REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, April 3, 2019 7:00 PM
Eureka School District Office, LARGE GYM
5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, CA

1. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance  7:00 PM

2. Welcome, Introduction of MAC Members & Statement of Meeting Procedures
   Virg Anderson, Eric Bose, Tom Kruse, Jim Radler and Te Iwi Boyd, Secretary.

3. Approval of April 3, 2019 Agenda
   Motion was made to approve the April 3, 2019 Agenda. Motion was seconded and
   passed, 4-0.

4. Approval of Mach 6, 2019 Minutes
   Motion was made to approve the March 6, 2019 Minutes. Motion was seconded
   however this vote does not have the quorum so a vote to approve these minutes will
   need to occur at the next meeting of the MAC.

5. Board Member & Public Safety Reports
   A. MAC Board
      No report given.
   B. Placer County Sheriff’s Office
      Deputies from the Sheriff’s Office reported that they are hearing concerns
      from the community regarding suspicious behavior and recent break-ins. The
      Deputies reminded residents to remain vigilant and to report suspicious
      behavior they see. Residents were also reminded not to leave items visible in
      their vehicles and to keep their homes and vehicles locked.

      A resident asked if doorbell cameras really do deter criminal behavior. Deputies confirmed that criminals typically won’t go to a home with a
doorbell cam and that they highly recommend doorbell cameras and surveillance equipment to protect your home.

      Suzanne Jones reported that the Treelake area has been experiencing an increase in stolen mail. The deputies reminded residents that this is an ongoing issue, but they typically see an increase this time of year as criminals are targeting residents tax refund checks. Residents were urged to check their mailboxes regularly.

The MAC is composed of appointed community members whose purpose is to advise the Board of Supervisors about activities and problems of the area represented. Residents are encouraged to attend and talk about issues important to them. More info at www.placer.ca.gov/bos/macs. Placer County is committed to ensuring that persons with disabilities are provided the resources to participate fully in public meeting. If you require disability-related modifications or accommodations, including auxiliary aid or services, to attend or participate in this meeting, please contact the Board of Supervisor’s Office.
A resident asked for an update on the homeless population in the area. It was reported that they don’t have too many issues in the community regarding the homeless population and that they monitor the ones known for causing trouble by staying in contact with residents and business owners.

A resident asked if the Deputies had any advice regarding packages left on the door and the best way to not have them stolen. The Deputies recommended that residents request to sign for package delivery whenever possible.

C. California Highway Patrol
   No report given.

D. South Placer Fire District
   No report given.

6. Public Comment: Let us hear from you! Do you wish to share something that’s NOT already on this agenda? We welcome your input at this time and kindly ask that you keep your comments to 3 minutes or less (or as determined by the chairman).

   Resident Jane shared her experience at the last Planning Commission meeting regarding Whitehawk II and expressed her feeling that the community’s concerns and feelings were not adequately conveyed to the Planning Commission.

   Resident Cheryl wants help to save Granite Bay and to stop what she refers to as spot rezoning. She wants the Granite Bay Community Plan to be upheld.

   Chris Johnson asked how many people applied to the MAC and wanted to know what the term limit is for a Member. She would like to see more people involved.

7. Supervisor Report

   Supervisor Uhler reported that the Charter Review Committee application deadline has been extended to May 1. Recruitment is still open for seven members of the Charter Review Committee, who will be charged with reviewing the charter and making recommendations for changes or additions, if any, they may determine are appropriate. One committee member from each of the county’s five supervisorial districts and two at-large members will be appointed collectively by the board. Applicants are not required to live in the district they may be selected to represent.

   Facilities impact fees were explained, and existing county infrastructure and potential county future needs were discussed.
Supervisor Uhler reported on the Capital Projects Workshop. Some facility types that were discussed were: Crime Lab, District Attorney Office Building, PCGC Administration Building, PCGC Agriculture/Farm Advisor, PCGC Corporation Yard, PCGC FAB Annex, PCGC Health & Human Services, PCGC Museum Warehouse and the Tahoe Justice Center.

Supervisor Uhler reminded residents that the community population numbers will be updated with next year’s census.

Supervisor Uhler also provided clarification on last meetings sewer fee increase and reiterated that this fee is specifically to be used for operational costs and maintenance and is completely unrelated to any increase in development, deficiencies in the system or upsizing of the lines. He provided the background for how the original sewer capacity was determined and reported that the total EDUs (Equivalent Dwelling Units) in the 1975 Loomis Basin General Plan, the precursor to Granite Bay Community Plan, was built to accommodate 80% buildout of the area. The basis for 80% was explained and it was explained that the 80% equaled 12,401 EDUs. Supervisor Uhler shared language contained in the follow up study for the Granite Bay Community Plan that allows densities to be moved around as long as they do not exceed the total previously calculated EDUs. Granite Bay currently utilizes 58% of the anticipated capacity identified in 1975.

Member Bose clarified that the fee increase is specifically for maintenance and operational costs and has nothing to do with capacity or upsizing lines. Supervisor Uhler confirmed.

Resident Chris Johnson asked about elections, polling places and the Charter Review Committee. An extensive discussion took place regarding elections and poling places and the potential for mandates on polling places. Supervisor Uhler shared some potential ideas to get out in front of the potential mandate. The purpose of the Charter Review Committee and member selection process was discussed.

Resident Cheryl B. inquired about a builder PAC article that she saw Supervisor Uhler mentioned. Supervisor Uhler explained PACs and that the money raised by the PACs does not go into his pocket. He further explained that what he believed she saw was an invitation to the Northstate Building Industry Association PAC event where other County Supervisors, City Council Members, etc. were also invited to attend. Cheryl asked about the potential for a conflict of interest. Supervisor Uhler explained that there was not a conflict of interest and he was not paid to attend the mentioned event. There was additional conversation regarding why there is not a conflict of interest.

A resident asked for clarification on term limits for MAC Members. It was explained that there are no term limits associated with the MAC Member positions and that there are no term limits in Placer County.
A resident asked if any thought had been given to a smaller increase over a longer period for the proposed sewer fee increase. Supervisor explained the thought process in the proposed method.

8. Information Items:

Granite Bay Marketplace (Formally Country Gables Shopping Center)
Granite Bay Marketplace is an existing shopping center on a 10.90 acre site (APN 048-103-062-000) located at the northwest corner of Douglas Boulevard and Auburn Folsom Road in Granite Bay. The site is designated Commercial in the Granite Bay Community Plan and is zoned C1-UP-Dc (Neighborhood Commercial, combining Use Permit Required and Design Review). Merlone Geier has plans to remodel the exterior and site of the existing shopping center.

Requested entitlements are a Design/Site Review Agreement.

Presenter: David Dreyfus, applicant (15 minutes)

Slides of site where shown and property was explained. Mr. Dreyfus provided a history of their company and explained problem areas within the project such as visibility, vacancy, and deferred maintenance.

Slides showcasing some of the proposed features were shown. Slides of the property today, showing current vacancy at 30-40% vacant. It was explained that the center struggles to retain “good” tenants, however they feel it has huge potential. Additional views of the site plan were shown, and it was explained that this project would require no rezone or densification. Photos showing current monument signs and update and refresh signage were shown and explained as were the building facades, parking and landscaping.

Residents were provided a rendering of the new court called “The Court” and the location on the property was shown.

New signage and architectural improvements were further shown and discussed.

An Illustrative Plan of Shops 2 & Shops 3A was shown and discussed. It was explained that this area will include firepits, outdoor lighting, outdoor seating, walkway with landscaping, upgraded connection point.
Character Imagery for Shops 2 & Shops 3A will include rock features, seat walls, landscaping retainment, outdoor seating features, water features, retaining walls that include water features, evening features.

Concept Renderings were shown and explained. Surrounding neighbors were discussed and lighting and sound mitigation ideas were explained.

University Village is the most recent renovation of a similar project this group has completed.

Tenant types were discussed. Preservation of current style with upgraded elements were further explained.

The project location was confirmed. The project site, parking and circulation were further explained.

Parking and parking space requirements for restaurants were discussed.

A revisit of site plan occurred.

Monument signs and requirements were discussed.

It was asked if this project would drive Raley’s out of its existing space. It was explained that Raley’s has a long-term lease.

Resident Cheryl asked if seating will only available for restaurants. It was explained that in addition to restaurant seating there will be common area seating for everyone to enjoy.

Shannon Quinn thinks it is a great concept.

A Resident expressed concern regarding circulation in the center and parking impacts.

A Resident thanked the presenters for coming before the MAC and encouraged them to use native landscaping.

A Resident requested that special care be taken regarding lighting. This resident doesn’t want the rules regarding signage to change.
Member Radler confirmed the reduction of square footage in a specific location of the project.

Member Bose asked for clarification regarding parking ratios. Typical retail center parking was discussed. Member Bose also mentioned the Community Plan should be updated to allow some tenant identification signage on street signage. The estimated timeline for the proposed makeover of the center was discussed. It was explained that their goal is to start next year, and that it would be an 8-month renovation. Additional discussion occurred regarding tenant signage and the need for changing it.

Member Kruse asked for clarification regarding outdoor entertainment. It was explained that all outdoor entertainment would be limited to low decibel activities. Examples of such were provided.

Further discussion regarding lighting occurred.

9. Action Items:

A. Quarry Ridge Office Park Project (PLN16-00157)

County staff will request the MAC take action to provide a recommendation on the Quarry Ridge Office Park Project. The applicant (Neil Doerhoff, Doerhoff Family Trust) is requesting an amendment to the Granite Bay Community Plan to change land use designation of the project site from Low Density Residential to Commercial; text changes to the Granite Bay Community Plan to modify the setback standard for buildings located on the north side of Douglas Boulevard; Rezone of the project site from Residential Single Family, Building Site 20,000-sf minimum (RS-B-20) to Office and Professional with Design Review combining district (OP-DC); a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide the project site into four parcels ranging in size from 24,202 square feet to 48,936 square feet; and Design Review to construct four office buildings and associated improvements within 3.23-acre property. The project site is located at the northeast corner of the Douglas Boulevard and Berg Street intersection in Granite Bay.

Presenter: Jennifer Byous, Planning Services Division

The Presenter introduced herself and the applicant. Handouts with architectural renderings and a site plan were provided to the MAC Members. The project site was shown, and location was described. Site photographs were shown to attendees.
The existing zoning was explained as were the proposed entitlements.

The Tentative Map proposed configuration was shown that included vehicle access to the site, parking and pedestrian sidewalks. A Phasing Plan was shown and explained. Phase I and Phase II were explained.

The Grading Plan was shown, and it was explained that grading will occur during Phase I. Widening of Berg Street, new curb and sidewalk and future grading of Douglas Boulevard for a future turn lane was explained.

Proposed tree removal was discussed as was the arborist report.

The proposed landscaping plan was shown and discussed.

An illustrative plan was shown that provided views from various surrounding locations and depict building renderings.

It was explained that the project objectives are to develop a new professional office park close to existing office and commercial development by providing a boutique office park that complements and blends in the natural setting and is compatible with neighborhood.

The Environmental Impact Report was discussed.

The proposed amendment to the Community Plan was read and shown in text and discussed.

Next steps in the process for the proposed project were explained.

Member Radler asked for clarification regarding the lighting in the back near the neighbors. The lighting plan was explained.

Afterhours access and the proposed gate were clarified. The location of the gate was shown on the Landscape Plan.

Member Bose asked if this was the same proposal that has been brought before the MAC previously as an information item. It was explained that the only change was a 2ft bump on Building A, otherwise it is an identical plan to what had previously been presented.
Member Kruse asked for clarification on the community plan amendment.

BJ Baker expressed her feelings and the feelings of her neighbors that this is a wonderful proposal for the site and that the applicant has been wonderful to work with.

Resident Jennifer expressed her concerns regarding traffic.

A Resident asked why a proposal for a rezone is being considered when housing is needed.

A Resident asked for clarification on the hours of operation. It was explained that the proposed hours of operation will be standard business hours. Further discussion regarding the purposed gate and the reason they are proposing the gate ensued.

Member Anderson reiterated the neighbor’s comments and desire for the gate.

Shannon Quinn expressed her concern regarding traffic impacts and the draft environmental impact report. She further expressed her belief that certain intersections were not included. Stephanie Holloway with the County addressed Ms. Quinn’s questions.

Shannon Quinn asked for clarification regarding setbacks and expressed her concerns Standards for setbacks were explained.

Cheryl expressed her understanding of zoning text amendment. She went on to say she thinks the proposed project is a great project but thinks the County is complicating the process and creating problems for the future.

Member Kruse stated that in general he likes the project as presented, but that he is concerned with amendment to the community plan.

Member Anderson stated that he likes this project because of how the developer worked with the neighbors however he is not sure about the change in the ordinance as this was the first, he had heard of it. Member Bose agreed with that sentiment. Other attributes of the proposed project including circulation were discussed by the MAC.
Stephanie Holloway provided additional clarification to the NOP as requested by Shannon Quinn.

Member Bose made a motion to recommend approval of project rezone and tentative map as proposed with a recommendation that staff find an alternative solution to the setback issue regarding the community plan amendment. Motion seconded by Tom Kruse and passed, 4-0.

Roll Call:

Jim Radler – Yea
Eric Bose – Yea
Virg Anderson – Yea
Tom Kruse – Yea

**B. Placer Retirement Residences (PLN16-00298)**

County staff will request the MAC take action to provide a recommendation on the Placer Retirement Residences project. The applicant, Lenity Architecture, is requesting a rezone from RS-AG-B-100 (Residential Agriculture, Combining Agriculture, Combining Minimum Building Site of 100,000 Square Feet) to RA-B-100 (Residential Agriculture, Combining Minimum Building Site of 100,000 Square Feet) and a Minor Use Permit to operate a residential care home with seven or more clients. The project proposes a three-story residential care home with 145 congregate living suites for up to 160 residents. Associated improvements include grading, landscaping, parking and circulation, and road improvements. The project site is located at the northwest corner of Old Auburn Road and Sierra College Boulevard in Granite Bay.

**Presenter: Kally Kedinger-Cecil, Planning Services Division**

The project team was introduced, and the project site was shown on a slide. Project size was given, and site photos were provided from surrounding site locations. Vegetation and tributary were explained. Existing undeveloped condition was shown. Current zoning was given, and surrounding zoning was given.

It was explained that this will be a residential care home with 145 congregate living suites for up to 160 residents. The project site, building size, EVA, etc. were explained.
Requested entitlements were explained as were the rezone and minor use permit.

Project operations and project objectives were given and the project EIR analysis and mitigation were shared.

The proposed building design was shown and explained. The site design was detailed, and setbacks were explained. It was explained that the proposed project provides for greater setbacks than required. The site design and landscape plan were shown.

Frontage improvements and the grading plan were explained.

On-Site Habitat was shown and explained, and tree impacts were explained.

It was reported that this project will go before the Planning Commission on April 11th.

The applicant thanked the county and staff. A lifestyle profile of the type of resident that would live at the proposed facility was provided. It was explained that the target age of residents is approximately 75+, in good health, does not require medical assistance; is currently living within 10 miles. Facility services such as meals, housekeeping and linen service were discussed as were social and physical activities and volunteer opportunities. Management of the facility was explained as were site amenities such as van service, an on-site chapel, a beauty salon, exercise room, game room, libraries, coffee lounge, movie theater, private rooms for family gatherings and many smaller gathering areas throughout the building and all services and utilities are included in rent.

Senior Housing Demand within five miles of the site were discussed and statistics provided. Demand for Hawthorn’s Services were provided. Target market for the residence was explained.

It was explained that the applicant has extensive experience in developing and managing these types senior facilities over the past 4 decades. Operations have
been continually refined to provide the best possible care for residents and to reduce the impact on emergency services.

Site plan and location goals were shared with attendees.

It was explained that the proposed project requires minimal site development and provides large setbacks, it provides excellent access to community, personal and medical services, it is located near single and multi-family neighborhoods to allow seniors to remain a part of the community and provides no significant impact on traffic, especially during peak travel hours.

Site size and project attributes were reiterated.

A preliminary site plan depicting site access and emergency vehicle access was shown, and the proposed vegetative boarder and habitat protection was discussed.

Building Design Guidelines were explained and site and building design features were shared.

An in-depth discussion regarding setbacks occurred.

Photos of the site from various perspectives were shown and discussed.

Slides of suites, dining room, library, coffee lounge and movie theater were shown.

Key points of the proposed project were gone over and included low impact on city and special district services; low traffic generation; no impact on schools; job creating; park like setting; allows local seniors to remain in the area; quiet low impact senior use and long-term neighbor.

Member Bose asked if this project would be like a senior apartment complex. It was explained that this is a misnomer because these units don’t have kitchens. Member Bose asked if the project is age restricted via a deed. It was explained that this project is not currently and that is not a typical practice for this type of product. Member Bose asked the applicant if they would consider a deed
restriction and asked about the transition point when residents disqualify from living at this type of facility. The process was explained.

Shannon Quinn asked what type of license is required for this type of residence. Requirements were discussed.

Sandy Harris expressed her concerns regarding impacts on EMS services and she doesn’t think this was addressed in the EIR. She further expressed her opinion that she doesn’t believe this is an appropriate use for this area.

Chris Johnson has been looking at this product and is concerned we are overbuilding this type of product for our area.

Resident Cheryl is concerned that this will be 3 story and that it doesn’t fit in the community plan. She shared her concerns regarding licensing and possible impacts on community services.

Barbara Singleterry asked for clarification regarding staffing and medical attention for residents. The process was explained.

A resident expressed his support for the project and thinks there is a need for it in the community.

The applicant was asked to clarify what happens when/if there is a change of use for this project in the future. The process for a possible change later down the line was explained.

Member Bose asked for a clarification regarding zoning. Clarification was provided.

Mr. Lo Duca offered the MAC further clarification on future use for the site and what that process would be. He reiterated that the proposed project is not an assisted living care center. The resident evaluation procedure was reiterated and there was further discussion regarding non-emergency transport vs. 911 call.

EIR cumulative analysis were discussed and clarified and the building height and height limits were discussed.
Member Radler expressed his concern regarding a 3-story product in this area. Perspective slides were shown of different vantage points and it was explained that from the street, the proposed building will look like a 2-story building.

Member Radler asked if the applicant had received any feedback from the neighbors. It was reported that they haven’t received any major feedback from the neighbors, it was also reported that the applicant has not held any specific neighborhood meetings, however they have reached out to the community through the MAC meeting process.

Member Bose asked if the proposed use is consistent with the Community Plan/General Plan. Allowable uses for the site were explained.

Member Kruse asked for clarification on the number of employees the facility would have as well as transportations services that would be offered. It was explained that there would be 18 full-time staff and 30 total staff. Transportation services were reiterated. Delivery service was discussed.

Member Bose expressed his concern regarding the scale and use of the proposed project at this location and his concern that there is no deed restriction. He expressed his concern that this project could become a hotel at a later date.

Member Kruse expressed his agreement with Member Bose’s concerns.

Mr. Lo Duca told MAC Members that they could make a recommendation to add a deed restriction if that adds comfort to the repurposing issue.

Member Bose made a motion to recommend denial of the proposal. Motion seconded by Tom Kruse and passed, 3-1.

Roll Call:

Jim Radler – Yea
Eric Bose – Yea
Virg Anderson – Nay
Tom Kruse – Yea

10. Adjournment to next regular meeting on May 1, 2019 10:06PM