed, is held before the Board of Supervisors at one of its regular meetings. For appealed projects, the Board of Supervisors makes a final decision. The timing of the appeal hearing is approximately 30 days after the filing of the appeal.

The entire process is generally completed within six to eight months. The length of time is mainly determined by the level of environmental review required, changes or modifications made to the project by the applicant, or additional information needed to resolve issues or complete the environmental document.

Page 110, Table HO-26 is renumbered as shown:



Table HO-2629.

Page 112, the last sentence in the last paragraph is revised as shown:

Table HO-2730 lists impact and related development fees...

Page 112, the following text is inserted after the second paragraph under Impact Fees discussion:

As noted on table HO-30, a portion of total fees are payable to entities other than the County (i.e., fire districts, school districts, park and recreation providers, community services districts, and water providers). The County has no authority to change or waive fees assessed by non-County entities. County-levied fees for single-family dwellings are based on costs to process applications (building permit and septic system fees), ordinance requirements (rare plant fees), and costs to construct improvements. Developments that consist of something other than a single unit may have additional processing fees depending upon the type and size of the project (e.g., a large subdivision project may require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, which would be funded by the applicant).

County-levied fees are established or changed using a formal process. To determine an appropriate fee (or fee change), the County conducts a study that identifies details of the service and the cost to administer that service. The Board of Supervisors then considers the new or amended fee based on the results of the study. The Board has final say in the established fee amounts. The County regularly reviews its fee programs and conducts fee studies in responses to changes in requirements, changes in demand, and changes in the value of its services (e.g., influenced by inflation).

Page 113, Table HO-27 is revised as shown:

<b>TABLE HO-27 -30</b>			
<b>Single-Family Dwelling Impact and Other Fees<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Type of Fee</b>	<b>Amount of Fee</b>	<b>Agency Collecting Fee</b>	<b>Time of Assessment</b>
Building Permit	\$0.83-87/sq. ft. <sup>2</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Road, County	\$4,223-8,418/d.u. \$4,337-8,645/d.u. <sup>3</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Road, State	\$1,632-2,832/d.u. \$1,676-2,908/d.u. <sup>4</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Road, Special District	\$94-5,864/d.u. \$97-6,791/d.u. <sup>5</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Fire	\$281-1,915/d.u.	Fire District	Building Permit

School	\$2.14-3.07/sq. ft.	School Districts	Building Permit
Park Dedication In-Lieu Fee	Varies <sup>6</sup>	Park Agency	Final Subdivision or Parcel Map
Recreation	\$2,331-2,747/d.u. <sup>7</sup>	Community Services Districts	Building Permit
Rare Plant, County	\$0-885/d.u. <sup>8</sup>	El Dorado County	Building Permit
Rare Plant, EID <sup>9</sup>	\$345	EID	Building Permit
Water, EID	\$5,210/d.u. <sup>10</sup>	EID	Building Permit or Final Map <sup>11</sup>
Water, GDPUD <sup>12</sup>	\$100-5,000/d.u.	GDPUD	Building Permit or Final Map <sup>13</sup>
Water, Grizzly Flats CSD	\$3,650/d.u.	GFCSD	Building Permit
<u>Water, Permit to Drill Well</u>	<u>\$245</u>	<u>El Dorado County</u>	<u>Building Permit</u>
Sewer	\$7,467-8,902/d.u. <sup>14</sup>	EID	Building Permit or Final Map
Septic System	<del>\$326</del> <u>\$490</u>	El Dorado County	Building Permit

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup>~~Based on January 1, 2003, fee schedule.~~ Fees in effect as of October 19, 2003.

<sup>2</sup>Varies based on construction type.

<sup>3</sup>Road Impact Fee (RIF) for El Dorado Hills Area; Traffic Impact Mitigation fee (TIM) for remainder of West Slope.

<sup>4</sup>Varies based on location by Regional Analysis Zone (RAZ).

<sup>5</sup>Varies based on location and size of structure.

<sup>6</sup>Park fees based on the value of the land and the amount of land required for dedication.

<sup>7</sup>Recreation fees are only collected in the El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park Community Services Districts boundaries.

<sup>8</sup>Plant fee varies based on location.

<sup>9</sup>El Dorado Irrigation District.

<sup>10</sup>Based on a ¾" meter.

<sup>11</sup>Fee is collected at recording of a subdivision final or parcel map, unless the lot is pre-existing and does not already have an EDU allocated to it.

<sup>12</sup>Georgetown Divide Public Utility District.

<sup>13</sup>\$100 is basic service fee for previously assessed parcels; \$5,000 or more is due at time of recording a map creating new parcels.

<sup>14</sup>Varies based on location.

**Source:** El Dorado County Building Department, Planning Department, El Dorado Irrigation District, and Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (2003).

Page 113, the following text is inserted immediately after Table HO-30 (which was Table HO-27):

Though not indicated on the table, larger residential projects (subdivisions more than four parcels or development of more than four multifamily units) may require additional road improvement fees or road construction in order to comply with policies first adopted pursuant to Measure Y, "The Control Traffic Congestion Initiative." This initiative, passed by the voters in 1998, added five policies to the General Plan. These policies are currently in effect under the Writ of Mandate. Similar policies are included in the draft general plans currently being considered by the County. The policies with the greatest potential to affect fees related to housing development are as follows:

- Traffic from residential development projects of five or more units or parcels of land shall not result in, or worsen, Level of Service "F" (gridlock, stop-and-go) traffic congestion during weekday, peak-hour periods on any highway, road, interchange, or intersection in the unincorporated areas of the County.
- Developer-paid traffic impact fees shall fully pay for building all necessary road capacity improvements to fully offset and mitigate all direct and cumulative traffic impacts from new development upon any highways, arterial roads, and their intersections during weekday, peak-hour periods in unincorporated areas of the County; and
- County tax revenues shall not be used in any way to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset traffic impacts from new development projects. Exceptions are allowed if County voters first give their approval.

In summary, if subject residential development were to cause or contribute to existing Level of Service (LOS) F conditions (gridlock, stop-and-go), the developer would be required to fund its share of roadway improvements to ensure that the impact would not occur (i.e., ensure that development would not cause/contribute to LOS F conditions). The cost for necessary roadway improvements would vary depending upon the location of the development and roadway LOS conditions in the area. If the necessary roadway improvement(s) were substantial (e.g., adding lanes or reconstructing interchanges), the costs associated with the developer's share could be high. This cost factor could constrain development.

Page 115, the fourth sentence of the paragraph under Writ of Mandate is revised as follows:

Adoption of a new General Plan is expected to occur by ~~December 2003~~ June 2004.

Page 115, the following sentence is inserted at the end of the first paragraph under Existing Commitments:

The majority of units associated with these commitments are near the westernmost boundary of the county, close to the job centers of Folsom, Sacramento, and the El Dorado Hills Business Park.

Page 119, the following text is inserted after the last sentence under the Building Code Constraints heading:

**Lessening the Effects of Governmental Constraints**

This Housing Element proposes a number of programs to help alleviate the effects of some governmental constraints. The following text summarizes those measures that may lessen the effects of the constraints, as appropriate.

For the most part, proposals outlined in this Housing Element addressing governmental constraints are focused on affordable housing. However, a number of the constraints are requirements of state law and are necessary to ensure maintenance of public health and safety. The County lacks the authority to reduce the effects of these constraints.

Land Use Control: General Plan

General Plan land use controls are required by state law, including land use designations that protect open space. Other designations allow for residential development. The land use map designates sufficient land for housing development, so no adjustments are necessary.

Land Use Control: Zoning

Zoning land use controls are required by state law. The County will update its Zoning Ordinance upon adoption of a new General Plan. As outlined in this Housing Element, the County is proposing some Implementation Measures that would facilitate or encourage certain types of residential development. Measure HO-G directs the County to review and revise Zoning Ordinance standards to provide more flexibility for developers of affordable housing. Measure HO-T directs the County to amend the Planned Development combining zone district in a manner that provides incentives for the development of a variety of housing types. Measure HO-U directs the County to adopt standards for affordable housing development so that it may be considered for ministerial approval; such standards would likely be included in the Zoning Ordinance. Finally, Measure HO-EE directs the County to review the Zoning Ordinance for constraints to housing for persons with disabilities. These measures are sufficient to lessen the effect of the Zoning Ordinance as a constraint to housing development.

Land Use Control: Subdivision Ordinance

The County's Subdivision Ordinance is consistent with state law. The subdivision requirements are comparable with those of jurisdictions having similar topography

and demographics. The ordinance does not create excessive obstacles to residential development. No changes are necessary.

### Development Processing Procedures

The County's development processing procedures are similar to those of other jurisdictions statewide. The procedures do not create excessive obstacles to residential development, though this Housing Element includes programs to relax the procedures for certain types of projects. These include HO-N, which directs the County to review its current procedures to identify opportunities for streamlining; HO-R, which directs the County to establish a working group to ensure consistent application of processing requirements; HO-U, which directs the County to adopt standards that would facilitate ministerial approval of affordable housing projects; and HO-MM, which directs the County to develop a procedure for processing reasonable accommodation requests. No additional changes are necessary.

### Impact Fees

As noted above, only a portion of impact fees associated with residential development are established by the County. The combination of the County's fees and those of other agencies and service providers collectively pose a constraint to the development of affordable housing because developers cannot as easily pass the cost on to the purchaser or future inhabitants. The County is proposing a fee waiver/fee reduction ordinance (Measure HO-I) to help alleviate some of its fee requirements. Other Implementation Measures that may be used to help developers offset fee requirements include HO-E, which directs the County to partner with other entities obtain grant money or negotiate fee waivers to develop affordable housing; Measure HO-K, which would establish a Housing Trust Fund that could potentially be used to offset fees for affordable housing construction; Measure HO-V, which directs the County to consider ministerial approval of affordable housing, which could lead to overall lower development fees; and Measure HO-EE, which directs the County to adopt an ordinance addressing reasonable accommodation for disabled persons, including funding for such development.

In addition to the measures addressing impact fees (discussed above), the County will continue to consider ways to reduce the adverse effects of impact fees on affordable housing projects as it develops new fee programs.

### On and Offsite Requirements

On and offsite requirements, such as those for parking and landscaping, are consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and other County codes. Jurisdictions across California have these types of requirements. Although these requirements do not place an undue hardship on developers of residential projects, this Housing Element contains incentives that may relax standards for certain types of development. Measure HO-G, directs the County to review and

revise Zoning Ordinance standards to provide more flexibility for developers of affordable housing. Measure HO-J directs the County to work with TPRA to consider changes to its Code of Ordinances that would facilitate the construction of affordable housing. Measure HO-O directs the County to develop and infill incentive ordinance, which will address standards for such development. Finally, Measure HO-T directs the County to amend the Planned Development combining zone district in a manner that provides incentives for the development of a variety of housing types.

It should be noted that some of the new measures proposed in this Housing Element may lead to additional development requirements. No mitigation is proposed for these new requirements.

#### Building Codes

Building code requirements are intended to protect public health and safety. No changes are necessary.

#### Writ of Mandate

The Writ of Mandate, issued by a Superior Court Judge, will be in effect until the Court agrees that the County has met the terms of the Writ. Upon adoption of a new General Plan, the County will return to the Court and ask that the Writ be lifted. Other than following the procedure to have the Writ lifted, there are no other changes that can be made.

#### Existing Commitments

Because of the location of units associated with the majority of the existing commitments, these projects promote housing development near job centers. Generally, the agreement(s) may only be changed if both parties agree to renegotiate the terms. No mitigation is available.

#### Concurrency Requirements

Requirements for concurrency of services and development are contained in the General Plan and County Code. Requirements for utility delivery, such as water, are necessary for public health and safety. Requirements for concurrency of roadway improvements are tied to the County's LOS standard. It is not feasible to lower the LOS standards or concurrency requirements without significant adverse effects on traffic congestion and air quality.

#### Special Requirements in the Tahoe Basin

Residential development in the Tahoe Basin is primarily regulated by the TRPA. The County has no authority to relax or otherwise change the standards of TRPA. This Housing Element contains Implementation Measures (Measure HO-J and HO-

Q) that encourage closer cooperation with TRPA so that affordable housing issues in the El Dorado County portion of the Basin may be more adequately addressed. No additional measures are necessary.

#### Government Constraints and Housing for Disabled Persons

As noted in the text, the County is proposing three Implementation Measures (Measures HO-DD, HO-EE, and HP-MM) to address the constraints associated with the development of housing for persons with disabilities. No additional measures are necessary.

Page 124, the first paragraph under **Survey Summary** is revised as follows:

The survey results show that El Dorado County has enough land appropriately zoned to meet its total 2001–2008 allocation of 9,994 units. As shown on Table HO-28 -31, there is capacity to accommodate ~~12,088~~ 12,059 DUs outside of the Development Agreement areas.

Page 124, the following text is inserted after first paragraph under **Survey Summary**:

Consistent with Section 65583(c)(1) of the Government Code, the survey does not attempt to predict actual rates of residential development, but rather provides an inventory of land available for development. Once the County adopts a new General Plan and the Superior Court of California removes the restrictions outlined in the 1999 Writ of Mandate (see the Writ of Mandate discussion under “Other Land Use Controls” in Section 3: Housing Constraints), the County expects that actual housing development will be influenced by the housing market, housing programs included in this element, and constraints outlined in Section 3 of this element.

The survey numbers reflect development uninhibited by constraints described in Section 3 of this Housing Element. While few of these constraints would affect the physical development potential of vacant sites, the County expects that some could affect development rates and intensities. For example, a landowner wishing to develop a smaller parcel with a limited number of multifamily units could have more difficulty in securing the funds necessary to complete the project. This element proposes a number of programs that could offset or assist landowners with fee payment, including fee waiver/fee reduction (Measure HO-I), a housing trust fund (Measure HO-K), additional grant monies (Measure HO-M), and model or relaxed development standards (Measures HO-N, HO-O, HO-T, and HO-V).

Page 124, the third sentence of the second paragraph under **Survey Summary** is revised as follows:

The inventory and Table HO-28 ~~-31~~ indicate that there is capacity to supply a total of ~~8,324~~ 8,060 higher density units having public water and sewer (this does not include the Development Agreement areas).

Figure HO-12, following page 124, is revised. Please see Appendix D of this Response to Comments document.

Page 125, Table HO-28 is revised as follows:

<b>TABLE HO-28 <del>-31</del></b>			
<b>Vacant Land Survey Summary</b>			
	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Parcels</b>	<b>Adjusted Maximum Capacity (DUs)</b>
All Lands in Communities Except Lands in Development Agreements <sup>1</sup>			
Total of Vacant Lands	11,985.1	1,575	12,059
Higher Density Lands (4+ DUs/acre)	<del>2,079.7</del>	<del>349</del>	<del>9,989</del>
	<u>1701.9</u>	<u>278</u>	<u>9,680</u>
Higher Density Lands Having Public Services	<del>1,086.3</del>	<del>167</del>	<del>8,324</del>
	<u>1541.4</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>8,060</u>
<p>2001–2008 Allocations: Very Low = 2,829 units; Lower = 1,890 units; Moderate = 2,100 units;            Above Moderate = 3,175 units; Total = 9,994 units.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <p><sup>1</sup>Considers land vacant as of August 2002 (information from the El Dorado County Assessor's Office database). See text and Attachment A for further information.</p>			

Page 125, the third sentence on the last paragraph is revised as follows:

(See Table HO-~~1516~~ for an example of this)

Page 141, Measure HO-E is revised as follows:

Partner with existing nonprofit and for-profit corporations that are interested and able to construct and manage housing affordable to very low and lower income families in order to expand their ability to serve the county. ~~Partnerships Assistance may focus on include~~ site identification, site acquisition, ~~design standards,~~ and identification of subsidy sources like Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) monies, fee waivers, and expedited permit processing. [Policy HO-1r]

Page 142, Measure HO-G is revised as follows:

Amend the Zoning Ordinance and *Design and Improvement Standards Manual* to consider ~~provide~~ provide more flexibility and ~~relaxation of certain in~~ development standards as incentives for affordable housing developments. Any amendments to



development standards should consider site and ~~potential~~ occupancy characteristics. The specific standards that may be evaluated include, but are not limited to, the following...

Page 143, the table under Measure HO-H is revised as follows:

Responsibility:	Planning Department
Time Frame:	Within one year of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Adoption of Density Bonus Ordinance.
Objective:	<del>400</del> 150 units

Page 144, Measure HO-J is revised as follows:

Responsibility:	Planning Department; <del>and</del> Department of Community Services; <del>and</del> TRPA
Time Frame:	Ongoing
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Adopted changes in the TRPA code to allow more affordable housing.

Page 146, Measure HO-O is revised as follows:

~~Evaluate the feasibility of Adopting~~ an infill incentive ordinance to assist developers in addressing barriers to infill development. Incentives could include, but are not limited to, modifications of development standards, such as reduced parking and setback requirements, to accommodate smaller or odd-shaped parcels, and waivers or deferrals of certain development fees, helping to decrease or defer the costs of development. [Policy HO-1e]

Responsibility:	Planning Department
Time Frame:	Within two years of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	<del>400</del> 200 units

Page 148, Measure HO-U is revised as follows:

~~Work with non-profit and for profit developers to adopt~~ development and design standards that would make affordable multifamily housing ministerial, requiring such housing to blend in with the surrounding area. [Policy HO-1p]

Responsibility:	Planning Department
Time Frame:	Within <del>three</del> <u>two</u> years of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Quicker turnaround of multifamily development applications; reduced cost for multifamily development; and minimization of constraints to new multifamily development.

Page 149, Measure HO-X is revised as follows:

Apply for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) rehabilitation funds annually to provide housing rehabilitation services and continue to provide weatherization services to very low and lower income households. [Policy HO-2a]

Page 150, Measure HO-Z is revised as follows:

Responsibility:	Planning Department and Department of Community Services
Time Frame:	Within two years of General Plan adoption.
Funding:	General Fund
Expected Outcome:	Mobile home park conversion ordinance.
Objective:	200 Mobile Homes

Page 152, Measure HO-FF is revised as follows:

Work with community and local organizations in providing community education on homelessness, gaining better understanding of the unmet need, and developing and maintaining emergency shelter programs, including ~~consideration of funding for programs developed through interjurisdictional cooperation~~ and working with local organizations to annually apply for the End Chronic Homelessness through Employment and Housing grant. [Policy HO-4d]

Page 152, Measure HO-GG is revised as follows:

As part of the Zoning Ordinance update, clearly define temporary shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing and identify zone districts within which temporary shelters or transitional housing may be established by right or by Special Use Permit. Once that exercise is complete, identify potential suitable sites for use as establishment of emergency shelters and transitional and permanent supportive housing, with characteristics appropriate for such use, including but not limited to proximity to public services and facilities; and accessibility to and from areas where homeless persons congregate; and having zoning classifications that allow the siting of an emergency shelter or the conversion of an existing structure for such use. [Policy HO-4d]

Responsibility:	Planning Department and Department of Community Services
Time Frame:	<u>Zoning Ordinance to be updated within one year of General Plan adoption. Identification of sites to begin immediately thereafter.</u>
Funding:	General Fund and other
Expected Outcome:	<u>Identification of suitable sites for emergency shelters and transitional housing.</u>

Page 154, Measure HO-LL is revised as follows:

~~Develop a procedure to~~ Continue to refer people who suspect discrimination in housing to the appropriate agency or organization for help. This is ongoing effort by the County. [Policies HO-6b and HO-6c]

Page 154, the following text is added after MEASURE HO-MM:

**MEASURE HO-NN**

As part of the Zoning Ordinance update, ensure that the permit processing procedures for farmworker housing do not conflict with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 which states that “no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves 12 or fewer employees and is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone.” The County shall also ensure that such procedures encourage and facilitate the development of housing for farmworkers.

Responsibility:	Planning Department and Department of Community Services
Time Frame:	<u>Zoning Ordinance to be updated within one year of General Plan adoption</u>
Funding:	General Fund and other
Expected Outcome:	<u>Compliance with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 and procedures that encourage and facilitate the development of farmworker housing</u>

- Add the following new subsection and text (after new Measure HO-NN):

**QUANTIFIED HOUSING OBJECTIVES**

Table HO-32 summarizes the housing objectives for each measure and shows if the units will be provided by new construction, rehabilitation, or conservation. New construction refers to the number of new units that could potentially be constructed by each measure. Rehabilitation refers to the number of existing units expected to be rehabilitated. Conservation refers to the preservation of affordable housing stock. A subset of the conservation objective in the preservation of units defined as “at-risk”. The quantified objectives are further broken down by income category (e.g. very low income, low income, and moderate income). Because a jurisdiction

may not have the resources to provide the state mandated housing allocation (see Table HO-24) the quantified objectives do not need to match the state allocation by income category.

Table HO-32 is shown on the following page.

Page 166, Table A-3 is revised as shown, beginning on page 5.1-30.

**TABLE HO-32  
Quantified Housing Objectives**

Measure	Objective	Construction				Rehabilitation			Conservation		
		Very Low	Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	Very Low	Lower	Moderate	Very Low	Lower	Moderate
HO-E	400	100	200	100							
HO-F	200 second units, 300 mobile homes	200	250	50							
HO-H	150		50	50	50						
HO-I	225	75	150								
HO-L	50		50								
HO-O	200	75	75	25	25						
HO-X	800					400	300	100			
HO-Z	200 mobile homes								80	70	50
HO-AA	300								175	100	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,825</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>75</b>
Additional Market Rate Units				80	3,200			160			
<b>Grand Totals</b>		<b>450</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>75</b>

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Cameron Park</b>								
Commercial (C)	12.9	2	6.5	4.2-8.7	A	10	129	13
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	2.1	4	2.1	-	A	10	21	2
Planned Commercial (CP)	19.1	3	6.4	3.1-8.7	A	10	191	19
Planned Commercial-Design Control (CP-DC)	54.3	5	10.9	2.1-33.7	A	10	543	54
Planned Commercial-Planned Development & Design Control (CP-PD-DC)	18.1	2	9.1	5.1-13.0	A	10	181	18
Professional Office Commercial-Design Control (CPO-DC)	20.2	3	6.7	4.2-11.1	A	10	202	20
Multifamily Residential-Design Control (RM-DC)	2.5	1	2.5	-	A	24	60	48
One-family Residential (R1)	135.5	19	7.1	2.2-31.2	A	7.3	989	791
One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1- PD)	27.4	2	13.7	2.9-24.5	A	7.3	200	160
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	3.2	2	1.6	1.6-1.6	A	21.8	70	56
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2- DC)	17.3	3	5.8	3.3-10.7	A	21.8	377	302
Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD)	16.4	4	4.1	2.8-6.5	A	21.8	358	286
Tourist Residential (RT)	4.7	1	4.7	-	A	21.8	102	82
<b>Cameron Park Total</b>	<u>333.7 acres</u> 207.0 acres	<u>48 parcels</u> 32 parcels					<u>3,423 units</u> 2,156 units	<u>1,851 units</u> 1,725 units
<b>Camino/Pollock Pines</b>								
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	6.1	2	3.1	2.1-4.0	B	4	24	2
One-family Residential (R1)	37.5	12	3.1	2.0-5.7	B	7.3	274	219

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	16.7	3	5.6	2.1-12.5	B	21.8	364	291
Tourist Residential (RT)	2.2	1	2.2	-	B	21.8	48	38
<b>Camino/Pollock Pines Total</b>	62.5 acres 56.4 acres	18 parcels 16 parcels					710 units 686 units	550 units 548 units
<b>Chrome Ridge</b>								
Planned Commercial (GP)	3.5	2	1.8	1.5-2.0	B	4	14	1
<b>Chrome Ridge Total</b>	3.5 acres	2 parcels					14 units	1 unit
<b>Goloma</b>								
Commercial (C)	2.3	1	2.3	-	B, C	4	9	1
<b>Goloma Total</b>	2.3 acres	1 parcel					9 units	1 unit
<b>Cool</b>								
Commercial (C-DG)	10.5	1	10.5	-	B	4	42	4
Planned Commercial-Design Control (CP-DG)	19.6	1	19.6	-	B	4	78	8
One-family Residential (R1)	3.1	2	1.6	1.0-2.1	B	7.3	23	18
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2-DC)	40.1	4	10.0	7.1-18.2	B	21.8	874	699
<b>Cool Total</b>	73.3 acres 43.2 acres	8 parcels 6 parcels					1,017 units 897 units	729 units 717 units
<b>Diamond Springs/El Dorado</b>								
Commercial (C)	6.1	3	2.0	0.9-2.9	A	10	61	6
Commercial-Design Control (C-DG)	42.3	7	6.0	2.1-16.3	A	10	423	42
Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD)	4.7	2	2.4	2.3-2.4	A	10	47	5
Planned Commercial (CP)	2.9	1	2.9	-	A	10	29	3
Professional Office Commercial (CPO)	7.2	1	7.2	-	A	10	72	7
Professional Office Commercial-Planned	2.2	1	2.2	-	A	10	22	2

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
<del>Development (CPO-PD)</del>								
Mobile Home Park (MP)	51.1	3	17.0	17.4-27.3	A	7	358	286
One-family Residential (R1)	120.5	12	10.0	3.5-41.8	A	7.3	880	704
One-family Residential-Design Control (R1-DC)	12.0	2	6.0	5.0-7.0	A	7.3	88	70
One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)	35.3	5	7.1	3.7-11.6	A	7.3	258	206
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	17.5	4	4.4	2.2-10.0	A	21.8	382	305
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2-DC)	41.5	8	5.2	0.1-16.8	A	21.8	905	724
Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD)	9.2	2	4.6	2.1-7.0	A	21.8	201	160
<b>Diamond Springs/El Dorado Total</b>	<del>352.5 acres</del> 287.1 acres	<del>51 parcels</del> 36 parcels					<del>3,726 units</del> 3,072 units	<del>2,520 units</del> 2,455 units
<b>El Dorado Hills</b>								
<del>Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)</del>	<del>28.7</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>7.2</del>	<del>2.0-18.7</del>	<del>A</del>	<del>10</del>	<del>287</del>	<del>29</del>
<del>Planned Commercial-Design Control (CP-DC)</del>	<del>7.0</del>	<del>1</del>	<del>7.0</del>	<del>-</del>	<del>A</del>	<del>10</del>	<del>70</del>	<del>7</del>
One-family Residential (R1)	228.5	20	11.4	0.1-49.8	A	7.3	1668	1,334
One-family Residential-Planned Development (R1-PD)	10.7	3	3.6	0.2-6.6	A	7.3	78	62
Limited Multifamily Residential-Design Control (R2-DC)	57.5	4	14.4	6.3-22.6	A	21.8	1254	1,003
Multifamily Residential-Design Control (RM-DC)	22.5	2	11.3	0.7-21.8	A	24	540	432
<b>El Dorado Hills Total</b>	<del>354.9 acres</del> 319.2 acres	<del>34 parcels</del> 29 parcels					<del>3,897 units</del> 3,540 units	<del>2,867 units</del> 2,831 units
<b>Garden Valley</b>								
<del>Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD)</del>	<del>7.0</del>	<del>1</del>	<del>7.0</del>	<del>-</del>	<del>B</del>	<del>4</del>	<del>28</del>	<del>3</del>



**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Garden Valley Total</b>	7.0 acres	1 parcel					28 units	3 units
<b>Georgetown</b>								
Planned Commercial (GP)	2.5	1	2.5	-	B	4	10	1
<b>Georgetown Total</b>	2.5 acres	1 parcel					10 units	1 unit
<b>Greenwood</b>								
Commercial (C)	2.0	1	2.0	-	B	4	8	1
<b>Greenwood Total</b>	2.0 acres	1 parcel					8 units	1 unit
<b>Kyburz</b>								
Commercial (C)	0.9	2	0.4	0.2-0.7	E	4	4	0
One-family Residential (R1)	16.9	41	0.4	0.14-1.9	C	7.3	123	99
<b>Kyburz Total</b>	17.8 acres 16.9 acres	43 parcels 41 parcels					127 units 123 units	99 units
<b>Little Norway</b>								
Commercial (C)	2.3	1	2.3	-	E	4	9	1
One-family Residential (R1)	14.9	25	0.6	0.2-2.67	C	7.3	109	87
<b>Little Norway Total</b>	17.2 acres 14.9 acres	26 parcels 25 parcels					118 units 109 units	88 units 87 units
<b>Mosquito</b>								
Planned Commercial (GP)	1.5	1	1.5	-	E	4	6	1
<b>Mosquito Total</b>	1.5 acres	1 parcel					6 units	1 unit
<b>Mt. Aukum</b>								
Commercial (C)	23.0	5	4.6	4.3-5.2	E	4	92	9
<b>Mt. Aukum Total</b>	23 acres	5 parcels					92 units	9 units
<b>Mt. Ralston</b>								
Commercial (C)	0.2	1	0.2	-	E	4	1	0

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
One-family Residential (R1)	11.9	34	0.4	0.2-2.1	C	7.3	87	69
<b>Mt. Ralston Total</b>	12.1 acres 11.9 acres	35 parcels 34 parcels					88 units 87 units	69 units
<b>Phillips</b>								
Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD)	21.8	4	21.8	-	E	4	87	9
One-family Residential (R1)	3.2	9	0.4	0.14-0.73	C	7.3	23	19
<b>Phillips Total</b>	25.0 acres 3.2 acres	10 parcels 9 parcels					110 units 23 units	28 units 19 units
<b>Pilot Hill</b>								
One-family Residential (R1)	0.2	1	0.2	-	C	7.3	1	1
<b>Pilot Hill Total</b>	0.2 acres	1 parcel					1 unit	1 unit
<b>Placerville<sup>5</sup></b>								
Mobile Home Park (MP)	4.2	2	2.1	2.0-2.2	A	7	29	24
One-family Residential (R1)	3.4	1	3.4	-	A	7.3	25	20
<b>Placerville Total</b>	7.6 acres	3 parcels					54 units	44 units
<b>Pleasant Valley</b>								
Planned Commercial (CP)	2.0	1	2.0	-	B	4	8	1
<b>Pleasant Valley Total</b>	2.0 acres	1 parcel					8 units	1 unit

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

Zoning	Acres	# of Parcels	Acres/ Parcels	Parcel Size Range (Acres)	Services <sup>2</sup>	Max DU/Acre	Max Capacity (Units) <sup>3</sup>	Max Expected (Units) <sup>4</sup>
<b>Shingle Springs</b>								
Commercial (C)	8.0	2	4.0	2.9-5.1	A	40	80	8
Commercial-Design Control (C-DC)	2.2	4	2.2	-	A	40	22	2
Planned Commercial (CP)	2.7	4	2.7	-	A	40	27	3
Professional Office Commercial-Design Control (CPO-DC)	7.3	3	2.4	2.1-2.8	A	40	73	7
Commercial-Planned Development (C-PD)	16.9	4	4.2	2.2-9.8	A	40	169	17
Limited Multifamily Residential (R2)	5.5	1	5.5	-	A	21.8	120	96
Limited Multifamily Residential-Planned Development (R2-PD)	26.1	2	13.1	2.1-24.0	A	21.8	569	455
<b>Shingle Springs Total</b>	<u>68.7 acres</u> <u>31.6 acres</u>	<u>14 parcels</u> <u>3 parcels</u>					<u>1,060 units</u> <u>689 units</u>	<u>588 units</u> <u>551 units</u>
<b>Somerset</b>								
Commercial (C)	7.7	2	3.9	2.7-5.0	E	4	31	3
One-family Residential (R1)	4.0	1	4.0	-	C	7.3	29	23
<b>Somerset Total</b>	<u>11.7 acres</u> <u>4.0 acres</u>	<u>3 parcels</u> <u>1 parcel</u>					<u>60 units</u> <u>29 units</u>	<u>26 units</u> <u>23 units</u>
<b>Strawberry</b>								
One-family Residential (R1)	9.8	25	0.4	0.2-0.7	B	7.3	71	57
<b>Strawberry Total</b>	9.8 acres	25 parcels					71 units	57 units
<b>Tahoe Basin<sup>6</sup></b>								
One-Family Residential (R1)	659.5	14	47.1	4.7-189.9	A	7.3	4,814	404
Tourist Residential (RT)	29.4	3	9.8	5.0-16.2	A	21.8	641	50
<b>Tahoe Basin Total</b>	688.9 acres	17 parcels					5,455 units	454 units

**TABLE A-3  
VACANT LAND SUITABLE FOR HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b># of Parcels</b>	<b>Acres/ Parcels</b>	<b>Parcel Size Range (Acres)</b>	<b>Services<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Max DU/Acre</b>	<b>Max Capacity (Units)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Max Expected (Units)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>TOTAL HIGHER DENSITY</b>	<u>2,079.7</u> acres <u>1,701.9</u> acres	<u>349 parcels</u> <u>278 parcels</u>					<u>20,092 units</u> <u>16,996 units</u>	<u>9,989 units</u> <u>9,680 units</u>
<i>Total With Both Water And Sewer Service</i>	<u>1,086.3</u> acres <u>1,541.4</u> acres	<u>167 parcels</u> <u>120 parcels</u>					<u>17,615 units</u> <u>14,966 units</u>	<u>8,324 units</u> <u>8,060 units</u>

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup>Higher density development is ~~4~~7 or more dwelling units (DUs) per acre. Survey focuses on established communities in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. See Figure HO-12 for locations of communities.

<sup>2</sup>A = public water and sewer service available

B = public water and septic

C = private water and septic

<sup>3</sup>Maximum density from Zoning Ordinance. ~~For commercially zoned lands, the maximum amount of residential units allowed as part of mixed-use projects is 10 DU/acre in urbanized communities and 4 DU/acre in rural communities.~~

<sup>4</sup>Adjusted maximum capacity is 80% of maximum capacity for residential development in all areas of the county except the Tahoe Basin. ~~Adjusted maximum capacity for commercially zoned lands is 10% of maximum capacity.~~ See the text for more information.

<sup>5</sup>Refers to land on the periphery of the Placerville city limits. Does not include parcels in the City of Placerville.

<sup>6</sup>Development in the Tahoe Basin is subject to the regulations of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). On average, the County issues 92 building permits per year under TRPA's allocation system. The adjusted maximum capacity units shown are based on the proportion of R1 and TR lands as compared to all vacant residential lands. According to Table A-1, R1 units account for 88% and TR units account for 11% of the vacant lands in the Tahoe Basin. The adjusted maximum capacity for R1 and TR units, then, is 88% and 11% of the 460 unit five-year allocation. The remaining housing types combined represent approximately 1% of the five-year allocation.

**Source:** El Dorado County Assessor's Records (2002).

Page 205, the following policy is added under Objective 5.2.1:

New Policy The County, in cooperation with the Water Agency and water purveyors, shall collect and make available information on water supply and demand.

Page 208, the following new policy is inserted after Policy 5.2.3.6:

New Policy The Environmental Management Department shall compile and make available information regarding typical water demands associated with rural residential development that is dependent upon groundwater. The information shall be posted on the Department's Internet website and available in hardcopy format at the Development Services Public Counter.

Page 211, the following policy is inserted after the text under **OBJECTIVE 5.7.3: LAW ENFORCEMENT:**

Policy 5.7.3.1 Prior to approval of new development, the Sheriff's Department shall be requested to review all applications to determine the ability of the department to provide protection services. The ability to provide protection to existing development shall not be reduced below acceptable levels as a consequence of new development. Recommendations such as the need for additional equipment, facilities, and adequate access may be incorporated as conditions of approval.

Page 212, Policy 5.8.1.1 is revised as follows:

Policy 5.8.8.1 School districts affected by a proposed development shall be relied on to evaluate the development's adverse impacts on school facilities or the demand therefore. No development that will result in such impacts shall be approved unless:

1. To the extent allowed by State law, the applicant and the appropriate school district(s) have entered into a written agreement regarding the mitigation of impacts to school facilities; or
2. The impacts to school facilities resulting from the development are mitigated, through conditions of approval, to the greatest extent allowed by State law.

~~The County shall condition or deny a request for a quasi-legislative approval, including any such request necessary for a proposed development, if the development impact fees allowed by State law for development projects would not result in the full avoidance or reduction to an acceptable level of the impacts of the approval or development on school facilities or the demand therefore, or the County shall condition or deny such a request, unless the applicant or developer enters into a development agreement with the County requiring that the applicant or developer enter into a written agreement with the appropriate school district(s) for the mitigation of impacts to school facilities or the demand therefore.~~

Page 213, Policy 5.8.1.4 is deleted.

Page 213, Policy 5.8.1.5 is deleted.

Page 213, Policy 5.8.1.6 is revised as follows:

The County will coordinate with the school districts as to the development of additional land use and zoning standards ~~requiring specific mitigation of school impacts from proposed development to address the provision of educational services.~~

Page 218, Goal 6.2 is revised as follows:

Minimize fire hazards and risks in both wildland and developed areas.

Page 219, Policy 6.2.3.1 is revised as follows:

As a requirement for approving new development, the County must find, based on information provided by the applicant and the responsible fire protection district must demonstrate that, concurrent with development, adequate emergency water flow, ~~fire access~~, and fire fighting personnel and equipment will be ~~provided available~~ in accordance with applicable State and local fire district standards.

Page 220, the following new policy added after the first (partial) sentence after Policy 6.4.2.2:

New Policy Coordinate with the local Fire Safe Councils, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and federal and state agencies having land use jurisdiction in El Dorado County in the development of a countywide fuels management strategy.

Page 220, Policy 6.3.2.4 is deleted as shown:

~~Policy 6.3.2.4 The latest revisions of the Uniform Building Code concerning seismicity and liquefaction shall be promptly adopted by the County.~~

Page 221, Policies 6.4.2.1 and 6.4.2.2 are revised as follows:

Policy 6.4.2.1 Apply a zoning overlay for areas located within dam failure inundation zones as identified by in the State Department of Water Resources Division of Safety of DamsEl Dorado County Operational Area Multi-Hazard Functional Emergency Operations Plans.

Policy 6.4.2.2 No new critical or high occupancy structures (e.g., schools, hospitals) should be located within the inundation area resulting from failure of dams identified by in the State Department of Water Resources Division of Safety of DamsEl Dorado County Operational Area Multi-Hazard Functional Emergency Operations Plans.

Page 229, the following text is added to the end of Policy 6.8.1.1:

Where there is a difference between the County development standards and the development standards of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, as applied to proposed development, the standards that will most reduce airport-related safety hazards shall apply.

Page 233, Policy 7.2.1.1 is revised as follows:

In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Sections 3675-3676, the County shall maintain all Mineral Land Classification reports produced by the State ~~Division of Mines and Geology~~ Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey which pertain to El Dorado County. El Dorado County hereby recognizes, accepts, and adopts by reference those State Classification Reports as they currently exist and as may be amended, or supplemented, in the future. ~~A list of said reports is provided in Volume II-Background Information, El Dorado County General Plan, Chapter 7.~~ These reports are as follows:

1. Kohler, S.L. 1983. Mineral Land Classification of the Georgetown 15' Quadrangle, El Dorado, and Placer Counties, California. Open File Report 83-35. Prepared for the California Department of Conservation.
2. Kohler, S.L. 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Auburn 15' Quadrangle, El Dorado and Placer Counties, California. Open File Report 83-37. Prepared for the California Department of Conservation.
3. Loyd, R.C., T.P Anderson, and M.M Bushnell.1983. Mineral Land Classification of the Placerville 15' Quadrangle, El Dorado, and Amador Counties, California. Open File Report 83-29. Prepared for the California Department of Conservation.
4. Loyd, R.C. 1984. Mineral Land Classification of the Folsom 15' Quadrangle, Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, and Amador Counties, California. Open File Report 84-50. Prepared for the California Department of Conservation.
5. Loyd, R.C., and S.L. Kohler. 1987. Mineral Land Classification of the Camino and Mokelumne Hill 15' Quadrangles, El Dorado, Amador, and Calaveras Counties, California. Open File Report 87-02. Prepared for the California Department of Conservation.

Page 243, the table in Policy 7.4.4.4 is revised as follows:

<b>Existing Canopy Cover</b>	<b>Percent Canopy Cover to be Retained or Replaced</b>
80–100 percent	<del>60</del> 60% of existing canopy
60–79 percent	<del>70</del> 70% of existing canopy
40–59 percent	<del>80</del> 80% of existing canopy
20–39 percent	<del>85</del> 85% of existing canopy
19 percent or less	<del>90</del> 90% of existing canopy

Page 244, Policy 7.5.1.3 is revised as follows:

Cultural resource (historic, prehistoric, and paleontological resources) studies shall be conducted prior to the approval of discretionary projects. Studies may include, but are not limited to, record searches through the North Central Information Center at California State University, Sacramento, the Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley, field surveys, subsurface testing, and/or salvage excavations.



Page 246, Objective 7.5.4 is revised as follows:

~~Identification, p~~Preservation, and protection of existing cemeteries including access and parking.

Page 252, Policy 8.1.3.1 is revised as follows:

Agriculturally zoned lands including Williamson Act Contract properties (i.e., lands within ~~“agricultural preserves”~~) shall be buffered...

Page 252, Policy 8.1.3.2 is revised as follows:

Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agricultural zoned lands ~~within designated agricultural districts~~ shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet from the boundary of the agriculturally zoned lands.

Agriculturally incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned land outside of designated Agricultural Districts shall provide a minimum setback of 200 feet on parcels 10 acres or larger.

~~The implementing ordinance shall contain provisions for Administrative relief to these setbacks may be granted by the County Planning Director, where appropriate, and may impose larger setbacks where needed to protect agricultural resources.~~

Page 255, Policy 8.2.1.1 is revised as follows:

The County shall ~~allow and~~ support the extension of water lines and the use of reclaimed ~~and untreated~~ water for the irrigation of agricultural lands.

Page 257, Policy 8.2.4.2 is revised as follows:

...and are in full compliance with the provisions of the El Dorado County Code ~~and the compatibility requirements for contracted lands under the Williamson Act.~~

Page 263, Policy 9.1.1.2 is revised as follows:

Neighborhood parks shall be primarily focused on serving ~~children’s walk-to~~ or bike-to recreation needs. When possible, neighborhood parks should be adjacent to schools. Neighborhood parks are generally 2 to 10 acres in size and may include a playground, tot lot, turf areas, and picnic ~~tables~~ facilities.

Page 264, Policy 9.1.1.8 is revised as follows:

The County will adopt a Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program to meet current and future needs as identified in the Parks Master Plan. ~~Interim Master Plan for Parks, Creation Facilities and Trails, Dangermond and Associates, May 1992. Said plan shall be reviewed and updated in accordance with Policy 2.9.1.2.~~

Page 266, Policy 9.1.2.8 is revised as follows:

Integrate and link, where possible, existing and proposed National, State, regional, County, city and local hiking, bicycle, and equestrian trails for public use.

Page 296, Policy 11.1.12.5 is revised as follows:

Continue to ~~actively participate in the development~~ support operation of the permanent U.S. Forest Service Visitors Center in Meyers ~~with the U.S. Forest Service and other agencies.~~