

**GRANITE BAY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES FOR
WEDNESDAY, May 5, 2010**

Eureka Union School District Office, 5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay

1. Call to Order 7:05 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Introduction of MAC Members

A. Vice-Chairman Eric J. Teed-Bose, Virg Anderson, Tom Habashi, Walt Pekarsky, Dr. Gloria Freeman, David Gravlin, and John Thacker (Secretary).

B. Also present was Fourth District Supervisor Kirk Uhler, and Fourth District Director Brian Jagger.

4. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made (and seconded) to approve the May 2010 MAC Agenda. Approved 5-0 (Dr. Freeman abstaining).

5. Approval of Minutes from April 7, 2010

A motion was made (and seconded) to approve the April 7, 2010 MAC Minutes. The vote was 3-0; however, Dr. Freeman, Mr. Pekarsky, and Mr. Gravlin abstained. Thus, lacking a sufficient number of votes cast to establish a quorum, this matter will be deferred to the June, 2010 meeting.

6. Public Safety Report

Captain Bob Richardson of the South Placer Fire District reported that call volume thus far this year has trailed last year's level, by 113-131. However, medical aid calls have increased, indicating a large reduction in fire and miscellaneous calls. He attributes this in substantial part to the community's pro-active efforts on vegetation abatement (fuel reduction), and expressed the Department's appreciation for this. Further, the late rains have been good for fire fuel, so these efforts are especially important, and appreciated, this year.

In response to an inquiry, Capt. Richardson noted that there is effectively no recourse for bad neighbors who won't mow their yards. However, your best defense against fire is to pay attention to your own vegetation - that's your best assurance that if there's a fire, it will be of minimal consequence. Most fires are caused from outside, not inside, of homes, but both areas are of interest. But remember, an inside fire can get a lot worse if there's a lot of fuel outside.

Captain Bill Donovan of the Auburn CHP reported that there have been 34 accidents in Granite Bay since the beginning of the year. Only six of these

involved injuries, and none involved fatalities. This is an outstanding figure. He believes this is a function of CHP enforcement efforts and presence. Moreover, there have been no stolen vehicles, just a couple of license plates. The radar/lidar enforcement has been working very well.

Garland Lew of the Placer Sheriff's Department reported that they are starting to see a lot of burglaries. There were fifteen residential burglaries in Granite Bay last month. He attributes this to warmer weather, plus an influx into the area of people being released from different facilities. The unfortunate reality is that thieves go to neighborhoods to steal where there are things to steal. So, your defense is to lock cars, leave lights on, leave radios on, and have a neighbor look in on your property.

Unfortunately, the Sheriff's Department thinks this is going to be a busy summer, so it's really important to do all these little things that truly make a difference. This is exacerbated by the fact that due to a recent change in the law, law enforcement can't violate parolees based on non-violent felonies, such as burglaries. On the other hand, they have recently broken two burglary rings.

Finally, Deputy Lew announced that the Placer Sheriff's Council would present a Health and Safety Expo on Saturday, May 22, at Del Oro High School. Proceeds from the Expo will fund certain equipment needs for deputies, such as providing tasers for all deputies. The Expo will feature live taser demonstrations! The South Placer Fire Department will be there as well.

7. Public Comment

A long-term resident spoke concerning the Placer Land Trust. This organization is hoping to acquire the 2300-acre "Bruin" ranch, which is located on the Bear River. This would be the signature project for the Bear River Protection program. It would connect and enlarge Hidden Falls Regional Park. This would create a total of 6500 protected acres. In order to accomplish this, they are hoping to raise two million dollars by the end of year. Between now and May 15, any donation made for this purpose will be doubled by two charitable foundations. She has made literature available, and suggests contacting the Trust with any questions.

8. Supervisor Uhler's Report.

Supervisor Uhler first wished to acknowledge the presence of not one but two (2) Planning Commissioners: Fourth District Commissioner Jeff Moss, and Commissioner at-large Gerry Brentnall. He also noted that E.J. Ivaldi and Planning Department Head Michael Johnson both appeared before the Board of Supervisors last Tuesday to present regarding the Community Plan Update. The question of what course to pursue in completing the Update will be taken up in August at the Board's budget workshop.

A long-time resident expressed concern about excessive vegetative growth along

the pathway between Lakeland and Hidden Lakes. She asked if prisoners might be recruited to alleviate this problem. She noted that it is impossible to ride a bike in this area without running into overgrowth. Mr. Jagger noted that Public Works has indicated a crew will be dispatched to Granite Bay tomorrow, in fact, to address what is clearly a product of the late rains we've experienced this spring.

Another long-time resident read each of the five options presented to the Board for further action in regard to the Update. She expressed concern regarding the first three of these. Specifically, she believes that if any one these three were chosen, the community involvement initiatives, which have been a hallmark of the Update process, would effectively be negated.

Supervisor Uhler does not so interpret them. He views them as a means the Planning Department chose to present the Board with an array of options from Option#1 (the way the County has always approached updates, which is the most expensive), to Option#5 (do nothing at all, which is the least expensive). This approach highlights for the Board the cost factor, which is, of course, of paramount interest.

Supervisor Uhler stated that he would not take a public position on which of the five options he might be inclined to support because to do so would be inappropriate until the Board's budget workshop has been completed. Otherwise, his opinion would lack the context necessary to qualify as well informed.

Another resident asked what impact adoption of any of the various options would have on Planning's handling of the recently discussed halfway house issue. Supervisor Uhler responded that the progress of the Update process has no impact whatsoever on this issue. Halfway houses, and the like, are an issue relevant to the County General Plan and it's accommodation of state mandates. Further, we should note that the way Planning has developed this issue - i.e., these facilities will be allowed in commercial areas - works to benefit Granite Bay because our community has the least proportion of land so zoned.

Another citizen wished to commend Public Works for their work on the sidewalks on Douglas near Bushnell's.

9. MAC Committee Reports

No Committee Reports

10. Informational Non-Action Items –

A. Update on Granite Bay Community Plan Review E.J. Ivaldi of the Planning Department presented regarding the Community Plan Review. Land use change requests are tonight's topic. More specifically, Mr. Ivaldi will address comments from the survey, as well as the meetings Planning has had recently with property owners. In that regard, Planning has met with many, but not all, of the owners of property subject to land use change requests. In total, there have been forty-nine

separate change requests. Three of these have been withdrawn. Others don't need to be subject of the review process – this has been determined through the property owner meetings.

With respect to change requests made within the Douglas Boulevard corridor, out of six such properties subject to change requests, one has been withdrawn, and another, owned by Surewest, was sold.

Regarding the remainder, parcel #6, on the south side, west of Quarry Ponds, has the disadvantage of being located within the 300' setback. The owners were considering a day care center for this location. A special planning area might be a workable alternative from the owner's point-of-view.

Parcel #16 is located at the eastern corner of Douglas and Berg. The owners wished to construct a professional building, since the lot is not suitable for residential construction. They may have a dentist interested in building on that site. Difficulties with this proposition include compatibility with nearby residential properties, as well as building height. A long-time resident pointed out that this parcel may have been split off from adjacent residential parcels many years ago, and that the owners unsuccessfully pursued this change in the past.

Parcel #21 is adjacent to Quarry Ponds. Planning has not met with this owner. The change proposed is from Rural/Residential to Professional/Office. Current zoning would permit limited medical offices. Parcel #24 presents the same issues. Planning has not yet met with these owners either. It is located directly across from the Granite Bay Library, next to the Veterinary office. The proposed change is to high-density residential - specifically, sixty age restricted senior housing units. There are many difficulties with this proposal, including the presence of wetlands, and lack of resources, space, and compatibility. Traffic, light, and noise also present challenges, as does a lack of easily accessible senior services.

With respect to the Auburn-Folsom Road corridor, there are three parcels of note. First, parcel #4 is a 1.7-acre parcel located at the Sacramento County line. It is zoned commercial, so it does not appear that there is any need for a land use change. However, there is some uncertainty regarding a ¼ acre portion the owners acquired in a swap with San Juan Water. Thus the owners simply desire some confirmation that this one small portion remains commercial.

Parcel #20 is located at the southwest corner of Country Court. The owner is seeking a change from rural/low density, to commercial. Lots to the west are within a small residential subdivision; however, this lot is not conducive to residential, thus the change request. The owner envisions a drive through coffee house, or a small professional office. In this instance, compatibility with adjoining uses presents a difficulty, as well as safety concerns arising from its proximity to Auburn-Folsom Road.

Parcel #22 is at the southeast corner of Eureka Road and Auburn-Folsom Road. This 1.9-acre parcel presents numerous challenges for the owners' proposed change to commercial. These include the creek setback, proximity to Lake Trail Court and the water utility, access issues, probable heavy tree loss, and additional traffic generation. As well, it is questionable whether a need for additional commercially zoned land exists in this area.

With respect to the Tanner Property, there are actually two parcels subject to change requests, totaling 66 acres. The change requested is from rural/residential to low-density residential, such as would allow for a total of 70 residences. Significant road improvements would be required, thus the number of houses per acre is limited. Challenges include the presence of oak woodlands, compatibility with adjacent parcel sizes (density), traffic, and utility (sewer). There are also possible flood plane issues (no flood map is available as yet). There is some thought of incorporating some form of residential care facility.

With respect to the proposed Special Planning Areas south of Douglas Boulevard near Seeno, the change would be from a combination of rural/residential and rural low-density, to Special Planning. This change would add up to 217 residential lots. It should be noted that parcel #46 is already an approved project; however, combining these parcels would provide the advantage of minimizing access issues. There has been discussion about incorporating an Esakton type facility into this area. Challenges include compatibility with adjoining parcels, wetlands, oak lands, and traffic congestion.

With respect to the Patterson Property, located just off of Sierra College Boulevard, up to 65 units are proposed. These would be residences of between 2000 and 2500 square feet. Density is a challenge at this location, as well as the likely impact upon the High School.

With respect to the Enclave, Planning has not met with the applicant. Density, traffic congestion, a landmark oak tree, appropriateness for the proposed use, and proximity to adjacent schools, are the challenges presented.

With respect to the remaining parcels, most of them do not require a land use change for their intended uses. The notable exception is Itchy Acres, which will not be addressed tonight, since there have not been any meetings as yet with these property owners.

Mr. Ivaldi is hopeful that by August he can appear before the MAC with an action item regarding the proposed land use changes.

Mr. Habashi asked whether Planning has had any meetings with the Supervisors, specifically concerning options 1 through 5. Mr. Ivaldi responded in the negative; as of now, Planning is simply operating under the direction received from the Board two years ago. Planning will go back to the Board for further direction in August,

following the Board's budget workshop. Mr. Habashi then asked whether it would make sense for Planning to suspend work on the Update pending further direction from the Board in August, which would save money given the possibility that the Board will approve either Option #4 or #5. Mr. Ivaldi responded that his understanding is that the Planning Department believes that since money has already been budgeted through the end of the fiscal year, it would be worthwhile to continue developing information pursuant to the Board's original direction.

A long-time resident asked if the County would provide the MAC and/or the public with specific data regarding the community's responses to the land use requests. Mr. Ivaldi responded that each and every comment will be posted on the Planning Department web site.

Another long-time resident helpfully noted that in fact this information has been posted as of this afternoon. She then proceeded to read a short correspondence from the Granite Bay Community Association to the Board of Supervisors, as follows:

“Thank you for the opportunity to provide input even though this is not a public hearing. When the Board directed staff to revisit the GBCP, Supervisor Uhler informed the community that he supported the following three parameters:

1. No new commercial zoning;
2. The 300 foot setback on south side of Douglas would remain intact; and
3. The population would be capped at 23,000.

Considering these parameters and the fact that only 49 (.6 of 1%) of the 8,500 property owners notified of the update submitted requests for land use changes, a case can be made that the overwhelming majority of the community accepts the Plan as adopted in 1989.

There has been no push from the community to undertake this update. Only two General Plan Amendments have occurred in over 20 years so the Plan doesn't need adjusting to reflect land use changes. In addition, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Uhler stated at the beginning of the process that depending on the requests received there might not be a need for a complete update and this could be a simple review.

According to the staff report, most of the rezoning requests can be handled with the Minor Land Division process.

The GBCA has felt since the beginning of the process that some language in the Plan should be updated to reflect new state mandates.

The GBCA feels that Option 4 is the best alternative. It reflects the survey results submitted by residents, community input at MAC, meets state requirements, and is cost effective.

Thank you”

Another long-time resident asked how much money would be saved if the process were stopped right now. Mr. Ivaldi deferred budget questions to Mr. Johnson.

Commissioner Brentnall raised the issue of the place of trails in a Community Plan. He feels trails are an overlooked asset, akin to sidewalks and other means of ingress/egress. Mr. Ivaldi noted that trails don't need to be a part of the Update process, since no EIR is required. Mr. Brentnall suggested that now would be a good time to examine the role of trails in the community and consider incorporating the same into the Community Plan.

Another long-time resident averred that good planning practice requires that land use changes be evaluated in terms of community benefit. He believes community benefit has been overlooked in the land use change discussion. Mr. Ivaldi responded that it is his hope that with all of the community involvement, community benefit will take care of itself. Dr. Freeman echoed this, and added that it must be remembered that land owners have rights to.

In response, a long-time resident suggested in regard to the “community benefit” issue that such benefits ought to be defined, so that we can most effectively engage in the kind of balancing of interests that Dr. Freeman and others have spoken of.

Another long-time resident, who served on the circulation update committee, asked whether any newer, better traffic data is now available that should be considered in this discussion. He also noted that in looking at trails as part of that exercise, he found that they fall into a no-man's land. Public Works, in his opinion, doesn't care about something if it's not considered a public roadway. He sees a need for a pathway map.

11. **Action Items - NONE**
12. **Correspondence – Found on Table at the rear of the room.**
13. **Next Meeting: GB MAC June 2, 2010 @ 7:00 p.m.**
14. **Adjournment: 8:40 p.m.**

