



COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION

Building C Hearing Room
2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA 95667
<http://www.edcgov.us/planning>
Phone: (530) 621-5355 Fax: (530) 642-0508

Lou Rain, Chair, District I
Dave Pratt, First Vice-Chair, District II
Tom Heflin, Second Vice-Chair, District III
Walter Mathews, District IV
Alan Tolhurst, District V

Char TimClerk of the Planning Commission

MINUTES

**Regular Meeting
May 13, 2010 – 8:30 A.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 8:37 a.m. Present: Commissioners Rain, Pratt, Heflin, Mathews, and Tolhurst*; Paula Frantz-County Counsel**; and Char Tim-Clerk of the Planning Commission.

*[*Arrived at 8:38 a.m. and took his seat on the Commission.]*

*[**Arrived at 8:53 a.m. and was in attendance at the start of the public hearing portion.]*

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion: Commissioner Mathews moved, seconded by Commissioner Pratt, and carried (4-0), to adopt the agenda as presented.

AYES: Heflin, Pratt, Mathews, Rain

NOES: None

ABSENT: Tolhurst

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. CONSENT CALENDAR (All items on the Consent Calendar are to be approved by one motion unless a Commission member requests separate action on a specific item.)

a. Minutes: April 22, 2010

Motion: Commissioner Heflin moved, seconded by Commissioner Mathews, and carried (4-0), to approve the minutes of April 22, 2010.

AYES: Pratt, Mathews, Heflin, Rain

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Tolhurst

b. **Finding of General Plan Consistency: GOV10-0005** submitted by EL DORADO COUNTY for a Finding of General Plan Consistency pursuant to Government Code Section 65402 for the acquisition of real property and proposed animal shelter facility. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 109-480-21, consisting of 5.11 acres, is located on the south side of Business Drive, north of Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way in the Barnett Business Park, in the Shingle Springs area, Supervisorial District II. [*Project Planner: Mike Baron*]

Staff Recommendation: Find request consistent with the General Plan

Commissioner Heflin pulled the item from Consent Calendar for discussion. Mike Baron presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation to find the request consistent with the General Plan.

Pierre Rivas commented that this item was before the Commission for review of consistency with the General Plan in accordance with Government Code Section 65402 and that the Board of Supervisors would be taking action on the item if it moved forward. He also stated that the County was circulating a draft Negative Declaration and the public comment review period was April 23 – May 12, 2010. Mr. Rivas requested that the Commission ask the audience to restrict their comments to the Finding of Consistency of the General Plan and not on the project itself as there will be separate hearings with the Board of Supervisors on that. Chair Rain reiterated Mr. Rivas's comments to the audience.

There was discussion between Commissioner Pratt and staff as to whether Public Facilities was required, instead of Industrial. Mr. Rivas stated that an animal shelter facility, which is what is being proposed, clearly fits within Industrial and is not required to be "Public Facilities".

Commissioner Mathews stated that he does not like approving General Plan consistency requests without an actual project attached.

County Counsel Paula Frantz informed the Commission that the County has submitted an offer that is contingent on the hearing of the acquisition of the property by the Board of Supervisors which has been noticed for their May 18, 2010, meeting. She stated for today's hearing, the Commission needed to review and determine if the acquisition of the property for use as an animal shelter facility would be consistent with the General Plan.

Bill Wilde stated that per discussion with staff this week, he was led to believe that the public comment period for the Negative Declaration had not yet been opened and now was just informed that it ended yesterday. He made the following comments as to why the request cannot be found consistent with the General Plan: (1) Site is not appropriate as it will have unacceptable impacts to the two nearby neighborhoods (General Plan Policy 2.2.5.2.1); (2) Noise levels will be unacceptable (General Plan Objective 6.5.1); and (3) Previous approval of expansion of business park was inconsistent and makes the request unacceptable. Mr. Wilde encouraged the Commission to send the item back to staff for further review.

County Counsel Frantz commented that County operations need to be consistent with the General Plan but that they are not subject to the Zoning Ordinance.

Jim Shook/representative for the Milton Ranch residents stated that this was not an appropriate site and submitted a petition opposing the project.

Mike Kenison said that the business park is a good neighbor, especially at night and is concerned that the dogs will be barking during that time. He spoke with the County's Chief of Animal Services, Mr. Brzezinski, who indicated that the dogs would be inside at night but that there would be outside pens for farm animals. Mr. Kenison is concerned what this project may eventually morph into.

Jules Napoli said that he was surprised that the business park was rezoned to Industrial and felt that the area had been set up as a dump.

Hope Leja, General Manager of the Cameron Estates Community Services District, stated that the community was developed in 1959 and at that time there wasn't any Industrial zoned parcels nearby and since then that zone has been placed all along their borders. She felt that this type of action had not considered the residents in the surrounding area.

Commissioner Pratt felt that from the land use perspective, the request was consistent but he questioned the site selection as it is on the outer edge of the business park instead of being more centrally located with the business park.

Commissioner Mathews indicated that he was quite familiar with the business park and it is consistent with the Industrial zone, as is the animal shelter facility. He felt that the site itself should perhaps be mitigated due to the potential noise level of an animal shelter facility.

Commissioner Tolhurst indicated that an animal shelter facility belongs in an Industrial zone district.

Commissioner Heflin encouraged the public to follow this project to the Board of Supervisors level as the Commission can't hear what they have to say and he commended them on the large turnout.

There was no further discussion presented.

Motion: Commissioner Heflin moved, seconded by Commissioner Pratt, and carried (5-0), to find the request consistent with the General Plan.

AYES: Mathews, Tolhurst, Pratt, Heflin, Rain
NOES: None

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

5. **DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**
(Development Services, Transportation, County Counsel)

Pierre Rivas provided a summary of events regarding current planning:

- Z07-0033/PD07-0020/TM07-1448/McCann Subdivision: The Board of Supervisors heard this item on May 11, 2010 and concerns were voiced on the traffic impacts and the Mitigated Negative Declaration in regards to regional cumulative impacts on traffic. The applicants were requested to return within 120 days to submit a revised Tentative Map eliminating flagged lots and a focused Environmental Impact Report.
- COC09-0002: The Board of Supervisors approved this item on May 11, 2010.

6. **COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Pratt stated that he had attended the Board of Supervisors' Special Meeting on May 10, 2010 regarding the General Plan and had some questions. Roger Trout indicated that a detailed discussion on the General Plan with the Commission would be agendized in the near future and that Peter Maurer would be present for that item in order to answer any of their questions.

9:00 A.M.

7. **PUBLIC FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT** – None

8. **SPECIAL USE PERMIT**

a. **S09-0015/SBA Cellular Telecommunications Facility-Garden Valley** submitted by SBA TOWERS, INC. (Agent: Gary Mapa/Site Acquisition Resultants, Inc.) to allow the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility to include a 100-foot tall monopine tower with 12 antennas at the 98-foot level and ground support equipment to be located in a 60-foot by 90-foot fenced lease area. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 088-420-06, consisting of 5.033 acres, is located on the south side of Sagebrush Road, approximately 500 feet west of the intersection with Mt. Murphy Road, in the Garden Valley area, Supervisorial District IV. [*Project Planner: Tom Dougherty*] (Mitigated negative declaration prepared)*

Tom Dougherty presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation of approval. He stated that the primary concerns were noise and aesthetics.

Gary Mapa/applicant's agent said that the tower would represent a Foothill Pine tree, be color-matched to the other surrounding trees and the branches would be positioned to eliminate a lollipop effect. He indicated that the submitted Staff Report was accurate.

In response to Chair Rain's inquiry if the branches could be placed in an unsymmetrical pattern, Mr. Mapa stated that he did not foresee any issues in designing the tower with that in mind.

Paul Albritton, Counsel for SBA, stated that the pine cell towers are very expensive and well designed. He summarized the contents in his letter dated May 11, 2010 regarding the federal law and what could and could not be used for denial of this project.

Jeff Burch, adjacent neighbor, said the majority of the neighbors were opposed to this project and since the property owner never contacted them in advance, they now find themselves in the position of fighting this project in this type of setting. He indicated that the tower would be visible from his property and his family would be subjected to the constant noise from the equipment. Mr. Burch said that he conducted two site visits at other cell towers and found the noise level from the equipment to be unacceptable. He felt that the neighbors would be negatively impacted by this project while the owner financially benefited.

Debra Burch, adjacent neighbor, felt that her viewscape and quality of life is important and that the property owner and SBA had no concern on the negative impacts to the neighborhood.

Carol Galvin, neighbor, indicated neither the property owner nor SBA ever contacted the neighbors regarding this project. She felt that the 100 foot cell tower tree would stick out since the other surrounding trees are not even close to that height. Ms. Galvin also voiced the following concerns: (1) Noise impact; and (2) Potential health risks due to close proximity. She encouraged the Commission to deny the request.

Richard Smith, Garden Valley resident and Verizon customer, indicated that he was very interested in obtaining cell service at his home but perhaps the cell tower was being proposed for the wrong location as he questioned whether or not the frequency waves would actually be able to reach Garden Valley due to the cell tower height and the surrounding terrain.

Sandy Mancusco lives at one of the identified alternative sites and felt her site would be less intrusive than the current selected site.

Mr. Albritton provided a rebuttal to audience concerns regarding noise, health issues, scenic views, and traffic/asbestos issues.

Doug Picard, applicant's engineer, agreed with Mr. Smith's comments that radio frequency waves are primarily "line of sight" and terrain-limited, but there were also height limitations since a cell tower located too high would cause other complications. He indicated that the proposed site had desirable attributes and obtained the preferred coverage area, whereas the Mancusco site had some disadvantages.

Significant discussion ensued between Mr. Picard and the Commission in regards to alternative site issues, State park's stance on cell tower visibility, necessity/driving force for that particular coverage area, federal law guidelines, and whisper equipment.

In response to Commissioner Pratt's inquiry, County Counsel Paul Frantz stated that the Commission had areas of discretion that have been curtailed by Federal law for this particular type of project and that the Commission can still review the compatibility, aesthetics and noise of

the project. However, if this project was approved, then it would be treated similar to other Special Use Permits in that if the terms were violated, a revocation hearing could occur.

Commissioner Pratt was in agreement with Chair Rain's earlier comment on utilizing whisper units to minimize the noise impact. He felt that the submitted noise study appeared to be an analysis on the equipment and not specifically on the proposed site, and, therefore, more noise mitigation was needed. Mr. Picard suggested that the Commission add a condition that requires a post-installation acoustic analysis.

Commissioner Mathews stated his issues with the project were visibility and noise. He understood that the valley needs coverage but it was important to weigh the needs of the neighbors vs the needs of the service in the valley. Commissioner Mathews was not satisfied that the proposed location was the best location but valid points had been made by the applicant as to why that site was chosen over the alternative sites.

Chair Rain agreed that the proposed site was "do-able" although, optimally, he would have preferred the Mancusco site location.

Commissioner Heflin voiced concern on the tree branches being symmetrical and wanted to mitigate the noise by requiring damper kits. He stated that it would be difficult to select a location that was agreeable by everyone involved.

In response to Commissioner Pratt's concern of dust mitigation, it was stated that Condition #20 currently addressed it.

Staff read into the record proposed language to amend Condition #2 regarding noise mitigation and stated that they would amend Condition #5 to address the symmetry issue regarding the tree branches.

No further discussion was presented.

Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Rain, and carried (4-1), to take the following actions: 1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, based on the Initial Study prepared by staff; 2. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15074(d), incorporating the Mitigation Measures in the Conditions of Approval as presented; and 3. Approve Special Use Permit S09-0015 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as modified: (a) Amend Condition #2 with language provided; and (b) Amend Condition #5 to require asymmetry in the tree branches.

AYES: Heflin, Tolhurst, Rain, Pratt
NOES: Mathews

This action can be appealed to the Board of Supervisors within ten (10) working days.

Findings

Based on the review and analysis of this project by staff and affected agencies, and supported by discussion in the staff report and evidence in the record, the following findings can be made:

1.0 CEQA Findings

- 1.1 El Dorado County has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration together with the comments received during the public review process. The proposed project, as conditioned, will not have a significant effect on the environment. The Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and is adequate for this proposal.
- 1.2 The Planning Commission finds that through feasible conditions and mitigation placed upon the project, impacts on the environment have been eliminated or substantially mitigated.
- 1.3 Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires the County to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The approved project description and conditions of approval, with the corresponding permit monitoring requirement, is hereby adopted as the monitoring program for this project. The monitoring program is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.
- 1.4 The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is base are in the custody of the Development Services-Planning Services at 2850 Fairlane Court, Placerville, CA.

2.0 General Plan Findings

- 2.1 As conditioned, mitigated, and with strict adherence to county Codes, the proposal is consistent with the intent of 2.2.5.2 (review for General Plan consistency), 2.2.5.21 (compatibility with surroundings), 6.2.3.2 (adequate access), 6.5.1.2, 6.5.1.7 (noise), and 7.4.2.9 (biological corridor) because the project would have minimal impacts on visual resources, existing utilities, access, existing emergency response times, and on a biological corridor. There are adequate services to facilitate the site, such as water, power and solid waste. The project provides improved cellular service for phone, as well as internet and emergency communications to the Garden Valley and Coloma areas.

3.0 Zoning Findings

- 3.1 The project is zoned Residential 10-Acre, which allows wireless telecommunication facilities by Special Use Permit, provided they follow standards and permitting requirements defined in Section 17.14.210 of the County Code. These standards include screening, compliance with setbacks, and proper maintenance.

- 3.2 As proposed and conditioned, the project meets all applicable development standards contained within the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance because sufficient screening, setbacks and maintenance, have been provided.

4.0 Special Use Permit Findings

- 4.1 **The issuance of the permit is consistent with the General Plan.** The applicant's proposal has been determined to be in compliance with County regulations, addressing environmental issues and health and safety concerns. As discussed above, the proposal is consistent with the applicable General Plan Policies and all potential project-related environmental issues, and the benefits to the community have been evaluated. Therefore, staff finds that the project, as conditioned, conforms to the General Plan. The proposed use is consistent with the policies in the El Dorado County General Plan, as discussed in the General Plan section of this staff report. The proposed use is consistent with all applicable policies including Policy 5.6.1.4 (Special Use Permit required) because the aesthetics of the proposed collocation and related ground equipment have been designed to minimize the effects on adjacent properties. The proposed antennas will be painted to match the existing branches. The proposed ground equipment will be screened from adjacent land uses by existing chain-link fencing with colored slats and native trees and shrubs which will buffer the enclosure from local views.

- 4.2 **The proposed use would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, or injurious to the neighborhood,** based on the conclusions contained in the staff report. The use will not conflict with the adjacent uses as it will be buffered from view by landscaping and brown slatted chain link fencing. The minimal grading and foundation work will not cause significant environmental impacts. The project will result in insignificant environmental, visual, noise, and traffic impacts to surrounding residents and businesses, based on established thresholds. Further, the new wireless telecommunications facility will provide wireless cellular telecommunication services to the Coloma and Garden Valley communities. After review of the submitted site plan and upon consultations with concerned agencies, it has been determined that the impacts of allowing the construction wireless telecommunications facility, will not have a detrimental affect nor be injurious to the neighborhood. The proposed use would not create hazards that would be considered detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare, or injurious to the neighborhood based on the data and conclusions contained in the Staff Report. At less than one percent of the public safety standard established by the FCC, the risk of emissions to the public is remote.

- 4.3 **The proposed use is specifically permitted by Special Use Permit.**

Section 17.14.200 (D) (3) of the County Code requires a Special Use Permit for collocation of new antennas on existing non-building structures or public facilities. Section 17.22 outlines the requirements for Special Use Permits and the project and associated materials have been reviewed in accordance with this section. The proposed use complies with the requirements of County Code Sections 17.14.210 (E) through (J)

and 17.36.210 thru 17.36.260. As proposed, the project is consistent with these requirements.

Conditions of Approval

Planning Services

1. This Special Use Permit is based upon and limited to compliance with the project description, the hearing exhibits marked Exhibits A through N, and conditions of approval set forth below. Any deviations from the project description, exhibits, or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the County for conformity with this approval. Deviations may require approved changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

The project description is as follows:

Approval of the Special Use Permit allows the construction and operation of a new wireless telecommunications facility to support cellular transmission consisting of a 100-foot tall monopine tower with four antennas in three sectors (total of 12 antennas), mounted at the 98-foot level, with a 12-foot by 16-foot, 10 feet tall equipment shelter and associated ground support equipment to be located within a 60-foot by 90-foot lease area enclosed by a six-foot tall chain link fence to obscure the view of the ground support equipment. The monopine shall accommodate up to four additional future antenna arrays on the tower and up to four additional future equipment shelters within the lease area, for a maximum of five total carriers or arrays. The equipment shelter subject of this approval will include two wall-mounted HVAC units and one emergency generator. The fencing and tower base shall be buffered by native landscape shrubs and trees with brown slatting installed into the fence. The remainder of the fenced in area for the tower shall be graveled to allow for future development to accommodate additional network's radio equipment. The monopine shall accommodate up to five antenna arrays.

CONDITIONS FROM THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DELECRATION

The following mitigation measure is required as a means to reduce potential significant environmental effects to a level of insignificance:

2. **NOISE-1:** To avoid having project noise levels exceed the General Plan noise standards, The project's equipment shelter shall be rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise putting the two air conditioners and emergency backup generator on the east side of the equipment shelter, as shown in Figure 4 as shown in the Noise Analysis Report for Verizon Coloma, dated February 25, 2010, and prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates.

Monitoring Responsibility: Planning Services

Monitoring Requirement: Planning Services shall verify that the air conditioners and emergency generator are placed in the prescribed location prior to issuance of final occupancy for the building permit. A post-construction acoustical analysis shall be provided to Planning Services for review and approval that confirms that the project site meets the General Plan noise standards prior to issuance of final occupancy.

Planning Services Site Specific and Standard Conditions

3. Project improvements shall be completed in conformance with the plans submitted and in conformance with the conditions of approval herein and shall substantially comply with Exhibits E1 to F-12. Minor variations are allowed, however, any major changes in the design of buildings, location of buildings, access ways, and parking shall require review and approval by the Planning Services prior to project modifications.
4. Prior to commencement of any use authorized by this permit, the applicant shall provide a written description, together with appropriate documentation, showing conformance of the project with each condition imposed as part of the project approval. The applicant shall also schedule an inspection by Planning Services for verification of compliance with applicable conditions of approval. The operator shall pay Planning Services for the time spent reviewing the site on a time and materials basis. All future development plans shall include this condition on the submitted plans.
5. All equipment shelters, cabinets or other auxiliary structures shall be painted in a matching color. The chain link fence shall be covered entirely by dark green or brown colored plastic or wood slats. Said fence shall not have gaps at any portion where it touches ground level. No antenna shall project out past the "branch" tips. The "branches" shall be installed with random lengths that create an asymmetrical appearance. All facility RF antennas shall be painted with non-reflective paint and maintained to match the color of the branches. Colors of the monopine, antennas, and other appurtenances shall be maintained to ensure the appearance remains consistent and so that nothing on the tower causes a reflection of light. All improvements associated with the facility, including equipment shelters, towers, antenna, fencing, and landscape shall be properly maintained in good visual repair at all times. The monopine shall be maintained in order to provide a quality and aesthetically pleasing exterior finish, including maintenance and upkeep. Planning Services shall verify the painting of the structures and antennas, said fence conditions and antenna projections within the "branches," prior to issuance of final occupancy for the building permit.
6. Native landscape shrubs and trees shall be planted around the entire fenced area as shown in Exhibit E-10. All landscaping associated with the wireless telecommunications facility shall be properly maintained and shall be irrigated when necessary to promote and maintain growth. Applicant shall install and maintain landscaping in accordance with the approved landscaping plan in perpetuity or unless otherwise modified through any future permit. Proof that the landscaping has been installed as described shall be received by Planning Services prior to issuance of final occupancy.

7. One exterior emergency light is approved and shall conform to the approved exterior light shown in Exhibit H. The light shall comply with County Code Section 17.14.170, and be fully shielded pursuant to the Illumination Engineering Society of North America's (IESNA) full cut-off designation. The final lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval by Planning Services with the building permit application and shall be reviewed for conformance with Exhibit H prior to issuance of a building permit. The light shall be activated with motion-sensor or timer.

Should final, installed lighting be non-compliant with full shielding requirements, the applicant shall be responsible for the replacement and/or modification of said lighting to the satisfaction of Planning Services.

8. The applicant shall assume full responsibility for resolving television reception interference or other electrical interference caused by the operation of this facility. The applicant shall take corrective action within 30 days of the receipt of any written complaint.
9. Expansions to the lease area, increases in pole height, or additional antennas mounted on the monopine shall be subject to review and approval by the Development Services Director. Should the Director find that additional lease area, height or antennas may create a significant visual impact, the Director shall decide if the changes can be approved administratively or will be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator or the Planning Commission through an amendment to this Special Use Permit.
10. The applicant shall consent to the co-location of other wireless telecommunication communication users on their monopine when the increase in pole height would be undesirable. All new collocations, and/or addition of any new piece of equipment that creates noise, shall be subject to the submittal of an acoustical analysis for review and approval by the Development Services Director. Should the Director find that additional noise may create a significant impact; the Director shall decide if the changes can be approved administratively or will be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator or the Planning Commission through an amendment to this Special Use Permit.
11. All obsolete or unused communication facilities shall be removed within six months after the use of that facility has ceased or the facility has been abandoned. The applicant shall notify Planning Services at the time of abandonment and all disturbance related to the communication facility shall be restored to pre-project conditions.
12. Due to the ever-changing technology of wireless communication systems, this Special Use Permit shall be reviewed by the County Development Services Department every five years. At each five-year review, the permit holder shall provide the Development Services Department with a status report on the then current use of the subject site and related equipment. Development Services shall review the status and present that report to the approving authority with a recommendation whether to:

(A) Allow the facility to continue to operate under all applicable conditions; or

- (B) Hold a public hearing to determine whether to modify the conditions of approval in order to reduce identified adverse impacts; or initiate proceedings to revoke the special use permit, requiring the facility's removal if it is no longer an integral part of the wireless communications system.

By operation of this condition, it is the intent of County to reserve the right to modify or add new conditions, consistent with the language specified above. The failure of the County to conduct or complete a five-year review in a timely fashion shall not invalidate the Special Use Permit. The applicant shall pay a fee determined by the Development Services Director to cover the cost of processing a five-year review on a time and materials basis.

13. The operator (lessee) and property owner (lessor) are responsible for complying with all conditions of approval contained in this Special Use Permit. Any zoning violations concerning the installation, operation, and/or abandonment of the facility are the responsibility of the owner and the operator.
14. The applicant shall make the actual and full payment of Planning Services processing fees for the Special Use Permit application prior to issuance of any County development permit.
15. If human remains are discovered at any time during the subdivision improvement phase, the County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted per Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code. The procedures set forth in Supplementary Document J, Section VIII, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines concerning treatment of the remains shall be followed. If archaeological sites or artifacts are discovered, the subdivider shall retain an archaeologist to evaluate the resource.

If the resource is determined to be important, as defined in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures, as agreed to by the subdivider, archaeologist, and Planning Services shall be implemented. Treatment of Native American remains and/or archaeological artifacts shall be the responsibility of the subdivider and shall be subject to review and approval by Planning Services.

16. The applicant shall submit to Planning Services a \$50.00 recording fee and a \$2,010.25 Department of Fish and Game fee prior to filing of the Notice of Determination by the County. No permits shall be issued or Certificate of Compliance issued until said fees are paid.
17. In the event of any legal action instituted by a third party challenging the validity of any provision of this approval, the developer and landowner agree to be responsible for the costs of defending such suit and shall hold County harmless from any legal fees or costs County may incur as a result of such action.

The developer and land owner shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless El Dorado County and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against El Dorado County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of El Dorado County concerning a Special Use Permit.

The County shall notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding, and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense.

El Dorado County Department of Transportation

18. The applicant shall construct the encroachment onto Sagebrush Road per El Dorado County DISM Standard Plan 103B-1. The improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of DOT or the applicant shall obtain an approved improvement agreement with security, prior to issuance of a building permit.

El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (AQMD)

19. AQMD Rule 223.2, which addresses the regulations and mitigation measures for natural occurring asbestos dust emissions, shall be adhered to during the construction process. Mitigation measures for the control of naturally occurring asbestos dust shall comply with the requirements of Rule 223.2. In addition, an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan (ADMP) Application shall be submitted along with the appropriate fees to and approved by the AQMD prior to issuance of any development permit.
20. The project shall pave any road or exposed surface which allows vehicular travel or the application of a minimum of three (3) inches in depth, asbestos free gravel.

El Dorado County Environmental Management-Hazardous Waste Division

21. If the commercial facilities will store reportable quantities of hazardous materials (55 gallons) or generate hazardous waste, prior to commencing operations the owner/operator must:
 - (A) Prepare, submit and implement a hazardous materials business plan and pay appropriate fees.
 - (B) Obtain a hazardous waste generator identification number from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
 - (C) Train all employees to properly handle hazardous materials and wastes.
 - (D) Implement proper hazardous materials and hazardous waste storage methods in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code and Uniform Building Code.

Garden Valley Fire Protection District

22. The applicant shall provide a low priority "Knox" padlock on the access gate. Applications for both high and low security "Knox" systems are provided at the District office. Proof of compliance with said condition shall be received by the District prior to issuance of final occupancy of a building permit.

23. Applicant shall provide a high priority "Knox Box" to access the cabinets, (if not already provided), and keys for all cabinets shall be placed within the "Knox Box." Proof of compliance with said condition shall be received by the District prior to issuance of final occupancy of a building permit.
24. The applicant shall install one 2A10BC Fire Extinguisher shall be mounted inside a weather resistant fire extinguisher box within the lease area. Proof of compliance with said condition shall be received by the District prior to issuance of final occupancy of a building permit.
25. Vegetation control shall be required 100 feet in all directions of the fenced enclosure and tower or the property line whichever is closer. Proof of compliance with said condition shall be received by the District prior to issuance of final occupancy of a building permit.
26. The access driveway to the fenced enclosure and turnaround shall be capable of supporting a 75,000 pound load. The District shall review and approve the location and design of the access road and turnaround prior to issuance of a grading permit.

b. **S09-0022/AT&T Communications Tower-Placerville** submitted by AT&T (Agent: Jacob Reeves/The Lyle Company) to allow the construction of a wireless communications facility to include a 68-foot tall monopine tower to include 12 antennas at the 60-foot level with ground support equipment to be located within a 30-foot by 30-foot fenced lease area.. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 323-250-32 and 323-250-33, consisting of 3.55 acres, is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Kelli Drive and Cold Springs Road, in the Placerville area, Supervisorial District III. [*Project Planner: Tom Dougherty*] (Negative declaration prepared)*

Tom Dougherty informed the Commission that the applicant was requesting the project be continued to a date specific, to the next available hearing.

County Counsel Paula Frantz stated that since the applicant was requesting the continuance in order to obtain more information on an alternative site, a two week continuance may not be adequate time for staff to review the impacts of the new site location.

Jacob Reeves/applicant's agent stated that although the May 27, 2010, meeting would be a rush on their end, it was still their preferred date.

Chair Rain indicated that since the June 10, 2010 meeting had been cancelled, the June 24, 2010, meeting would be the next available meeting that would allow appropriate time for staff review and an opportunity for the applicant to meet with the community regarding the proposed project.

Barbara Winn, AT&T representative, was reluctant to have the project moved to the June 24, 2010 meeting as she wanted to keep it on track in order to meet certain deadlines. She stated that

she had just recently become involved in the project and understood the importance of involving the community regarding the proposed project.

County Counsel Frantz stated that the basics of a project (i.e., location) are very important to know as it could alter study results and staff would need to determine if the new site location would require a re-circulation of the environmental document. Therefore, a two week continuance would not be adequate time.

Commissioner Mathews reminded the applicant that the Commission had received a large amount of public comment opposing the project as it is currently proposed.

No further discussion was presented.

Motion: Commissioner Pratt moved, seconded by Commissioner Mathews, and carried (5-0), to continue the item to the June 24, 2010, meeting.

AYES: Heflin, Tolhurst, Mathews, Pratt, Rain

NOES: None

c. **S09-0017** submitted by THOMAS WILLIAMS (Agent: Larry Garrett) to allow the following: (1) Expand an existing retail center to include a used auto dealer with an 11,400 square foot outdoor sales area and 943 square feet of office space; (2) Incorporate a Master Parking Program for the retail center; and (3) Approve a Master Sign Program for the retail center to include the following: (a) Approve a freestanding "Sunset Village" identification sign to be 10 feet in height and 4 feet in width; and (b) Approve a phased program for parapet wall signs. Parapet wall signs would be 4 feet in height and 8 feet in width. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 090-430-43, 090-430-44, and 090-430-01, consisting of 3.34 acres, is located on the north side of Mother Lode Drive, approximately one-fourth mile east of the intersection with French Creek Road, in the Shingle Springs area, Supervisorial District IV. *[Project Planner: Gina Paolini]* (Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines)**

Gina Paolini presented the item to the Commission with a recommendation of approval.

Larry Garrett/agent indicated that the intent of this request was to clean up the property and bring it up to code. He stated that both property owners have since passed away and the children of the deceased are now proceeding with this project. Mr. Garrett said that their main concern was that the surrounding parcels would not be held accountable to the same standards as they would be required to follow.

Mark Weiner, adjacent business owner, relayed the numerous incidents that have occurred on his property regarding illegal parking from customers of the auto dealer. He would like to see a sign designating a particular customer parking area for auto dealer.