COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development/Resource Agency

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION

E.J. Ivaldi, Deputy Director

HEARING DATE: April 24, 2014
ITEM NO.: 3
TIME: 10:20 a.m.

TO: Placer County Planning Commission

FROM: George Rosasco, Supervising Planner

DATE: April 24, 2014

SUBJECT: **WORKSHOP – EVENT CENTER USES IN PLACER COUNTY**

GENERAL PLAN/COMMUNITY PLAN: Placer County General Plan and all Community Plans

ZONING: All Residential Zone Districts, Farm Zone District, and all Commercial Zone Districts

STAFF PLANNER: George Rosasco, Supervising Planner

LOCATION: Countywide

APPLICANT: Planning Services Division of the Community Development Resource Agency

WORKSHOP DESCRIPTION: Conduct a Fifth Public Workshop with the Planning Commission to review the Draft Ordinance for Event Centers.

BACKGROUND:
On April 9, 2013, the Placer County Board of Supervisors approved an interim ordinance establishing a 45-day moratorium on applications for community centers, citing concerns that the current definition of "Community Centers" does not consider impacts that may result from allowing these uses in historically rural areas. The sections in question are 17.04.030 (Definitions of Land Uses, Specialized Terms and Phrases) and 17.06.050.D (Land Use and Permit Tables) of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. In conjunction with the moratorium, staff has been directed to explore the possibility of developing revised criteria and standards for the review of community centers and determine if the definition of "Community Centers" needs to be modified.

On May 21, 2013 the Board of Supervisors extended the moratorium on community centers for up to 22 months and 15 days to allow for the processing of a Zoning Text Amendment that would revise the definition of "Community Centers" and provide new standards and criteria for their review.

PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOPS:
As directed by the Board of Supervisors Planning Services staff has conducted four workshops before the Planning Commission on the proposed Event Center Ordinance.

May 9, 2013 Planning Commission Workshop
The workshop was attended by approximately 30 members of the public, with 12 of those giving public testimony. The public testimony provided included the following concerns:

- The definition of "Community Center" was too broad and needed to be more specific and based specifically on its land use.

- Specific standards should be placed on Community Centers and event-type centers that must be met for a use to be approved. Examples of such standards would be mandating a minimum parcel size and establishing minimum access requirements.

The Planning Commission stated that it was pleased with the process identified by staff, and the Planning Commission supported staff's proposal for extensive public outreach to address issues associated with Community Centers. The Planning Commission liked the analysis provided by the Rural Lincoln MAC, and recommended that the issues they identified be considered by staff in its analysis of Community Centers.

The issue of zoning compatibility was a primary concern to the Planning Commission. When considering possible Zoning Text Amendment changes, the Planning Commission recommended that staff analyze the appropriateness of parcel sizes and the proximity to adjoining residents/properties. The Planning Commission concluded that standards of some type were needed, but that the standards should not be defined so narrowly that control was taken away from the decision-makers. The Planning Commission wanted the decision-makers to be allowed the greatest amount of flexibility in any review of a Community Center application.

The Planning Commission also discussed issues associated with Code Enforcement. The Commission noted that most violations occur during evening and weekend hours when staff is not available, and that Code Enforcement would be a key component to the success of any proposed ordinance changes. Additionally, the Planning Commission concluded that staff should analyze the creation of different categories for Community Centers (similar to Santa Barbara County). In considering new definitions, the Planning Commission stated that it was not as important to differentiate between non-profit and for-profit facilities, but rather it was more important to clearly define the intensity of use for each definition.

June 27, 2013 Planning Commission Workshop
On June 27, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a second workshop on "Community Centers". Staff scheduled this workshop to obtain direction from the Planning Commission on preparing a Zoning Text Amendment on Community Centers. The workshop was attended by about 15 members of the public, with eight of those giving public testimony. The public testimony provided included the following concerns:

- Specific standards should be placed on Community Centers and event-type centers that must be met for a use to be approved. Examples of such standards would be mandating a minimum parcel size and minimum access requirements.

2

- Standards that will ensure that noise created by event-type centers in an agriculturally zoned area will be eliminated or greatly reduced.

The Planning Commission also gave staff direction to include the following performance standards to "Community Centers" and "Event Centers" as part of the Community Center Zoning Text Amendment:

- minimum parcel size
- setback regulations
- maximum event size
- maximum number of events
- hours of operation
- noise issues
- access issues
- parking issues
- on-site agricultural use
- on-site security
- lighting
- food guidelines
- event center density
- noticing requirements
- "Community Center" and "Event Center" code enforcement options".

In addition to the establishment of performance standards, the Planning Commission also concluded that event center uses in agricultural zone districts should be required to obtain a Use Permit. The Planning Commission also discussed the challenges faced by Placer County as a result of parcel fragmentation. Parcel fragmentation is the single greatest challenge that Placer County faces with regard to regulating event center-type uses in agricultural areas, as past actions of the County have created a patchwork of small-scale agricultural parcels inter-mixed with residential uses. As a result, there are not adequate buffers between agricultural uses and rural residences.

Ideally, agricultural lands are established on parcel sizes of 40 acres or more; however, Placer County has allowed very small (from one to ten-acres) parcels in its agricultural zoning districts. As a result, the proposed event center type uses could be located on smaller parcels where other residential/non-agricultural uses are located in proximity. Because of this influx of residential/non-agricultural uses in the County's agricultural zoning districts, the Board of Supervisors adopted a "Right-to-Farm" ordinance that gives preference to agricultural uses in agricultural zoning districts, regardless of the adjoining land use. The Planning understood and acknowledged that as Community Centers Zoning Text Amendment moves forward, this issue will need to be considered and addressed as part of the process.

<u>July 25, 2013 Planning Commission Workshop</u>
On July 25, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a third workshop on "Community Centers". Staff scheduled this workshop to obtain direction from the Planning Commission on preparing a Zoning Text Amendment on Community Centers. The workshop was attended by about 11 members of the public, with eight of those giving public testimony. The public testimony given by the eight citizens requested that the Commission ensure that specific non-flexible standards should be placed on Event centers that must be met for a use to be approved

3

and could be modifies as part of a Use Permit. Examples of such standards would be mandating a minimum parcel size and minimum access requirements.

The Planning Commission also agreed on preparing a Zoning Text Amendment with five definitions for "Event Centers", including the following:

> **"Community Center"** (land use) means a facility, which may be located on public or private property that functions primarily to provide a community-centered meeting hall for members of the public to carry out local community-oriented activities and public and civic functions. Examples of such facilities include Grange Halls, Community Sponsored Meeting Halls, and Veterans Halls that consist of a multipurpose meeting and recreational facility, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various groups for such activities as public assemblies, meetings, private meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.
>
> **"Commercial Event Center"** (land use) means a facility located on private property that primarily functions to provide a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.
>
> **"Small Agricultural Event Center"** (land use) means a facility located on agriculturally zoned land of ten (10) acres or larger that has ongoing viable agricultural use (as defined in section-to be determined) that provides a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups of 100 or less for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.
>
> **"Intermediate Agricultural Event Center"** (land use) means a facility located on agriculturally zoned land of twenty (20) acres or larger that has an ongoing viable agricultural use (as defined in section-to be determined) that provides a facility for any type social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups of 200 or less for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.
>
> **"Large Agricultural Event Center"** (land use) means a facility located on agriculturally zoned land of forty (40) acres or larger that has an ongoing viable agricultural use that provides a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups of 400 or less for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.

<u>October 10, 2013 Planning Commission Workshop</u>
On October 10, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a fourth workshop on "Community Centers". Staff scheduled this workshop to obtain direction from the Planning Commission on

the proposed Draft Zoning Text Amendment, which would replace the Community Center provisions set forth in the Zoning Ordinance with a new Event Center section. The workshop was attended by approximately 12 members of the public, with seven of those giving public testimony. The public testimony given by the seven citizens was centered on protecting the long term viability of agricultural lands, issues that could arise based on an Event Center using a shared private access road, the lack of code enforcement on weekends to police Event Centers, and excessive noise that may emanate from an Event Center in a rural agricultural area. To address these issues they asked that Code Enforcement services be available on the weekends and that the Planning Commission require non-flexible standards for all Event Centers to ensure the issues discussed above are addressed.

After hearing the public testimony and reviewing the Draft Event Center Ordinance, the Planning Commission determined that it was satisfied with the overall content of the proposed Draft Event Center Ordinance and instructed staff to present it to all interested Municipal Advisory Councils. The Commission specifically asked staff to solicit comments from the Municipal Advisory Councils on the following four issues:

1. How many events are appropriate at an Agricultural Event Center?

2. How to ensure that a viable agricultural use continues after approval of an Agricultural Event Center?

3. Should Agricultural Event Centers be subject to more stringent noise standards as required in the Draft Ordinance or should they be required to only comply with the existing Noise Ordinance?

4. Should Event Centers be required to provide permanent signage with a contact number manned by a live person to address problems that may occur during events?

DISCUSSION OF MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL RECCOMENDATIONS:
Staff presented the Draft Event Center Ordinance a minimum of two times for comments to the Foresthill Forum, Granite Bay Municipal Advisory Council, Horseshoe Bar Municipal Advisory Council, Meadow Vista Municipal Advisory Committee, Newcastle Ophir Municipal Advisory Council, North Auburn Municipal Advisory Council, Penryn Municipal Advisory Council, Rural Lincoln Municipal Advisory Council, Sheridan Municipal Advisory Council, Weimar Applegate Colfax Municipal Advisory Council, West Placer Municipal Advisory Council, and Agricultural Commission. The following is a synopsis of each Municipal Advisory Councils recommendation:

Foresthill Forum:
- The Access Standards Section of the Draft Ordinance should be modified to clarify road maintenance issues and road use liability.
- The minimum 200' setback should for Event Center structures should be removed and should be as specified in the Use Permit.
- Reduce the amount of events an Event Center may have and specify the maximum number of events that can occur in a one month period.

Granite Bay Municipal Advisory Committee:
- Recommended approval of the Ordinance with the caveat that an event be better defined with regard to maximum length of time.

Horseshoe Bar Municipal Advisory Council:

- Agricultural Event Centers should not be accessed via a shared private road.
- An Agricultural Event Center should be required to demonstrate to the Placer County Agricultural Commissioner that they have onsite agricultural production of $1000 gross per acre per year.
- Agricultural Event Centers should be 400 feet from other dwelling on adjoining parcels.
- Code Enforcement should be available on the weekends to deal with Event Center issues.

Meadow Vista Municipal Advisory Council:

- Strengthen the agricultural requirement.
- Reduce the number of events from 26 to between 4 and 12.
- Create an online data base that lets people know when an Event Center is having an event.

Newcastle Ophir Municipal Advisory Committee:

- Guidelines for the funding of private road maintenance.
- An event should be better defined with regard to maximum length of time and what constitutes an "event".
- Method for tracking the number of events held at each Event Center that is accessible to the public, preferably via the internet or online data base.
- Provide an exemption to the 26 events per year limit to allow for a fixed number of nonprofit fundraising events each year.
- Chapter 17.D.4 is revised to state that setbacks can be greater than 200 feet if required by the Conditional Use Permit, but not less than 200 feet.
- Chapter 17.D.7 is revised to indicate that the agricultural production requirement of $4,500 is a five year average based on actual production. This chapter should also specify whether this production requirement is net income or gross income.
- Provide guidelines on how enforcement will be applied to Event Centers.

Rural Lincoln Municipal Advisory Committee:

- Agricultural Event Center should not be accessed via a shared private road.
- Code Enforcement should be available when needed to hear and respond to complaints.
- The acreage for all Agricultural Event Centers should be doubled.
- The owners that desire to develop an Event Center must demonstrate that at least 51% of their income is from agriculture.
- Event Centers should be limited to hosting events 12 times per calendar year.
- The Event Center permit must go to the applicant and not the property. When the owner dies, sells, or transfers ownership, the permit expires.
- There must be a method for evaluating each event center site in order to avoid a concentration in a relatively small area before a permit is granted.

North Auburn Municipal Advisory Committee:

- Examine the necessity for an agricultural requirement.
- Examine need to have permanent notification signage.
- Examine the number of Events allowed.

Penryn Municipal Advisory Committee:

- Agricultural Event Centers should not be accessed via a shared private road.

- The maximum number of events allowed at an Event Center per year should be 6 not 26.
- The acreage for all Agricultural Event Centers should be doubled.
- Code Enforcement should be available on the weekends to deal with Event Center issues.

Sheridan Municipal Advisory Committee:

- Code Enforcement should be available on the weekends to deal with Event Center issues.
- Agricultural Event Centers should not be accessed via a shared private road.

Weimar/Applegate/Colfax Municipal Advisory Council:

- An Agricultural Event Center should be required to demonstrate to the Placer County Agricultural Commissioner that they have onsite agricultural production of $1,000 gross per acre per year.
- Put sheriff's phone number on the permanent posting signage in case of a problem with an event.
- The acreage for all Agricultural Event Centers should be doubled.
- Reduce the number of events because 26 is excessive.
- Agricultural Event Centers should not be accessed via a shared private road.

Agricultural Commission:

- An Agricultural Event Center should be required to demonstrate to the Placer County Agricultural Commissioner that they have onsite agricultural production of $1,000 gross per acre per year.
- A Use Permit for an Agricultural Event Center shall terminate if the property owner who obtained it sells the land.
- No Agricultural Event Center building or component shall occur within current agricultural production areas on parcels designated as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance or unique farmland by the Department of Conservation.
- Agricultural Event Centers shall not be protected by the Placer County Right to Farm Ordinance.
- The Agricultural Event Center is supportive of surrounding agricultural production.

The following recommendations reflect the common theme of the recommendations made by each Municipal Advisory Council and the Agricultural Commission. Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission review these recommendations and direct staff to make changes to the Draft Ordinance as they see fit.

- An Agricultural Event Center should be required to demonstrate to the Placer County Agricultural Commissioner that they have onsite agricultural production of $1,000 gross per acre per year.
- No Agricultural Event Center building or component shall occur within current agricultural production areas on parcels designated as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance or unique farmland by the Department of Conservation.
- Agricultural Event Centers shall not be protected by the Placer County Right to Farm Ordinance.
- The proposed minimum acreage for each Agricultural Event Center should be doubled.

7

- Agricultural Event Centers should not be accessed via a shared private road.
- The suggested (or proposed) number of events permitted each year should be reduced.
- Code Enforcement should be available on the weekends to deal with Event Center issues.
- Define how long an event can be and what constitutes an event (i.e., can one event take place over multiple days, is a family wedding an event?).

NEXT STEPS:
Listed below is a tentative schedule for the remaining processing of the Community Event Center Zoning Text amendment:

- The Negative Declaration prepared for the Event Center Zoning Text Amendment has been released for public review & comment. The public comment period ends May 7, 2014.
  http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/negdec
- Planning Commission to make recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the Negative Declaration and the Draft Zoning Text Amendment for Event Centers.
- Board of Supervisors consideration of the Negative Declaration and Draft Zoning Text Amendments for Event Centers.

ACTION REQUESTED: Staff requests that the Planning Commission receive public comment and provide direction to staff on the Draft Zoning Text Amendment for Event Centers. The direction from the Planning Commission will be used to make any final changes to the Draft Zoning Text Amendment. This item will then be returning to the Planning Commission for final consideration.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A: Draft Zoning Text Amendment for Community Event Centers
Attachment B: Correspondence
Attachment C: Municipal Advisory Council recommendation letters
Attachment D: Agricultural Commission comments and recommendation 1/17/14

cc: Engineering and Surveying Division
Environmental Health Services
Air Pollution Control District
Andy Fisher - Parks Department
Gerry Cardin - County Counsel
Karin Schwab – County Counsel
Michael Johnson - CDRA Director
EJ Ivaldi – Deputy Director
Paul Thompson – Deputy Director
Holly Heinzen – CEO Office
Joshua Huntsinger – Agricultural Commissioner
Subject/chrono files

8

o/plus/pln/plng comm/pc staff report format 11-06.doc

Event Centers

Event Centers

A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this section is to provide for the orderly development of Community Centers, Commercial Event Centers, Small Agricultural Event Centers, Intermediate Agricultural Event Centers, and Large Agricultural Event Centers within Placer County. Additionally this section is intended to protect the agricultural character and long-term agricultural production of agricultural lands which may have on site Agricultural Event Centers.

B. **Definitions.**

"Community Center" (land use) means a facility, which may be located on public or private property, that functions primarily to provide a community-centered meeting hall for members of the public to carry out local community-oriented activities and public and civic functions. Examples of such facilities include Grange Halls, Community Sponsored Meeting Halls, and Veterans Halls, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various groups for such activities as public assemblies, meetings, private meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.

"Commercial Event Center" (land use) means a facility located on private property located in a commercial zone district that primarily functions to provide a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.

"Small Agricultural Event Center" (land use) means a facility located on agriculturally zoned land of ten (10) acres or larger that has ongoing viable agricultural use (as defined in section-to be determined) that provides a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups of 100 or less for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.

"Intermediate Agricultural Event Center" (land use) means a facility located on agriculturally zoned land of twenty (20) acres or larger that has an ongoing viable agricultural use (as defined in section-to be determined) that provides a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups of 200 or less for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.

"Large Agricultural Event Center" (land use) means a facility located on agriculturally zoned land of forty (40) acres or larger that has an ongoing viable agricultural use (as defined in section-to be determined) that provides a facility for any type of social gathering and consisting of multipurpose meeting and/or recreational facilities, typically consisting of one or more meeting or multipurpose room and a kitchen and/or outdoor barbecue facilities, that are available for use by various private groups of 400 or less for such activities as meetings, parties, weddings, receptions, and dances.

"Conditional Use Permit" - See Zoning Ordinance Section 17.58.130.

Event Centers

C. **Permit Requirements.** The permit requirements for Community Center, Commercial Event Center, Small Agricultural Event Center, Intermediate Agricultural Event Center, and Large Agricultural Event Center are set forth below.

	Zone Districts												
	RESIDENTIAL				COMMERCIAL							AGRICULTURAL, RESOURCE, OPEN SPACE	
LAND USE TYPES	RS	RM	RA	RF	C1	C2	C3	CPD	HS	OP	RES	AE	F
Community Center	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	C	C	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP
Commercial Event Center					CUP	C	C	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP		
Small Agricultural Event Center			CUP	CUP								CUP	CUP
Intermediate Agricultural Event Center			CUP	CUP								CUP	CUP
Large Agricultural Event Center			CUP	CUP								CUP	CUP

KEY TO PERMIT REQUIREMENTS	
Zoning Clearance required (Section 17.06.050)	C
Conditional Use Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	CUP
Use not allowed	

D. **Development and Operational Standards**. The following development and operational standards shall apply to Community Center, Commercial Event Center, Small Agricultural Event Center, Intermediate Agricultural Event Center, and Large Agricultural Event Center as specified. If specific regulations are not setforth for an Event Center then Placer County Code, the Placer County General Plan and any applicable community plan shall apply. The event Center standards do not apply to any parcels within the Squaw Valley General Plan or the Tahoe Basin as defined by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

1. **Parking**. A Community Center, Commercial Event Center and Agricultural Event Center shall provide parking at a ratio of 1 parking space for each 2.5 guests allowed onsite and one parking space for each permanent employee. No off-site parking is permitted unless approved by a Conditional Use Permit or through a Zoning Clearance process. Surfacing shall be all-weather surfacing (e.g., aggregate base, chip seal, asphalt, concrete) and capable of supporting a forty thousand (40,000) pound vehicle load.

2. **Access Standards.**
   a. Access roads to a Community Center, Commercial Event Center and Agricultural Event Centers shall comply with County Code, State and local Fire Safe Standards as determined by the County and the serving fire agency.

b. If a Community Center, Commercial Event Center and Agricultural Event Center are accessed from a County-Maintained Highway, an encroachment permit may be required to address ingress, egress and sight-distance requirements.

c. If a Community Center, Commercial Event Center and Agricultural Event Center are accessed by a private road, the applicant shall provide reasonable proof of access rights as determined by the Engineering and Surveying Division.

3. **Minimum Parcel Size**

a. "Small Agricultural Event Center" shall have a minimum parcel size of 10 acres.

b. "Intermediate Agricultural Event Center" shall have a minimum parcel size of 20 acres.

c. "Large Agricultural Event Center" shall have a minimum parcel size of 40 acres.

4. **Setbacks**

a. All "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be required to have all outdoor activities associated with the Agricultural Event Center (with the exception of parking) a minimum of 200 feet from the exterior property lines or as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

5. **Event Size**

a. "Community Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

b. "Commercial Event Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

c. "Small Agricultural Event Center" shall be allowed a maximum event size of 100 guests.

d. "Intermediate Agricultural Event Center" shall be allowed a maximum event size of 200 guests.

e. "Large Agricultural Event Center" shall be allowed a maximum event size of 400 guests.

6. **Number of Events**

a. "Community Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

b. "Commercial Event Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

c. All "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be allowed a maximum of 26 events per year, or as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

7. **Agricultural Requirement.**

a. All "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be required to have an on site verifiable agricultural production of $4,500 a year at the time of application for a Conditional Use Permit, or have the potential to produce $4,500 from on site agricultural production within one year of the application. The verification of Agricultural production for "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be made by the Placer County Agricultural Commissioner or his designee.

8. **Hours of Operation.**

a. "Community Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

b. "Commercial Event Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

c. All "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be allowed to operate from 10am to 10pm on Friday and Saturday and from 10am to 8pm Sunday through Thursday.

9. **Noise Regulations.**

a.. All "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be subject to Placer County Code Article 9.36 (Noise Ordinance) and shall be required to stop all noise generating activities, such as music, at 7:30pm or move such activities into an enclosed structure which will reduce the noise level to 20 decibels or less at the event centers exterior property lines.

10. **Lighting.**

a. All lighting for "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be consistent with the Rural Design Guidelines for Placer County and shall be Dark-Sky compliant as specified by the International Dark-Sky Association.

11. **Food Regulations.**

a. "Community Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

b. "Commercial Event Center" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit.

c. "Agricultural Event Centers" as specified by the Conditional Use Permit and if a commercial kitchen is approved with the event center it shall only be used in conjunction with onsite events. Restaurants are not allowed as part of an "Agricultural Event Center".

12. **Special Notice Requirements.**

Event Centers

a. "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be required to post a notice three days prior to an event with a poster no smaller than 8.5' by 11' in a location commonly accessible to adjoining property owners (e.g. clustered mailboxes or at the entrance to the property that that Agricultural Event Center is located). The notice shall specify the time and duration of the event, the date of the event and shall have a contact phone number that people can call during the event if an issue arises. The phone line shall be manned by a live person during the event. An affidavit of posting for each event shall be given to County two days prior to the event on an affidavit of posting available at the Planning Services Division of Placer County.

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

PLACER GROUP
P.O. BOX 7167, AUBURN, CA 95604

PUBLIC INTEREST COALITION
P.O. Box 671, Loomis, CA 95650

RECEIVED
OCT 1 2013
PLANNING DEPT.

October 12, 2013

George Rosasco and
Placer County Planning Commission
Auburn, CA 95603

Addendum to Submitted Comments re Proposed/Draft Comm Cntr ZTA Workshop

Thank you for holding the workshops and having the dialog regarding Community Centers (CC). We submitted comments at the October 10, 2013, workshop with the Planning Commission and assume that neither the Planning Commission nor staff had any opportunity to read them. We are grateful that a number of the issues we raised in that comment letter were also discussed at the workshop.

The workshop brought up a couple of points that we wish to address in this **addendum** to our October 10, 2013, submission and ask that you consider incorporating the concepts into the final draft ZTA.

1—Any property owner may have private events—private gatherings of family, friends, etc.—where there are no required fees, dues, donations, or other commercial elements involved with the event. However, there are problematic circumstances that a CC ZTA must address with regard to a site that has obtained a Community Center land-use designation.

(a) A number of ag operations have "memberships," where "members" (other names may be used) pay either an annual or one-time fee to be a part of the "Club" or "organization." If the owner of the property, designated as a CC or not, has events for these "members" and their guests, and attempts to call them "private" to avoid obtaining required permits, this will undermine the CC ZTA. Any type of payment of a fee for associated privileges, no matter what the arrangement, must not be exempted from obtaining required land use designations or permits. Any events with attendance conditions that incorporate dues-payments, "suggested donation," donation to another entity, or any consideration as a requisite for attendance must be construed as "events" or commercial and subject to land use or event permit compliance

(b) If the facility is already approved as an event center, then those "membership" or consideration-required events must be counted as a part of the maximum number of events allowed in the CUP.

2—Noise ordinances are generally considered reasonable and meant to allow citizens to enjoy their properties. Neighbors who comply with existing zoning performance standards must also follow the current noise ordinance. However, an entertainment venue—an event center land use—being placed in a res/ag or farm area is essentially a non-conforming use and will subject neighbors to noise intrusions they could not have anticipated when they invested in their properties. Therefore, it **is** reasonable to impose a separate noise standard with a lower decibel maximum at the property boundary

ATTACHMENT B

15

for event centers situated in Res Ag or Farm zones. We urge that the current language in the draft CC ZTA remain at 20 decibels or less at the event center property line.

3—The discussion to not have a set or maximum number of events—to leave it up to the CUP—is a fatally flawed position for many reasons. Parcel size, access, and other elements should be considered in determining the cap. To leave that open ended is to invite abuse and confusion with neighbors not knowing if an event is under or over the limit. It's akin to having a freeway with no speed limits, but trying to assess each driver as to how fast they should go. Each CC approval needs a concrete cap—a maximum number of events that is enforceable. Should an ag operation wish to hold more events than permitted, there are always venues located in commercial locations that can be rented to accommodate unlimited numbers of events.

4—We understand the argument against including code enforcement in the ZTA, but without knowing the consequences of noncompliance, or knowing there are none, non-permitted events will continue as they are occurring today.

One example where a penalty must be spelled out for noncompliance is with the proposed mandate that a phone number will be answered by a live person should someone wish to complain. If a live person does not answer, what are the consequences? What options are left for a citizen? How will a citizen produce legal evidence of this noncompliance? The CC ZTA must clearly state both the code and penalties for noncompliance. Otherwise, conditions are meaningless.

It may be helpful to have the event center's telephone number posted at the venue site, but for that to be the end of the complaint matter is simply going to complicate and escalate complaint (s). Certainly having code enforcement's telephone number posted will be helpful, but often calling code enforcement is not a satisfactory experience (leaving a message, waiting for call back, etc.).

Pertaining to this issue, the onus of code enforcement should never be a citizen's responsibility any more than traffic or drug law enforcement should be conducted by citizens. Public agency Code Enforcement personnel (or deputized officers) should be responsive to complaint calls for safety and other reasons.

5—We believe that performance standards need to be written "tight enough" so that there is no argument or "wiggle room" with violations in attempts to circumvent compliance. When the CHP enforces "no tolerance" speed laws, one can expect to be cited going 66 mph in a 65 mph zone. The same enforcement intention must be applied to event centers. True, there may be some who will claim that standards are so tight that no one can obtain a permit. We submit that in the unlikely event that is the case, there are plenty of other commercial venues that would welcome the event business and where an ag operator can hold unlimited events.

6—The argument that all the event center regulations, criteria, and/or performance standards will not pencil out (produce profits) for the small ag operation points to bigger issues: Is the Res/Ag or Farm zoned site to be primarily an ag operation or an entertainment center? Is the neighboring community/neighbors obligated to bear the brunt of commercial event centers that were not envisioned, either by the County or landowners?

Obtaining a CC land use designation is an optional business decision; its profitability or lack thereof cannot become the responsibility or burden of neighbors or

surrounding community. Bailing out a struggling business operation by negatively impacting neighbors is unacceptable.

(a) A $4,500 minimum income requirement, adjusted annually by the Cost of Living Index, is a good faith validation that the operation is first about preserving agriculture, which is what the operators claim they are doing by obtaining their CC permits. If that income requirement element is missing, then CC's are defacto commercial operations, locating in inappropriate Res/Ag/Farm zones, and trying to take advantage of an incompatible land use by fronting as an ag operation. The ag operation can eventually be scrapped entirely for the entertainment operation.

(b) There is a commercial, profit-making element to an ag operation (and all want ag operations to succeed), but the ancillary activities must adhere to compatible land uses. Will a beef cattle rancher be allowed to open a hamburger stand or fast food drive-in on his/her the Res/Ag/Farm zoned property? Will those who raise sheep be allowed to have clothing outlets with wool products? If not, why not? Or if yes, will all ResAg/Farm zoned locations be appropriate?

The processes where food and fiber are produced, have value added (packaged, bottled, etc), and are readied for market, are steps in the commercial ag process. However, that process does not justify changing the land use designations when other options are available for sales, and when it will impact property-rights enjoyment and values of neighbors and the community.

Thank you for considering our views on this critical issue,

Marilyn Jasper

Marilyn Jasper, Chair

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

PLACER GROUP
P.O. BOX 7167, AUBURN, CA 95604

PUBLIC INTEREST COALITION
P.O. Box 671, Loomis, CA 95650

PLACER COUNTY
DATE RECEIVED
OCT 10 2013
PLANNING
COMMISSION

Email to Commissioners + Staff 10/10/13 ES

October 10, 2013

Planning Commission
Placer County
Auburn, CA 95603

From Marylyn Jasper

RE: Event Center Uses and Proposed/Draft ZTA Workshop

We wish to reiterate: We are not opposed to event centers in Placer County as long as they are located in appropriate locations. We continue with our decades of work to protect agricultural and natural resources.

We firmly believe the creation of a Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) is moving in the right direction, and appreciate the consideration Placer County CDRA and George Rosasco have given to our concerns. However, we believe the proposed ZTA needs a bit more refinement of performance standards and code enforcement to correct potential misinterpretation, truly meet the needs of rural communities, and preserve agricultural lands.

We urge the Planning Commission to not approve the draft proposal, but rather to reconsider modifications that incorporate more of the suggested criteria, conditions, and enforcement possibilities submitted by concerned citizens in past workshops. With a little more fine tuning, we believe final ZTA can be created that will satisfy most of the pressing issues.

Background

Flexibility can be beneficial, but when it comes to codes, ordinances, and laws that require enforcement, flexibility is unacceptable. Huge problems will be created with unequal application and interpretations, which can lead to negative public perceptions and mistrust. The ZTA must create codes that are clear and cannot be misunderstood or misconstrued. To strengthen the integrity of a "Community Center" ZTA and ensure public trust in the process, we urge that language be included to prohibit any variances of the codes. Granting variances to well-crafted ZTA's begins the unraveling process and creates the very culture of noncompliance that Placer County must address.

We completely agree with the staff report statement that code enforcement is "a key component to the success of any proposed ordinance changes" and were pleased that the Planning Commission (PC) directed staff to include it in the list of performance standards (pages 2-3). However, on page 4 of the staff report, the "PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT list of standards **omits** code enforcement. As the lynchpin to a successful ZTA, we urge the PC to direct staff to incorporate both strong code enforcement language and firm-but-fair consequences for noncompliance.

The lack of foresight that resulted in "parcel fragmentation" decades ago will continue to be the albatross around Placer County's neck. The problems created by approving parcel splits, which created small/large parcels mixed with residential/non-

agricultural uses in agricultural zones, should not be exacerbated by creating even more incompatible land uses.

The "Right to Farm" ordinance was a good faith effort to allow the agricultural (ag) uses to continue, regardless of adjacent development or lack of buffers.[1] However, entertainment centers and other non-ag production ancillary uses were not "ag uses" that the supervisors had in mind when the Right to Farm ordinance was passed. To insist that they are is a stretch that compounds the problem and opens the door to even more disingenuous efforts to create a bogus nexus with non-ag uses.

Draft ZTA: Event Centers

The five definitions for "Event Centers" are reasonable and provide a workable platform.

A. Purpose. We urge the addition of a clause at the end of the paragraph so that it will read, "Additionally this section is intended to protect the agricultural character and long-term agricultural production of agricultural lands which may have on site Agricultural Event Centers ***and to protect the rights of all rural residents to enjoy their properties***."

B. Definitions.

"Community Center": We urge the PC to consider "Community Center" (CC) land use to be reserved for 501(c)3 nonprofit organizations. The parcel itself does not have to be owned by the nonprofit, but its function and use as a CC must be operated as a 501(c)3 nonprofit. Currently many, if not most of the CC's in Placer County are nonprofits.

"Commercial Event Center": In the list of activities at the end of the paragraph, we urge the addition of the word "conferences."

D. Development and Operational Standards.

1. **Parking**. This is an important standard, but it must be worded so that before the permit for the number of guests is approved, the parking must be in place. For example, with a "Small Ag Event Center" application, if the applicant plans to have the maximum number of guests allowed (100) then the 40 parking spaces, plus those for employees, must be constructed and in place before the permit is approved. If the applicant limits events to 50 guests, then the permit should reflect that limit, and 20 parking spaces (plus spaces for employees) must be constructed before the permit is approved or issued. Otherwise, the potential to ignore the maximum number of guests allowed may become problematic.

2. **Access Standards**:

c. (Private Roads) We urge the county to not allow any event center land use on any private road. Proof of access rights is only part of the issue. Private road safety for one- or two-way public traffic and costs for repair and maintenance must be addressed in the ZTA. Landowners who buy property on private roads are mandated by law to contribute to the repair and maintenance of their private road. As we submitted before: However, should a private road meet all standards of a public arterial and minimum CA Fire Safe Standards, before any approvals are granted, all residents lawfully sharing and using a private road easement should have to agree in writing to the event center's usage of

[1] The Right to Farm ordinance was intended to protect ranchers and farmers from neighbor complaints due to bona fide ag operations that might create smells, dust and fumes; the noise of livestock and ag machinery; the use of agricultural chemicals, etc.

that private road, possibly on an annual or biennial basis or with a "subject to review" clause, and any costs associated with private road maintenance and upkeep (e.g., resealing or "patching") to the point of the event center's ingress and egress on that private road should require a larger contribution by the event center.

3. **Minimum Parcel Size**. As mentioned before, there must be **no variances granted** with the ZTA standards. A 9.9 parcel simply does not qualify for an event center land use designation.

4. **Setbacks**. We urge the PC to change the language by deleting the word "or." This word has the potential to create a loophole that will make setback standards useless.

6. **Number of Events**. Oddly enough, items "a" and "b" are worded satisfactorily, but item "c" brings in the word "or" again that makes the mandate of "shall" meaningless. Item "c" should read, "...events per year as specified by the Conditional Use Permit (delete word "or").

Item "c" also allows for a seeming blanket "maximum of 26 events per year...." which is far too many for a 10-acre parcel. Unless the parcel is situated on a major arterial or thoroughfare, it must be assumed that a 10-acre parcel will most likely be located either in one of the many fragmented areas of the County, and/or it will have neighbors in close proximity. One event a week throughout half the year is unacceptable for many reasons, including traffic, noise, safety, etc., on remote, rural roadways. Depending upon the site location, a more reasonable maximum would be 8 one-day events (which may still mean one event every weekend for two months) or 6 two-day events.

7. **Agricultural Requirement**. We are grateful that this standard has been included and will help ensure ag lands are used for ag production. However, it must be edited; the word "production" is vulnerable to subjective interpretation, and the $4,500 must be adjusted annually with the Cost of Living Index. We urge the PC to direct staff to make these changes:

a. All "Agricultural Event Centers" shall be required to have an onsite verifiable agricultural production ***income*** of $4,500 per year at the time of application for a Conditional Use Permit, or ~~have the potential to~~ produce $4,500 ***in income*** from on-site agricultural production within one year of the application.... The $4,500 agricultural production income minimum requirement shall be adjusted annually according to the Cost of Living Index."

By relying on the word "production," a fruit tree operation may claim its production of 45 fruit pies are valued at $100 each and claim the minimum production amount has been reached—regardless of whether any were ever sold, or sold at that price. Without an actual verifiable **income statement**, this important criterion is meaningless. Also, "verifiable" should be by document submission of IRS and CA FTB tax returns and not by a simple verbal report.

9. **Noise Regulations**. These criteria should be amended to state, "...required to stop all noise generating activities, such as music, at 7:30 pm or at 30 minutes before sundown, whichever comes first, or moved such activities...." In months where sunset is later than 7:30 pm, many people are outside working and/or enjoying their properties. Year-round noises from commercial entertainment events in rural ag/farm zones can become so irritable as to create disharmony among neighbors.

12 **Special Notice Requirements**. This standard is important for good neighbor relations as well as for code enforcement. Note: Did the standard intend for the notice signage to be 8.5 x 11 inches (rather than feet)? Although it may be a positive gesture, merely having a phone answering requirement does not ensure or guarantee any immediate compliance or resolution of the complaint.

Standards to Be Addressed in ZTA

On-site Security: A security requirement should be incorporated, especially since it will help mitigate the most common complaints—traffic, noise, and enforcement. On-site security could be required, as is in Monterey County, or a **substantial bond** should be posted that will cover costs of an after-hour response from either or both the County Sheriff and/or County Code Enforcement to any/all incident calls or complaints to ensure a rapid response. Having the requirement of a phone line staffed by a live person is reasonable, but if/when that phone line is not answered, its business as usual with the onus being on the "victim" to try to resolve an unacceptable issue.

Code Enforcement:

Code enforcement and consequences for noncompliance must be included in the ZTA for transparency, effectiveness, and deterrence. We urge revision of the ZTA to include noncompliance penalties—revocation of permit, fines, and second/third offense increasing violation categories. With the district attorney's packed calendar, the prosecution of a misdemeanor may be too small to bother with. The first justifiable complaint should count whether it's prosecuted as a misdemeanor (or as an infraction) or settlement is reached. Subsequent violations should carry much more severe penalties, fines, and consequences—e.g., revocation of all event permits for a period of five years and/or permanent revocation, etc. If acquitted on complaint charges, assuming the complaint was viable (decibel level, number of guest violation, etc.), then there may be no fines/penalties, but it should be a part of the record and considered in any subsequent actions.

Additional Provisions:

A provision must be added that an online database be established that informs the public of what kind of permit any event is utilizing, the history, and the conditions of approval or all other stipulations for the event.

We urge that these revisions be considered before a proposed ZTA is circulated for public review. We hope to continue working on the draft ZTA and look forward to creating one that all stakeholders can support.

Thank you for considering our views on this critical issue,

Marilyn Jasper

Marilyn Jasper, Chair

Kathi Heckert

From: Susan & Carter Ames <wiselama@zetabroadband.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: Planning Commission meeting 10-10-13

Gentlemen;
Thank you for the forum today, hope it was helpful. I don't envy you your task and hold on to hope since you did manage to vote down the Gold Hill Gardens Event Center altho it went on through.
Today I addressed the issue of the detrimental effect of these commercial uses on all our property values, but I was so incensed at the woman who trashed Lorrie Lewis, who wasn't even there, that I forgot to mention the most important point (although I believe you know this as I've mentioned it previously) that I'm speaking from a history of 17 years as a residential appraiser in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, have dealt with properties from huge outlying ranch properties to multi million dollar mansons, and worked with FNMA/FHLMC and private lenders across the country and I assure you that what I reported today is absolute fact of the appraisal process, not my opinion. It's a disservice to us all and just going to get worse if this proliferates. Thank You,
Susan Ames

22

Kathi Heckert

From: Joanne Dietz <joanne_dietz@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 7:49 PM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: RE: 10-10-13 PC Agenda item of interest Community Center Workshop

Kathi,
Thanks for the info on all the hard work the committee is doing on defining what a Community Center is. One quick question: Based on the definitions provided, it looks like Wise Villa Winery comes under the category of Agricultural Event Center, correct? (area is zoned ag, not commercial)

Joanne Dietz

From: KHeckert@placer.ca.gov
Date: Thu, 3 Oct 2013 14:27:25 -0700
Subject: 10-10-13 PC Agenda item of interest Community Center Workshop

Hello Interested Parties

Please see attached agenda for upcoming Planning Commission Hearing on October 10th.

Note – The Community Center Workshop is on the agenda.

You can view the staff report by clicking on link below

http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/pchearings

click on 10-10-13 and then click on the Community Center staff report.

Thank you for your interest.

Kathi Heckert, Senior Board /Commission Clerk
Placer County CDRA
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn CA 95603
(530) 745-3082

23

Kathi Heckert

From: George Rosasco
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 8:07 AM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: FW: Placer County Planning Commission Workshop - Event/Community Centers - October 10, 2013

For PC

George Rosasco
Supervising Planner
Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
Phone (530) 745-3065

From: pjm@lonebuffalovineyards.com [mailto:pjm@lonebuffalovineyards.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 3:37 PM
To: Michael Johnson; George Rosasco
Cc: crubin@scbglobal.net; Jim Holmes; Paul Thompson
Subject: Placer County Planning Commission Workshop - Event/Community Centers - October 10, 2013

Gentlemen:

I write to point out an error in Carol Rubin's August 4, 2013 email regarding "Ag Center definition" which is attached as an exhibit to Mr. Rosasco's Staff Report for the **October 10, 2013** Planning Commission Workshop - Event Center Uses in Placer County. I direct your attention to the paragraph beginning on page 2 of that email (page 16 of the Staff Report), with the sentence "Two wineries (Dono Dal Cielo and Lone Buffalo), that already hold events without permits, are located on Wise Road within two miles of Gold Hill Grange and Gold Hill Gardens....." The statements made in this paragraph regarding "events" at Lone Buffalo Vineyards are not accurate.

As you well know, the definition of "events" in the Winery Ordinance is so vague and ambiguous that it provides little guidance to either wineries, county staff or the public as to what events are permitted. It is therefore nearly unenforceable. It is one of the primary reasons the Planning Department has undertaken the process to revise the Winery Ordinance and why the Placer County Vintners Association has submitted recommendations concerning the definition of "events" which mirror those recently adopted by Sacramento County and which are driven by the impact of the "event" as determined by the venue and number of participants.

It is also important to recognize that the planning department has wisely chosen to separate the refinement of the winery ordinance from the development of an ordinance to govern "community centers" and "event centers". There is a fundamental difference between wineries, whose business is driven by the production and marketing of wine, a quintessentially agricultural endeavor, but who need the ability to conduct "events" to make the business economically viable, and event centers, whose business is driven by the events themselves and any agricultural aspect of the business is ancillary.

Lone Buffalo Vineyards is a winery, the business of which is the production and marketing of an agricultural product, wine. It has no intention of becoming an "event center". Hopefully, the separate winery ordinance

24

revision procedure in which we are engaged will result in rational, reasonable, clear and enforceable standards for "events" at wineries. With that hope in mind, Lone Buffalo will continue to conduct its business in conformity with its agricultural nature and will only hold such "events" as are compatible with that nature and with the size and location of our property.

Please see that this email is forwarded to the members of the Planning Commission and that it is made part of the record of the October 10th workshop.

Thank you for your attention.

Phil Maddux

Lone Buffalo Vineyards

Forward to Commissioner & Staff 10/8/13 KH

Kathi Heckert

From: Joanne Dietz <joanne_dietz@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 03, 2013 7:49 PM
To: Kathi Heckert
Subject: RE: 10-10-13 PC Agenda item of interest Community Center Workshop

Kathi,
Thanks for the info on all the hard work the committee is doing on defining what a Community Center is. One quick question: Based on the definitions provided, it looks like Wise Villa Winery comes under the category of Agricultural Event Center, correct? (area is zoned ag, not commercial)

Joanne Dietz

From: KHeckert@placer.ca.gov
Date: Thu, 3 Oct 2013 14:27:25 -0700
Subject: 10-10-13 PC Agenda item of interest Community Center Workshop

Hello Interested Parties

Please see attached agenda for upcoming Planning Commission Hearing on October 10th.

Note – The Community Center Workshop is on the agenda.

You can view the staff report by clicking on link below

http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/pchearings

click on 10-10-13 and then click on the Community Center staff report.

Thank you for your interest.

Kathi Heckert, Senior Board /Commission Clerk
Placer County CDRA
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn CA 95603
(530) 745-3082

26

County of Placer
RURAL LINCOLN MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

April 15, 2014

Robert M. Weygandt
Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Supervisor Weygandt,

Over the past year, we have heard the members of our community express their concerns about a loss of the priority of agriculture and the effect on their quality of life due to businesses opening on neighboring farm land. Citizens attended from all areas of the MAC area and represented many professions and demographics.

Two businesses that have been allowed to move forward prior to the development of the Event Center Ordinance in our area and have caused considerable consternation are Wise Villa Winery and Gold Hill Gardens. These two businesses evidence some of the characteristics that most residents dislike coming into the community.

In all fairness, we also have had representatives from the community and some members of the clientele of the MAC area businesses (that fall under the current Winery Ordinance) attend the MAC meetings and express their point of view that these businesses do not interfere with Placer County's priority of agriculture nor do they diminish the quality of life for their neighbors.

We are pleased that the Board of Supervisors placed a moratorium on the development of any new event centers and charged the Planning Department with the task of developing an Event Center Ordinance. This has given our community needed time to consider all aspects of such an ordinance and voice opinions. We believe that an ordinance can support the development of new businesses and, at the same time, protect the community from potential negative effects of those businesses.

George Rosasco has done an excellent job drafting an Event Center Ordinance and we favor all the points that he included. We particularly appreciate the fact that he came repeatedly to the Rural Lincoln MAC to explain and listen to all the issues raised by our residents. While supporting the basics of the draft ordinance, the Lincoln MAC feels there are additional items to be considered to provide for the harmonious development of Event Centers in our county in the future.

The following is a list of those items that we believe are necessary to make the new Event Center Ordinance compatible with agriculture and quality of life:

- Code Enforcement must be available when needed to hear and respond to complaints
- No Event Center should be allowed on a shared private road
- The size of the property allowed to develop event centers must be increased to 20 acres, 40 acres and 80 acres
- The owners that desire to develop an Event Center must demonstrate that at least 51% of their income is from agriculture
- Event Centers must be limited to hosting events 12 times per calendar year
- The Event Center permit must go to the applicant and not the property. When the owner dies, sells, or transfers ownership, the permit expires
- There must be a method for evaluating each event center site in order to avoid a concentration in a relatively small area before a permit is granted.

In conclusion, we wish to express our appreciation to the Board of Supervisors for supporting the Municipal Advisory Council process. The community asks for your support of the recommended changes included above.

Sincerely,

George Alves

George Alves, Chairman

cc: Larry Sevison, Planning Commission Chairman
George Rosasco, Placer County Planning Department
Rural Lincoln MAC Members

County of Placer
SHERIDAN MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
175 Fulweiler Ave
Auburn, CA 95603
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

April 3, 2014

Robert M. Weygandt
Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Supervisor Weygandt,

RE: PROPOSED EVENT CENTER ORDINANCE | RECOMMENDATION

We appreciate the time and effort that George Rosasco made in drafting the proposed event center ordinance. We especially appreciate that he came twice to the Sheridan MAC to present and explain the draft ordinance and took the time to listen to our concerns and answer our questions.

In general we are pleased with the result of his work but we do have a couple reservations. We believe that some important elements have been left out of this draft. We respectfully ask that you consider our concerns and give your support to addressing them.

The following are the points that we feel should be included in the final ordinance:

- Code Enforcement must be available when needed to hear and respond to complaints raised by members of the community.
- No Event Center should be allowed on a private road without written agreement by all other property owners on that private road.

We also voted to recommend that the Event Center Ordinance be kept separate from the Winery Ordinance. While there is some overlap, we feel the issues would best be addressed by their own respective ordinance and considered separately.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jim Houck

Jim Houck, Chair

cc: Larry Sevison, Chairman, Placer County Planning Commission
George Rosasco, Placer County Planning Department

County of Placer
NORTH AUBURN MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
P. O. Box 6983
Auburn, CA 95604
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

February 21, 2014

Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Draft Zoning Text Amendment -- Event Centers

Dear Commissioners:

The proposed Zoning Text Amendment to change the definition and standards for Community Centers and Agricultural Event Centers in rural agricultural areas of Placer County was presented to the North Auburn Municipal Advisory Council in a series of workshops by George Rosasco, Supervising Planner.

The North Auburn MAC discussed the proposed ZTA and although there was generally support for the proposed changes to the Zoning Text to clarify the definition of Community Center and Event Center, members of the MAC voiced several concerns with the proposed language. Specifically, there were concerns regarding the minimum requirement for agricultural income, notably that such a requirement would force property owners into farming; that the signage and notification requirements could place an onerous burden on property owners; and that the number of events should be carefully examined and not based on a random number.

At its January 14, 2014 regular meeting the North Auburn MAC recommend approval of the draft Zoning Text Amendment to the Planning Commission with the following recommendations:

1. The Planning Commission should examine the necessity of minimum agricultural requirements;
2. The Planning Commission should review signage and notification requirements;
3. The Planning Commission should examine the number of events allowed.

MOTION: FARINHA/WATTS/WILBUR – YES
HUNGERFORD – NO
ROEDER – ABSTAIN
ABSENT: FLECKLIN AND LIVINGSTON

MOTION PASSED 3/1

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Hungerford

Dave Hungerford,
Vice Chairman
North Auburn Municipal Advisory Council

cc: Placer County Board of Supervisors
George Rosasco, Supervising Planner

County of Placer
WEIMAR/APPLEGATE/COLFAX
MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

February 19, 2014

Subject: WAC MAC Advisory to the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

On January 15, 2014 the Weimar, Applegate, Colfax Municipal Advisory Council (WAC MAC) reviewed and discussed the proposed Zoning Text Amendment for "Event Centers" in the unincorporated areas of Placer County. The MAC discussed several areas of concern and made the following recommendations:

- Agricultural Requirement (7.a.)
  - Amount of Agricultural Sales Required to be specified as $1000 per acre Gross Income Sales.
  - Need process to verify and revoke MUP/CUP if Agricultural Requirements are not met.
  - No paving before Event Center applicant meets agricultural requirements.
  - Paving is not allowed during one-year grace period to meet Agricultural Requirements.

- Special Notice Requirements (12.a.)
  - Back-up phone number to be posted to an entity guaranteed to respond (i.e., law enforcement in the event there is no answer at the "contact phone number".)

- Definitions (B) – recommend acreage requirements be adjusted as follows:
  - Small Agricultural Event Center means 20 acres or larger.
  - Intermediate Agricultural Event Center means 40 acres or larger.
  - Large Agricultural Event Center means 80 acres or larger.

- Number of Events: Modify - 26 is excessive

- Access - Replace Sections D.2.b and D.2.C with the following:
  - D.2.b. All Community Centers, commercial Event Centers and Agricultural Event Centers shall have direct and exclusive access from a County-maintained Road. An encroachment permit may be required to address ingress, egress and site distance requirements. Direct and exclusive access means either 1) the Event Center parcel abuts a County maintained highway or 2) fee simple ownership or an access easement for the exclusive use of the parcel on which the Event Center is located. Event Center access roads shall not be utilized to access any parcel other than the Event Center parcel, except in case of emergency.

Sincerely

Lynn Tauch, Vice Chairperson

County of Placer
MEADOW VISTA MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603
County Contact: Jocelyn Maddux, District 5 Field Representative (530) 889-4010

Laurie Sweeney, Chair
Mike Walker, Vice-Chair
Sherri Bloomfield
Anders Hauge
Patrick Shea-Burgess

February 5, 2014

Subject: Meadow Vista MAC Advisory to the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

On December 4, 2013 the Meadow Vista Municipal Advisory Council (MAC) reviewed and discussed the proposed Zoning Text Amendment for "Event Centers" in the unincorporated areas of Placer County. The MAC discussed several areas of concern and made the following recommendations on a 3-1 vote:

- recommend approval of the ZTA with the addition of attached Sierra Club Recommendations Item 3. Agricultural Requirement, Item 4. Number of Events and Item 7. Online Database.

- Recommend amending Chapter 17, Planning and Zoning Ordinance, section. D1 – Parking-4a by removal of the parenthesis "(w/exception of parking)" from the text.

Sincerely,

Laurie Sweeny, Chairperson

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ___ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ___ Other ✓ MAC Bder
FEB - 6 2014
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ✓ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ___ UK

County of Placer
FORESTHILL FORUM
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

February 3, 2014

To: Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

Subject: Event Center/Community Center ZTA Action

On January 6th, The Foresthill Forum (Municipal Advisory Council), reviewed and discussed the proposed Zoning Text Amendment for "Event Centers" in the unincorporated areas of Placer County.

The Forum discussed several areas of concern and took action on the proposed ZTA itself as follows:

- Section 2.c, Access Standards: Strengthen wording to address the issues of maintenance, liability, and enforcement. The Forum recommends that the burden of road maintenance, liability and enforcement be placed on the event center applicant. (UNANIMOUS 6-0)

- Section 4.a, Setbacks: Delete "minimum of 200 feet" and replace with "as specified by Conditional Use Permit". (4 Yes, 2 Abstain)

- Section 6, Number of Events: 26 events per year is too many, and the number of events per month should be specified. (UNANIMOUS 6-0)

Respectfully submitted,

Chase Dowling, Vice Chairperson, Foresthill Forum

Cc Jennifer Montgomery, Placer County Board of Supervisors Supervisor District 5
Jocelyn Maddux Field Representative to Placer County Supervisor Jennifer Montgomery
Foresthill MAC (Forum)

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ___ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ___ Other ✓ MAC Binder
FEB - 6 2014
Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ✓ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ✓ LK
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ___ * ✓

County of Placer
HORSESHOE BAR MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
Loomis, CA 95650-1081
County Contact: Leah Rosasco (530) 889-4010

January 31, 2014

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ___ CoCo ___
TSI ✓ CEO ___ Other ___

FEB - 3 2014

Sup D1 ___ Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ___ Aide D4 ___
Sup D2 ___ Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ___ Aide D5 ___
Sup D3 ___ Aide D3 ✓ ___ LK

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Event Centers (Community Centers)

To The Honorable Placer County Board of Supervisors:

On January 21, 2014, the Horseshoe Bar Municipal Advisory Council held its regular meeting, hearing from members of the community, as well as representatives from Placer County Planning, relative to the proposed ordinance criteria for review of event centers in Placer County. Based on that meeting discussion we have the following recommendations.

- Recommend that access to an event center is only from a public road. We received many comments and concerns centered around non-exclusive easements on private roads. Limiting access to public roads will greatly reduce the concern.
- We support the Ag Commission recommendation of $1000/ac. of verifiable agricultural production.
- Setbacks should include a minimum distance of 400 feet from existing dwellings. This is in line with the 200 foot setback criteria and will ensure separation for already existing dwellings that are closer than 200 feet to the property line.
- Recommend that code enforcement should be made available outside of regular business hours. Code violations will most likely occur on the weekends.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Mark Fortner,
Chairman, Horseshoe Bar Municipal Advisory Council

cc: Placer County Planning Department

Copy to MAC Binder

County of Placer
PENRYN MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

January 30, 2014

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BOS Rec'd ✓ COB ___ CoCo ✓ Kathi Hecker
CEO ___ Other ✓
MAR 14 2014
Sup D4 ___ Aide D1 ✓ Aide D4 ✓
Sup D5 ___ Aide D2 ✓ Aide D5 ✓ LK
Aide D3 ✓

Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Draft Zoning Text Amendment – Event Centers

Dear Commissioners:

At its January 28, 2014 regular meeting the Penryn MAC took action to recommend the following guidelines for the proposed Zoning Text Amendment to change the definition of "Community Center" and to establish a definition and guidelines for "Agricultural Event Centers."

Since this action item was a continued item from the December 3, 2013 MAC meeting Director Neifer felt that it was important to include the highlights of the discussion heard on this item at the December meeting. These items, as reflected in the minutes, were as follows: road access on shared roadways, private access issues, maintenance on private roads, noise issues, enforcement of codes and ordinances if violations occur, the number of events that can be scheduled for such centers (26) and the number of "centers" that could be in rural Placer County resulting in the loss of farmland. General discussion followed with input from the public as well as the MAC. The following motion was made and approved:

Patty Neifer made a motion to bring forward the following recommendations regarding the Event Center proposal:

- No event centers located on private shared roads;
- Maximum number of events allowed per year should be 6 not 26;
- Maximum hours of operation should be 8 hours;
- Event center minimum acreage should be doubled (Small: 20 acres, Medium: 40 acres and Large: 80 acres;
- Enforcement contact information/number should be provided and posted if violations occur, with appropriate personnel on duty to respond to any complaints in a timely manner.

The motion was seconded by Anita Yoder; the vote was unanimous with three council members present (Mike Bishop, Patty Neifer and Anita Yoder), one council member absent (Bob Brodovsky) and one vacant seat.

Respectfully,

Mike Bishop
Vice Chair, Penryn MAC

RECEIVED
MAR 14 2014
PLANNING DEPT.

Cc: Supervisor Jim Holmes

Placer County is committed to ensuring that persons with disabilities are provided the resources to participate fully in its public meetings. If you require disability related modifications, including auxiliary aid or services, please contact the Board of Supervisor's office.

Granite Bay MAC Minutes
Wednesday, January 8, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, CA

1) **Call to Order** 7:06

2) **Pledge of Allegiance**

3) **Approval of the Agenda**

Motion was made, and seconded, to approve the agenda. Motion passed, 6-0.

4) **Approval of the Minutes**
   a) **December 4, 2013 (Suzanne Jones absent.)**

Motion was made, and seconded, to approve the minutes with the correction of a duplicate sentence. Motion passed, 5-0.

5) **Introduction of MAC Members**

John Thacker, Suzanne Jones, Walt Pekarsky, Don DeSantis, Eric Bose, Virg Anderson and Ashley Gibian, Secretary.

6) **Public Safety Reports**
   a) Placer County Sheriff

Lynn Harrison reported that two more men were arrested in conjunction with a burglary. The homeowners were awoken around midnight at the sound of the break in and called 911. The two men fled the scene and were later apprehended and are still in custody.

Placer County placed again for last year's National Night Out. Placer and Los Angeles County were the only Counties in California to place. They love the commitment in the communities of Placer County, but our population isn't high enough to place higher. About a dozen neighborhoods in Granite Bay alone participated. Recently, six new neighborhood watch group were formed along the Auburn-Folsom corridor. If you share phone numbers with your neighbors and look out for each other, it can be the best deterrent. In burglaries they tend to take things they can get rid of quickly such as jewelry, money, guns, and computers.

A resident reported that the Itchy Acres community has had multiple mailbox robberies in the cluster boxes. He personally has had medical packages such as syringes stolen. He has been trying to get a higher security box and wants to know what the postal service is doing about this issue so he asked them to come to the MAC. They responded that they will come in February.

   b) South Placer Fire District

There has been a resignation on the Fire Board. Anyone interested in serving on the board must submit an application by January, 31 and they will be doing interviews in early February.

   c) California Highway Patrol

None Present.

7) **Public Comments:** Any member of the public may address the Municipal Advisory Council on any matter that is NOT listed on the agenda. Comments will normally be limited to three (3) minutes per person at the discretion of the Chairperson.

None.

8) **Supervisor Report (If Supervisor Kirk Uhler is not present, Linda Brown will present)**

Robert Dugan on the PCWA Board and Supervisor Kirk Uhler are working on putting together a presentation as an informational item to explain what they are anticipating in response to the lack of rain. They are also trying to get someone from San Juan Water to come speak. Some good news because of the dry weather, construction continues on Auburn-Folsom Road to finish the widening project and continue the sewer line project. On the Board level, there was a request to approve a new Williamson Act contract. Rickey Ranch on Cavitt Stallman has been divided among the younger family members. A 70 acre portion North of Cavitt Stallman has elected to take a new contract. The new tax rate will be based on a new appraisal. The South side is letting the Williamson contract expire. On December 10, Supervisor Uhler presented the Commemorative Coin to Eric Bose. Placer County acquired the final three links needed to lay out a public trail network that someday will connect Hidden Falls Regional Park to the Bear River.

Frank commented that an article in the Sacramento Bee reported that San Juan Water District said that if the water issue continues into April or May, they will implement a Stage 5 long term water emergency.

9) **Informational Item/Non-Action:**

a) **<u>The Affordable Care Act:</u>** Presented by, Cheryl S. Davis, M.S., Director, Human Services (20 min.)
The Federal Government's Affordable Care Act is a complicated change in American medical insurance coverage. To help Placer County residents navigate through this process, a brief overview will be presented explaining eligibility, coverage and enrollment provisions. This is not meant to be a fully comprehensive presentation but a way to find out more about where to go and the role that Placer County is playing to help the community.

Cheryl Davis came to talk about the Affordable Care Act because there has been some confusion over it. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, created a new way to purchase coverage through health insurance exchanges. It requires most of us to have health insurance or pay a penalty which is often called the "individual mandate" and has been very controversial. It also establishes essential health benefits for all health plans. It makes it illegal to deny coverage based on pre-existing conditions, age, or occupation. They cannot charge more to women and those who are sick and it eliminates annual and lifetime caps. It also extends parents' coverage for young adults up to 26 years old.

The essential benefits included in every plan are: ambulatory services, emergency services, hospitalization, maternity and newborn care, mental health and substance use, rehabilitative services, laboratory services, preventive wellness and chronic disease mgmt., pediatric services and prescription drugs.

Covered California is our health exchange for the Affordable Care Act. It is estimated that Placer County's uninsured make up about 9% of the population which is half of the National Average. It is estimated that 75% of these people will be covered by 2016 and that is a benchmark set by the Federal Government. The County is responsible for signing people up through Medi-Cal.

You can apply for coverage through March 31, by phone, online or mail.

10) **Action Item:**

a) **Proposed Event Center Ordinance:** Presented by George Rosasco, Placer County Planning Services Division (20 min.)

The Board of Supervisors has requested that the Planning Department develop a new ordinance, for their approval, on Community Centers and Event Centers in Placer County. There were four workshops at the Planning Commission that resulted in a Draft Event Center Ordinance. This will be the second presentation to the MAC to answer further questions. Staff is requesting a recommendation on the ordinance that will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for further consideration.

Ej Ivaldi was here last week to talk about the proposed Event Center Ordinance. He reported that the Granite Bay MAC had more questions so George Rosasco is here to answer those questions. After this has been around to all the MACs (most of them twice) it will go back to the Planning Commission and then on to the Board.

An "event" is not clearly defined at this time but it is going to need to be defined. It would be something like, anything lasting longer than an hour and no more than twelve. For an example. His recommendation will be 10-12 hours max.

In response to event centers next to sensitive receptors, such as schools, the Alcohol Beverage Control Agency will not license centers too close to sensitive receptors. The event centers will also require a Conditional Use Permit which could be used to deny a center too close to sensitive receptors.

In regards to lighting, Agricultural areas don't have a lot of rules so it is necessary to spell out lighting restrictions. Those restrictions are already set for commercial areas so they do not need to be spelled out again in this specific ordinance.

For code enforcement, we could put specific language in the ordinance but it would limit the County's police in their ability to handle new situations as they arise. They have a citation process which warns people they are breaking a rule and if they do not correct it they will be fined. This works very well and often people correct the issue before their hearing. Code enforcement is not set up like police to respond instantly. There is talk about changing the way it is run so that they can respond more quickly. There has been talk of having permanent signage with a phone line that will be manned during all events. This line would be available so that someone can call and say, "Hey, this is happening" and the facility can fix it immediately. There is a concern that "everyone knows that no one is around on the weekends so they'll take advantage." Rosasco believes that if you revoke Conditional Use Permits or give fines, people will learn quickly that there are consequences for not staying to code. They discussed many options but decided that they have everything in place that they need, and they just need to expedite their responses and use it.

There were concerns about access standards and event centers being on private roads. If you were to have an event center on a private road, you would be responsible for bringing that road up to code and for a portion of the maintenance. Depending on the size of the center, this could include making the road 25 feet wide, turnouts for fire department vehicles, etc.

The agricultural requirement means that if you have an agricultural event center, it is meant to be an *alternative* revenue stream to help support the agricultural use. Should the agricultural use go away, the Conditional Use Permit should be revoked.

In counting the number of events each year, we need to have an allowance for private vs public events so that a family could have their reunion or a birthday party and it would not count against the number of events per year. We would not want this allowance to be abused though.

Density of Event Centers was discussed but it was decided not to regulate this. The only County that has done this is Monterey and their restrictions go far beyond a zoning ordinance. The County decided that a better solution is the Use Permit process and they can consider density in the permit process and decide for or against a specific center.

Eric Bose commented that the beauty of this ordinance is that it gives County Staff the ability to assess each application on a case by case basis and include the amount of regulation needed.

Residents have expressed concern over noise in Agricultural Zones. If you are in an agricultural zone, next to a legitimate agricultural use property, it can be exceedingly loud. There is heavy equipment, tractors, generators, etc. That said, there are rules set in place because the agricultural land in Placer County is very fragmented. All noise must move inside at 7:30 PM and outside noise must not exceed 20 decibels.

Marilyn Jasper suggested an online database in her letter. There is no provision for such a database and Rosasco doesn't know who would create and maintain such a database. You could have the centers do it, but that is self-policing. Sandy Harris recommended posting the conditions of the ordinance online so that people could look and see if a center is in violation on their own.

A motion was made, and seconded, the MAC Board recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the ordinance after reevaluating the number of events allowable per year as well as defining what an event is in terms of hours and length. Motion passed 6-0.

11) Correspondence – Found on Table at the rear of the room.

12) Next Regular Meeting – <u>February 5, 2014</u>

13) ADJOURNMENT 8:53

County of Placer
NEWCASTLE/OPHIR MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PO Box 1222
Newcastle, CA 95658
County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

November 22, 2013

Mr. Miner Grey
Placer County Planning Commission Chairman
Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 96503

Dear Chairman Grey,

At the November 21, 2013 Newcastle Ophir Municipal Advisory Council (MAC) meeting, the MAC took action on a draft Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) related to Event Centers. Supervising Planner, George Rosasco, presented the ZTA and requested a recommendation from the MAC.

The MAC heard numerous concerns from residents, and shares their concern about the impact of Event Centers on the local community. At this meeting, the MAC approved a motion, 7 ayes / 0 noes / 0 absent, supporting the draft ZTA as presented with the condition that the following revisions are included in the ZTA:

1. Guidelines for funding of private road maintenance.
2. Definition of what constitutes an "event."
3. Method for tracking the number of events held at each Event Center that is accessible to the public, preferably via the internet.
4. An exemption to the 26 events per year limit to allow for a fixed number of non-profit fundraising events each year.
5. Chapter 17.D.4 is revised to state that setbacks can be greater than 200 feet if required by the Conditional Use Permit, but not less than 200 feet.
6. Chapter 17.D.7 is revised to indicate that the agricultural production requirement of $4,500 is a five year average based on actual production. This chapter should also specify whether this production requirement is net income or gross income.
7. Guidelines on how enforcement will be applied.

Sincerely,

Steven Palmer
Chair, Newcastle Ophir MAC

Cc: Jim Holmes, Placer County Board of Supervisors
George Rosasco, Supervising Planner, Placer County

COUNTY OF PLACER
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION MEMBERS
Tony Aguilar **Dan Macon**
Patricia Beard **William Morebeck**
James Brenner **John Nitta**
Larry Jordan **Stewart Perry**
Wayne Vineyard

Joshua P. Huntsinger
Agricultural Commissioner
Sealer of Weights & Measures

11477 E AVENUE, AUBURN, CALIFORNIA 95603
TELEPHONE: (530) 889-7372
FAX: (530) 823-1698
www.placer.ca.gov

January 17, 2014

TO: Placer County Planning Commission

FROM: Josh Huntsinger, Agricultural Commissioner

SUBJECT: **Comments and Recommendations on Draft Zoning Test Amendment for Agricultural Event Centers**

On January 13, 2014, the Placer County Agricultural Commission unanimously (7-0, 2 absent) approved the following recommendation:

The Agricultural Commission feels that credible, commercial agriculture must be the primary use of a parcel under consideration for a conditional use permit for an Agricultural Event Center (AEC). The AEC itself must be a secondary use. We also believe that the Agricultural Commission's role regarding land use is to protect and enhance the productivity of agricultural land in Placer County. Finally, we want to ensure that other county agencies continue to differentiate between events on agricultural properties (like farm tours, sheep dog trials, etc.) and Agricultural Event Centers (physical facilities and land conversion). Based on this foundation, we have a number of recommendations for the Planning Commission to consider. Furthermore, a number of these recommendations will obviously require review by County Counsel.

With respect to the proposal developed for consideration by the Placer County Planning Commission, we have a number of concerns relative to the underlying principles stated above. We support the size limitation contained in the proposal (10, 20 and 40 acre minimums on agriculturally-zoned parcels with associated event center sizes). Unlike Williamson Act determinations (which provide tax benefits in exchange for an agreement not to convert the land from agriculture, and which require a one-time determination of potential agricultural productivity), conditional use permits convey a right to engage in certain activities. To ensure the integrity of associated agricultural properties, and to protect important farmland resources, we have the following recommendations:

1. To ensure that agriculture is and remains the primary use on a parcel that is submitting an application for an AEC, we recommend that an initial finding and ongoing verification be made regarding the level of agricultural production on the property. We recommend that an applicant must demonstrate a minimum of $1,000 gross in agricultural production per acre. The initial determination could be made via inspection (similar to Williamson Act determinations), or it could potentially be made by requiring submission of a current IRS Schedule F. Ongoing verification could be made in a similar manner. We do not feel that a one-time determination at the time of application is sufficient.

2. As we've all experienced, the sale of an agriculturally zoned property does not ensure that the property will continue to be actively farmed or ranched. Consequently, we recommend that this conditional use permit run with the ownership of the property rather than with the land. This would require that a new owner demonstrate their commitment to agricultural production as the primary use of the land.

3. We feel that the Agricultural Commission should consider all proposals for AEC conditional use permits. Among the findings that the commission would need to make (in addition to 1 and 2 above) to recommend the approval of the permit are the following:

    a. The building and parking footprints must not occur within current agricultural production areas on parcels designated as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance or unique farmland by the California Department of Conservation.
    b. The operation of the AEC will not jeopardize Placer County's Right to Farm Ordinance. AEC-related activities shall not be protected by the county's Right to Farm ordinance.
    c. The AEC is supportive of surrounding agricultural production.

With respect to road impacts, the Commission feels that the issue is best addressed by other agencies.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments from the Agricultural Commission regarding the draft Zoning Text Amendment for Community Event Centers.

cc Placer County Agricultural Commission
George Rosasco, Supervising Planner
Michael Johnson, AICP Agency Director