

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COUNTY OF EL DORADO

<http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/devservices>



PLACERVILLE OFFICE:
2850 FAIRLANE COURT PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
BUILDING (530) 621-5315 / (530) 622-1708 FAX
bldgdept@co.el-dorado.ca.us
PLANNING (530) 621-5355 / (530) 642-0508 FAX
planning@co.el-dorado.ca.us
Counter Hours: 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM

LAKE TAHOE OFFICE:
3368 LAKE TAHOE BLVD. SUITE 302
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150
(530) 573-3330
(530) 542-9082 FAX
tahoebuild@co.el-dorado.ca.us
Counter Hours: 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM

TO: Planning Commission **Agenda of:** June 11, 2009

FROM: Roger Trout, Director of Development Services
James W. Ware, P.E., Director of Transportation **Item #:** 11

DATE: June 4, 2009

SUBJECT: **Land Development Manual/Highway Design Manual/Standard Plans –
Global Issues**

1. **Applicable General Plan Policies in the LDM: Should they be included verbatim? Currently, they are. Staff recommends Alternative “a. Leave as is”.**

Alternatives:

a. Leave as is

Pro:

- i. Policies needed to explain the justification for the standard in the document
- ii. The reader does not have to refer to the General Plan
- iii. SAGE and some other reviewers appreciated this approach

Con:

- i. Lengthens the document
- ii. Document may need to be updated more often as General Plan policies are updated/amended
- iii. May be difficult to differentiate the General Plan policy from the rest of the text

b. Remove all policies and leave in policy numbers only

Pro:

- i. Shortens the document
- ii. If policy is amended, the LDM doesn't have to be changed

Con:

- i. Policies needed to explain the justification for the standard is no longer in the document
- ii. Reader has to refer to the General Plan
- iii. References remain for Policies that are deleted entirely

c. Move all policies to Chapter 7 and use references only in the rest of the LDM to the policy numbers in Chapter 7

Pro:

- i. Policies are still in the same document so there is less need to refer to the General Plan
- ii. Updates would be limited to one Chapter as the General Plan is updated/amended

Con:

- i. Reader has to refer to another chapter

2. Should the LDM include both standards and land use process descriptions? Currently, they are. Staff recommends Alternative “a. Leave as is”.

a. Leave as is

Pro:

- i. The land use process is complicated and needs to be articulated in the LDM to make it user-friendly.
- ii. SAGE and some other reviewers appreciated this approach.
- iii. Other agencies have used a similar approach.

Con:

- i. It could potentially confuse the reader so that they miss the standards themselves.
- ii. It can be difficult to enforce.
- iii. Creates a larger document

b. Separate the LDM into 2 or more documents

Pro:

- i. Standards and procedures will be separate documents and thus less confusing.
- ii. Customers can choose which document(s) they need.

Con:

- i. Reader has to have 2 or more separate documents.
- ii. SAGE felt strongly that having these together was important and useful.

3. Conclusion: Staff recommends the Planning Commission direct staff to return with the design manuals updated according to the Planning Commission’s direction, ready for the Planning Commission to approve on July 23, 2009. (The updated manuals will be ready for review by July 9, 2009.)