DRC / CC / BD / Gary
e-mail to
9/30/14

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION

AUBURN OFFICE
3091 County Center Dr, Auburn, CA 95603
530-745-3000/FAX 530-745-3080
Website : www.placer.ca.gov
E-mail : planning@placer.ca.gov

TAHOE OFFICE
775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96146
PO Box 1909, Tahoe City, CA 96145
530-581-6280/FAX 530-581-6282

RECEIVED
SEP 29 2014
CDRA

PLANNING APPEALS

The specific regulations regarding appeal procedures may be found in the Placer County Code, Chapters 16 (Subdivision), 17 (Planning and Zoning), and 18 (Environmental Review Ordinance).

-----OFFICE USE ONLY-----

Last Day to Appeal 9/29/14 (5 pm)
Letter
Oral Testimony ✓
Zoning RA-B-X 4.6
Maps: 7-full size and 1 reduced for Planning Commission items

Appeal Fee $ $536
Date Appeal Filed 9/29/14
Receipt #
Received by EDB
Geographic Area

-----TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT-----

1. Project name Miles Residential Care Home
2. Appellant(s) Dena DeLapp
   Telephone Number Fax Number
   Address 3745 DeLapp Pl Loomis CA 95650
   City State Zip Code
3. Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 043-164-062-000
   7968 Rasmussen Rd
4. Application being appealed (check all those that apply) Application Number

	Administrative Approval	043-164-062
X	Use Permit	PMPB 20120102
	Parcel Map	
	General Plan Amendment	
	Specific Plan	
	Environmental Review	
	Minor Boundary Line Adjustment	
	Tentative Map	
	Variance	
	Design Review	
	Rezoning	
	Rafting Permit	
	Planning Director Interpretation _____ *(date)*	
	Other:	

5. Whose decision is being appealed: _____ (see reverse)
6. Appeal to be heard by: _____ (see reverse)
7. Reason for appeal (attach additional sheet if necessary and be specific):

Approval of Multiple Structures on property to allow for Multiple Senior residential Care Facilities

(If you are appeal[illegible] oject condition only, please state the condition number)

ATTACHMENT A

Note: Applicants may be required to submit additional project plans/maps.

Signature of Appellant(s) Dean DeLapp 9/29/14

PLACER COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 17.60.110

Rulings made by the below are considered by the Planning Commission:

- Planning Director (interpretations)
- Zoning Administrator
- Design/Site Review Committee
- Parcel Review Committee - other than road improvements which should be appealed to the Director of Public Works
- Environmental Review Committee

Rulings made by the Planning Commission are appealed directly to the Board of Supervisors.

Rulings made by the Development Review Committee are appealed to the hearing body having original jurisdiction

Note: An appeal must be filed within 10 calendar days of the date of the decision. Appeals filed more than 10 days after the decision shall not be accepted by the Planning Division.

For exact specifications on an appeal, please refer to Section 17.60.110 of the Placer County Code.

This is submitted on behalf of the Neighbors on Rasmussen Road, Loomis Ca. I want to bring to your attention respectfully that this is not a "Not In My Neighborhood" issue. Our neghborhood did not contest the exisiting Loomis Care Home Mr. Miles built [already in existance with 6 residents and employees]. Nor had we contested any of the other four residences Mr. Miles has in the Loomis surrounding area. This is a plea to not change rural area on Rasmussen Road and not affect our families, agriculture, wildlife or the land we have in in our neighborhood. Please preserve the Placer County Plan related to rual neighborhoods when you make your consideration and the affect it would have if Placer County were to approve four separate buildings on one property 'as one residence' and 'minimal impact' in the area. We state the following as examples:

RECEIVED
SEP 2 9 2014
CDRA

1. County Memorandum sites *"minimal impact on the neighborhood...and no impact against the county plan, less than significant measures against the environment, "*. I refer to Federal State and Local Requirements from the California State Library referencing a Change in neighborhood (included):

   A reasonable accommodation is determined on a case-by-case basis. Local governments can deny a request for reasonable accommodation if it would "fundamentally alter the nature of the ordinance, neighborhood, or local zoning procedures; undermine the legitimate purposes and effects of existing zoning regulations; or impose undue financial and administrative burdens on the municipality."[13]

   Our neighborhood is rural, with a dead end road – no outlet. Approval of multiple buildings [three physically separate buildings and an additional pool house] on one property is against the County Plan, changes zoning procedures, undermines the existing zoning regulstaion and imposes undue financial burdens on the municipality because of fencing, agriculture and the animal pastures.

2. County Memorandum states: *"Per section 17.56.180(c)(4), a guest home must be clearly subordinant to the primary use of the property – in this case, residential. The correspondence is correct in that the guest home, as defined, cannot be used as a permanent residence. It is also a correct statement that a house the size of 3,260 square feet cannot be defined as a secondary residence.*
The Mitigated Negative Decaration includes a discussion of the current development on the property, including the existing single-family residence, secondary residence and the guest house. However, should the Minor Use Permit be approved, the secondary residence and the guest house will collectively be converted into a residential care home, and will be required to meet all standards imposed by the approval of the care home. As a result, the definition of a secondary residence and a guest home as included in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance will no longer apply."

Please refer to Appendix C State Law Related Residential Care Facilities Health and Safety Section (included) which clearly explains a single family residence is six or fewer considered residential use of the property; residents and operators are considered a family for zoning purposes. The Miles Residential Care Home is being requested in addition to the already in existence Residential Loomis Home Care on the same property. Also in reference to Apendix C there is discussion of overconcentration which is again against State Law.

3. County comment on Memorandum states: *"Generally, commercial uses are required to construct frontage improvements along the portion of the County maintained roadway that the parcel fronts. In this case, the parcel frontage measures approximately 260 feet along Rasmussen Road. Rather than have the project construct one-half of a 24 foot road section where the project fronts Rasmussen Road, staff worked with the applicant on a roughly proportional alternative. In-lieu of the frontage improvement requirement, the applicant will reconstruct the full width of the first 50 feet of Rasmussen Road, which will include the relocation of a joint power pole that, as it exists today, currently impedes two-way traffic near the intersection. In addition, the applicant will construct a minimum of two paved roadway turnouts along Rasmussen Road to improve access to the project site. Staff concluded that these improvements will provide a greater benefit to the public in terms of vehicle safety and emergency response than what would have been provided with the typical required frontage improvements."*

This decision is against the Loomis Fire Protection District requirement (letter included) that was required and states the turn out for vehicles to be in front of the property [Mile's property location] a "twenty foot wide section of roadway at least 30 feet long with a taper at each end". Given the width of the road infront of Mr. Mile's property and directly across the street from a family home – there is no room to build that requirement as stated and required by the Loomis Fire District and part of Placer Counties original approval requirement. So therefore the County approved an alternative that is against the Fire Districts requirements, and against State Law.

Also 4. Wildlife regularly travels through this area. This is part of the Secrete Ravine waterway. There were coyotes regularly in this neighborhood that have been displaced by the recent building. Other wildlife like deer, cougar, turkeys, geese, fox, rabbits, etc.

included: 17.56.230. Single Family dwelling definition AND Environmental issues/impact

RECEIVED
SEP 2 9 2014
CDRA

Appendix C – State Laws Related to Siting of Residential Care Facilities

AUTHORITY	SUBJECT	REQUIREMENT
Health and Safety (H&S) Code Section 1267.8	Zoning – Health facilities	Licensed residential health facilities with six or fewer persons and congregate care facilities are considered residential use of property; residents and operators are considered a family for zoning purposes.
H&S Code Section 1267.9	Overconcentration – Health facilities	State policy to prevent overconcentration of health facilities. New facilities must be 300 feet or more from existing residential health or community care facilities (except for Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly); congregate living facilities must be 1000 feet or more from other existing facilities. Local government must approve requests for shorter distances.
H&S Code Section 1250.5	Overconcentration – Community Care Facilities (Group Homes, Adult Residential Facilities, Social Rehabilitation Facilities)	State policy to prevent overconcentration of residential care facilities. New facilities must be 300 feet or more from existing community care facilities (except for Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly). Local government must approve requests for shorter distances.
H&S Code Section 1566.3	Zoning – Community Care Facilities (Group Homes, Adult Residential Facilities, Social Rehabilitation Facilities)	Licensed residential community care facilities with six or fewer persons are considered residential use of property; residents and operators are considered a family for zoning purposes.
H&S Code Section 1569.85	Zoning – Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly	Licensed residential care facilities for the elderly with six or fewer persons are considered residential use of property; residents and operators are considered a family for zoning purposes.
H&S Code Section 11834	Legislative Intent Local Regulation/ Zoning – Alcoholism or Drug Abuse Recovery or Treatment Facilities	State policy that each county and city allow and encourage enough recovery or treatment facilities to meet local needs. Licensed facilities that serve six or fewer persons are not subject to any local taxes, permits or fees not applicable to single-family homes; facilities are considered residential use of property; residents and operators are considered a family for zoning purposes.

AUTHORITY	SUBJECT	REQUIREMENT
Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code Section 5115	Legislative Intent Zoning – Persons with disabilities	State policy that persons with disabilities are entitled to live in normal residential surroundings. Care of six or fewer persons with disabilities is residential use of property for zoning purposes.
W&I Code Section 5116	Zoning – Facilities for children	Licensed family care or group home for six or fewer children with disabilities or dependent and neglected children is considered residential use of property for zoning purposes.

12

LOOMIS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

P.O. BOX 606
LOOMIS, CALIFORNIA 95650
(916) 652-6813
FAX (916) 652-8472

DIRECTORS
John Shearer, President
Dennis Gage, Vice President
Bryan Thomson
William M. Tudsbury
Chris Gibson

Dave Wheeler, Fire Chief
Barbara Leak, District Secretary

May 21, 2012

Placer County
Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

RECEIVED
SEP 2 9 2014
CDRA

Attn: Melanie Jackson

Re: Mile Residential Care Home – PMPB T20120102

Dear Ms. Jackson:

The Loomis Fire District requirements for this project are as follows:

1. Provide an on-site water storage tank with a capacity of at least 6000 gallons. A fire department suction connection must be piped from the tank to an appropriate location for fire department use as it might relate to any structure on the property.

2. Provide a turn-out for vehicles in front of the property. This may essentially involve provision of a twenty foot wide section of roadway at least 30 feet long, with a taper at each end.

3. Conform to the requirements contained in the California Building Code for a R3.1 occupancy.

If there are any questions regarding these requirements, do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

David L. Wheeler, Fire Chief
Loomis Fire District

cc: Sharon Boswell

RECEIVED
SEP 2 9 2014
CDRA

3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN)				X
4. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN)				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:
The project site is designated as "other land" as shown on the West Placer County Important Farmlands map. Although some agricultural uses, such as small crops, are located within the vicinity of the project site, land use buffers that exist between the project site and these agricultural uses satisfy the requirements of the Placer County General Plan and the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan. The property is not part of a Williamson Contract and is not in conflict with a Right-to-Farm Policy because there are no agricultural uses within the vicinity that would be impacted by the proposed use, due to the distance between these properties and the subject property. Additionally, the project will not impact or convert farmland within the area for the same reasons. The project site is not located within an environment suitable for forest lands and therefore, forest lands will not be affected by the project.

There is pastures for Cows and wild lifk

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	

Discussion- Item III-1:
The project is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) portion of Placer County and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). Although the SVAB is designated as nonattainment for federal and state ozone (O_3) standards, nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard ($PM_{2.5}$) and state particulate matter standard (PM_{10}), the project will not contribute a significant impact to the Region given that the project related emissions are below the District's thresholds of significance. Therefore the project will not result in a significant obstruction to the Sacramento Regional Air Quality Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:
As stated above, the SVAB is designated non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standards (ROG and NO_x), nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard ($PM_{2.5}$) and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard (PM_{10}).

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items I-1,2:
The subject property is not located within a scenic vista or a state scenic highway and as a result, will not have an adverse effect on scenic resources.

Discussion- Item I-3:
The subject property consists of 5.1 acres and is developed with a single-family residence, a secondary residence, a guest house, a pool and improved driveways and parking areas. The implementation of the project will require the construction of access and fire suppression improvements that will involve minor grading activities on and off the project site. These improvements include widening portions of Rasmussen Road (approximately 1,200 square feet), construction of a concrete pad for the placement of a new 6,000 gallon water storage tank and approximately 265 lineal feet of on-site trenching to construct a water line between the proposed tank and an existing water tank near the existing single-family residence. These activities have the potential to degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

However, possible visual impacts resulting from the proposed project will not rise to the level of a significant impact because the majority the project site is already developed. No new structures would be required for the operation of the residential care center and few trees will be removed. While the access road will require improvements, these improvements will be minor. The required concrete pad and 6,000 gallon water tank would be located in an inconspicuous area where it will be screened from Rasmussen Road and neighboring properties. For these reasons, impacts resulting from improvements on or around the project site would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item I-4:
The project does not propose additional lighting beyond what is existing on the project site.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X

14. During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed unless permitted by the PCAPCD. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site.

Discussion- Item III-4:
The project includes grading operations which would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel PM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Because of the dispersive properties of diesel PM and the temporary nature of the mobilized equipment use, short-term construction-generated TAC emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item III-5:
The project would result in additional air pollutant emissions generated by diesel-powered construction equipment, and vehicle exhaust from traffic that could create odors. However, the long-term operational emissions (vehicle traffic) from this project alone will not exceed the District's significant thresholds. Therefore, potential impacts from odors will be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)		X		
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)			X	
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)		X		
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)		X		
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites? (PLN)		X		
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources? (PLN)		X		
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or				X

16

The majority of the protected trees that may be impacted by the proposed project are located within disturbed areas that are developed as Rasmussen Road and road shoulders. However, trees in the project area may be disturbed or removed as a part of the road improvements. While possible impacts to oaks or other protected trees in the area are considered minimal, the following mitigation measure is required to ensure that any impacts remain at a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures- Item IV-7:
MM IV.3 Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, trees identified for removal, and/or trees with disturbance to its critical root zone, shall be mitigated through replacement with comparable species on-site, in an area to be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) or through payment of in-lieu fees, as follows:

1. For each diameter inch of a tree removed, replacement shall be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees would equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate). If replacement tree planting is proposed, the tree replacement/mitigation plan must be shown on Improvements Plans and must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC). At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.
2. In lieu of the tree planting mitigation for tree removal listed above, a tree replacement mitigation fee of $100 per diameter inch at breast height for each tree removed or impacted or the current market value, as established by an Arborist, Forester or Registered Landscape Architect, of the replacement trees,

Discussion- Item IV-8:
Placer County does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including these interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Items V-1,2,3,4,5:
A Cultural Resources Records Search for the project site was performed by North Central Information Center on February 28, 2014. The study determined that there are no known historical resources, archaeological resources, unique paleontological resources or geologic features on the project site. No religious or sacred uses exist on the subject property or the properties within its immediate vicinity. As a result, implementation of a residential care home on the project site will not create significant impacts.

65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Item VIII-1:
The use of hazardous materials during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:
The project will not involve the use of hazardous materials.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:
There are no known existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed use. The closest known school is Placer Elementary School, which is approximately 0.8 miles southeast of the parcel.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:
The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 95962.5.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6,7:
The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project site is not located in an area that would expose people or structures to risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires because the property is not located in an area where there are wildlands.

Discussion- Items VIII-8,9:
The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment or expose people to existing sources of public health hazards.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells			X	

65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Item VIII-1:
The use of hazardous materials during normal construction activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:
The project will not involve the use of hazardous materials.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:
There are no known existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed use. The closest known school is Placer Elementary School, which is approximately 0.8 miles southeast of the parcel.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:
The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 95962.5.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6,7:
The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project site is not located in an area that would expose people or structures to risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires because the property is not located in an area where there are wildlands.

Discussion- Items VIII-8,9:
The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment or expose people to existing sources of public health hazards.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells			X	

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:
The proposed project will require the widening of approximately 50 lineal feet of Rasmussen Road and two paved turnouts adjacent to this existing road. The area of disturbance for these improvements is less than 1,000 square feet and will create a minor disruption of soils. The potential to degrade water quality to construct the required improvements will have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-7:
The project will not substantially degrade groundwater quality with regards to Environmental Health Services.

Discussion- Items IX-8,9,10:
The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project site plan demonstrates that project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows would be redirected after construction of the improvements. The project site is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-11:
The project will result in water usage consistent with residential use, such that the potential to alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-12:
The proposed project is a residential use located within the Dry Creek watershed. The structures proposed for the new use already exist. The only on-site construction proposed for the project is a concrete pad for the placement of a new 6,000 gallon water storage tank. Straw wattles are proposed to be installed at the perimeter of these improvements to provide temporary Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction. Therefore, impacts related to impacts to the Dry Creek watershed is considered less than significant and requires no mitigation measures.

X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)			X	
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)			X	
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

RECEIVED
SEP 2 9 2014
CDRA

17.56.230 Single-family dwellings, additional building site.

No more than one single-family dwelling shall be allowed on any single parcel, except for a secondary dwelling (Section 17.56.200), or one additional single-family dwelling if approved as provided by this section. If the parcel contains at least twice the minimum net lot area required by the applicable zone, an additional building site for a second single-family dwelling may be approved as follows:

A. Permit Requirement. An additional building site application shall be filed with the planning department to request approval for the additional building site.

B. Parcel Review Committee Review and Approval. Each additional building site application shall be reviewed and, if appropriate, approved by the parcel review committee, and shall comply with all applicable provisions of this chapter and other ordinances of Placer County which contain requirements for access, water supply and sewage disposal for separate building sites.

C. Limitation on Additional Building Sites. No more than two dwellings may be approved on any lot without complying with the provisions of Chapter 16 of this code (Subdivisions), except when the property in question is located in the multifamily residential (RM) zone and all units are to be used as rental housing.

D. Separate Sale or Rental Prohibited. No additional building site shall be sold or rented separately from the primary parcel without first complying with the provisions of Chapter 16 of this code (Subdivisions).

E. Recordation of Notice. Upon the completion of any required conditions of approval of the additional building site application, the applicant or an authorized designee shall record a report on additional building site with the county recorder. (Ord. 5126-B, 2001)

21