



Minutes – March 24, 2015
Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Municipal Advisory Council

Members Present:

Wayne Russell
Mike Bishop
Patricia Neifer
Anita Yoder
Susan Mahoney
Diane Nicholas
Randy Maggert

County Staff Present:

Leah Rosasco

Board of Supervisors:

Supervisor Jim Holmes

Members Absent:

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The regular meeting of the Council was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Introduction of MAC Members

3. The Agenda was approved

The March 24, 2015 Agenda was approved as written. Motion made by Diane Nicholas, 2nd by Mike Bishop, motion carried.

4. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of January 27, 2015 were approved as written. Motion made by Diane Nicholas, 2nd by Mike Bishop, motion carried.

5. Selection of 2015 MAC Chair and Vice Chair

At the beginning of each year, the MAC members move to select members to service as MAC chair and vice chair to lead the monthly MAC discussion. The MAC will select these people at this meeting.

Motion made by Diane Nicholas to nominate Patricia Neifer to Chair, 2nd by Wayne Russell, all ayes, motion passed.

Motion made by Wayne Russell to nominate Diane Nicholas to Vice-Chair, 2nd by Mike Bishop, all ayes, motion passed.

6. Public Comment: None for Non Agenda items.

7. Public Safety Reports:

- a. **Placer County Sheriff's Office:** Timothy Lewandowski reported on mail thefts. People stopped were in possession of other people's mail. Roseville PD broke ring of mail thefts. Encouraged people to leave valuables in homes not in car.
- b. California Highway Patrol: No one in attendance
- c. Penryn Fire: No one in attendance
- d. South Placer Fire Staff – Shawn - Loomis Fire Department answered questions about defensible space and until when would fire permits be given out. Fire permits would be given out probably until June. There should be 100 ft. of defensible space from home. Brush and trees should be trimmed. Brochures with information about defensible space recommendations are available at the station.

Question: What about neighbors who don't mow their lawn.

Answer: Get name and address and Fire Department will send them letter.

Supervisor Holmes: Placer County has Hazardous Vegetation Abatement program, whereas people can report to Officer of Emergency Services neighbors who don't comply with the measure to be taken regarding defensible space. In such instances, the County will send letter to neighbor; if nothing gets done as requested in letter, the County will proceed to do the work and assess the costs on their tax bill.

The county also has a chip program, which costs \$40 to chip. However, a group of neighbors may share that cost, if they get together and gather the vegetation.

- e. Cal Fire: No one in attendance

8. County Updates – Supervisor Holmes:

1. Congratulations to Patricia Neifer on being reappointed as the MAC Chair
2. Welcome to new MAC member, Randy Maggert.
3. Bickford Ranch workshop on April 23rd at 6:00 p.m. Notices will be sent out.
4. March 19th groundbreaking day for the Forest Ridge 64-apartment project. Will open spring of 2016.
5. Fire Protection Services – County is cutting Cal Fire program. This is a major concern to Holmes as Loomis, Penryn will place burden on other Fire Districts.
6. Update on I-80 overcrossing. The next street closure for the project will be Horseshoe Bar Road, which will be closed for 2 weeks. King Road will be closed in June and Newcastle overcrossing and road will be closed in September. More updates are available on the website.
7. Reflective markers are made possible by a \$5mil. secured grant. Markers reduce head collisions by 25%.
8. The library system – There were meetings on March 10th, 12th and 14th. Pleased that the BOS delayed voting on the closure by a vote of 14 to 7. This is an opportunity to work with the community to find other alternatives. On April 7th, it will be on the BOS Agenda as an

Informational Item only. Supervisors Montgomery and Holmes delayed vote in hope to find other alternatives to library's closure.

Question: When did the BOS become aware of shortage of funds?

Answer: During the 2009 budget workshops. Library was using money reserves. Hours were cut. Then the economic downturn came about and with it, loss of additional revenues.

9. Information/Non-Action Items:

- a. Loomis Library Update:** The Director of Library Services will present information on the Library's Strategic Plan, the possible closure of Loomis and Meadow Vista Libraries and the future delivery of library services to Placer County, including alternative delivery models.

Presenter: Mary George, Director, Placer County Library Services

In the last few years, the library system was struggling financially. With staffing declining and reliance on temporary staff, it was decided to consolidate resources to make the remaining libraries stronger. It is not her intention to offend the town of Loomis. Her intent is to work on a balanced budget with the Board of Supervisors. The public is encouraged to voice their concerns. Any ideas, suggestions are welcome, as are other alternative solutions for funding.

The Placer County Libraries Strategic Plan, which was paid by a grant, relied heavily on community input. The plan was approved by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in December 2013.

The plan comprises of three initiatives:

1. **Reverse Erosion** – Move beyond an interconnected system of small town libraries to a fully interdependent network of County library services outlets.
2. **Modernize** – Expand self-service. Rebalance library floor plans for more space and outdoor access. Explore and add mainstream technologies. Pursue community partnerships and exchanges of services with other agencies.
3. **Build Capacity for the Future** – Develop a long range facilities master plan for future space needs. Create destination libraries that attract visitors. Develop programs supporting workforce development and job seeking. Pursue partnerships to establish endowments.

Libraries' Chart showed the previous years' surplus progression. It was \$406k in 2005-06 and went down to \$106k in 2009-10; in 2010-11 it was in deficit of \$338k, 2014 saw a plus of \$51k and by 2014-15 it has a \$427.5k budget deficit.

The Loomis library is not a sustainable library, it is just limping along and not meeting the standards for a library.

Neifer: How did Loomis and Meadow Vista libraries get slated for closure?

Mary: Low usage and strategic planning. 20% of people use Granite Bay/Colfax; 75% use Auburn; Applegate and Foresthill 5%.

Susan: How about partnering with other libraries for money?

Mary: Plan is not sustainable. Take a look at the finances.

Many Loomis residents turned out in force to attend the meeting and to voice opposition to the Loomis library closure. Here are some of many questions and comments voiced by the audience:

- Cannot imagine Loomis without a library. People should band together and do some fundraising.
- Rocklin library has surplus of funds. How about a redistribution of funds?
- Libraries are a refuge for many people, they hosts lectures and concerts. We should save the library for our community – it is part of our town.
- 1000plus signatures were collected to keep the library open. Only 4 were from adults, the rest were from kids.
- Percentage of usage is meaningless, it only reflects the population's equal. Suggests the county could save by going solar. It is more ecological to keep the Loomis library open, since people can walk to and from.
- Linda Sandol, long-time resident and Friends of the Library member since the 1980s. Showed sign the kids were holding and the many drawings on the wall. 2200 signatures were collected to show support against the library's closure. Asked Mary to explain where the \$40k donated to Friends of the Library went.
- Mary: Placer Community Fund started Placer Community Foundation as an alternative way to get extra money that would not compete with Friends of the Library. The Foundation was to set aside people's donations for county library services. The goal was to create a separate revenue source. When Colfax was given money, they had to hire an attorney to create a trust. No much money was left after paying the attorney. The goal is that the money won't be used for many years so that it will grow into a robust fund. That money would never be used now.
- The number of children using the library is underestimated. Books are the best resource for mind expansion.
- Robert Hadelman – upset about how the decision to close the library was made without the community's involvement. This is not a fight for Loomis, but for all libraries in Placer County. Appeals to the community to work with County, the MAC and Mary George to join together in finding solutions. The funding just isn't there to be allocated to the town of Loomis. Suggests a committee be created by the MAC willing to work with Loomis.
- Curt Sandhoff – moved from Auburn to Loomis. He has helped residents as a tax aid person for free at the Loomis library. Nothing is for free. He always leaves donation at the dog park, but library doesn't have a box for donations.
- Justin Nash – Spoke at Town Council. Offers solutions: Read the budget and become educated. 501c3 for a legal entity – work for donations company and write off donations. Different cost structure. E-books much cheaper to purchase. Contact state representative to ask to loosen regulations to use E-books. Donations to be kept to remain within our library's system. Some libraries rent out material.

- Susan teacher/educator - Library gives children a place to study. She encourages library to be open for homework.
- Henry Schneider, President of the Loomis Chamber. Appreciates the help from Holmes. He questions the numbers of usage.

9. Action Items:

a. Orchard at Penryn

Penryn Development LLC has submitted an application for a 54-lot residential subdivision on approximately 15 acres in the Penryn area of unincorporated Placer County. The project site consists of two parcels (APNs 043-060-052 and 043-060-053) on the west side of Penryn Road, approximately one-half mile north of Interstate 80. The site has approximately 60 feet of frontage along Taylor Road.

The proposed residential lots would range in size from 4,000 to 12,000 square feet, with the average lot size of 8,200 square feet. The project includes the preservation of a portion of the wetland/riparian area, as well as several prominent rock outcroppings. A tot lot is included on the project site, as are 28 off-street public parking spaces.

In addition to a Tentative Map, the applicant is also proposing a rezone of the two parcels to Residential Single Family, building site minimum of 4,000 square feet (RS-B-4). The project will also seek a variance to the parking standards, and will be subject to a Design Review. The submitted application would modify the planning approvals previously granted by Placer County allowing for the development of 150 multi-family residential units at the project site.

A Supplemental Checklist has been completed and an Addendum to the previously-certified EIR has been prepared.

Presenter: Sherri Conway, Planning Services Division

Due to economic factors, the original project did not go forward. In 2014, the applicant came back with a different concept, to build 54 single-family homes, accessible from Penryn Road. The major difference was less density than originally planned. The proposal rezones from commercial to residential single-family. There is a proposed a variance to parking. There is an Addendum to previously certified EIR. Inclusion for additional mitigation measures: noise impact for some lots, construction of sound barriers and clean up of site due to toxins for prior use of pesticides.

Neifer: Concerns regarding lighting.

Answer: Project will go through a design review. Design phase will be more detailed.

Neifer: Will there be a gate?

Answer: Yes. Penryn continues north and ties into Taylor Road. Someone may cut through to the site which would not be not safe for residents. Project was approved with gate.

Diane: Wetland area where wildlife travels. Would there be a wildlife corridor?

Answer: No significant movements of usage for corridor detected.

Question: Size lots - Designed loop roads around wetland area.

Answer: Concessions to size of lots, etc. was to preserve rock outcropping. There were considerations from fire dept. and engineers to accommodate the natural settings as much as possible and still comply with setback requirements.

Question: Will the natural state be preserved?

Answer: Central area will have a ridge. Rock outcropping will be preserved.

Question: Guaranteed no parking overflow?

Answer: Gate will limit inflows/overflows. CC&Rs would probably prohibit on-street parking. The loop maybe dedicated to free parking.

Question: What kind of pesticide was used in the area?

Answer: Arsenic. The heavy metal is in the top 65% of soil.

Question: Where would this contaminated soil trucked to?

Answer: At a Lincoln site suitably classified for such disposal.

Question: Fencing on the property line would impact area to the north.

Answer: Screening process to lay down what kind of landscaping screening to use. There are two lots which are the biggest concerns. They are long so the lines will be low.

Comment: Point of reference. Up to 2012 a project this size would not have been approved because of wildlife use. A gated community would stop that. Wildlife would not be able to go through. In 2013, someone with the County clearly identified 165 acres protected for wildlife and no kind of housing to be allowed. Why is that plan protecting the area being disregarded now? At that time, the decision was made by Council and reinforced by Superintendents. Now 165 acres are up for grabs. County reported a negative impact and residual maintenance costs to taxpayers.

Question: Is there any truth that this project would create a negative impact?

Answer: The project was approved in 2012.

Question: Was there a negative financial impact on the county?

Answer: A fiscal analysis was not required because the proposed project is much smaller than the original plan.

Question: Green belt – how does it fit into the water conservation plan?

Answer: Penryn Parkway designated to neighborhood to have basic services. It is not in the greenbelt as area of conservation.

Question: How does it fit into unincorporated area for preservation of wildlife travel?

Answer: Some area will be preserved. The site is zoned for commercial/residential. No part of this site is part of conservation area.

Question: Will there be a private road?

Answer: Yes. It will be away from the travel corridor. Wetland area will not have connecting roads. It will be a separate area away from the travel corridor.

Question: MAC upholds fencing. There have been reports about small animals getting impaled when jumping over fence.

Answer: Design review will specify details.

Question: Water source for development. Horseshoe Bar Community Plan included as part of Placer County which protects this area as conservation area. With project of this nature, how to accommodate for water usage? Is entire area in Penryn conservation area and area in project designated as commercial/residential?

Answer: PCWA is the water provider. The agency sent letter stating it has the ability to provide water services to the planned units. The landscaping provides for type of plants that are drought resistant.

The MAC passed a second motion after a prior motion, which did not pass,

The MAC discussion of the project included concerns regarding the ability for wildlife to move through the project site and questions regarding impacts associated with parking and circulation within the project. After discussing the project, the MAC took action to approve a motion to recommend that the Planning Commission approve the revised project with the request that the Planning Commission take into consideration the potential impacts to wildlife migration resulting from the project.

**MOTION: YODER, BISHOP, RUSSELL, MAHONEY, MAGGERT - YES
NEIFER, NICHOLAS – NO
MOTION PASSED**

b. Winery Ordinance

At its February 24th hearing, the Placer County Planning Commissioners directed Planning Staff to present the proposed winery ordinance updates to the Municipal Advisory Councils (MACs). Planning Staff will present the proposed updates to the current winery ordinance and requested changes by the Placer County Vintners' Association. The MAC is being requested to make a recommendation on each of the proposed updates. The DRAFT updated ordinance can be reviewed at the website:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/-media/cdr/Planning/Ordinances/Wineries.pdf>

Presenter: George Rosasco, Placer County Planning Services Division

The proposed updates to the current winery ordinance are:

- Number of events: Unlimited for 20 people or less, for more, an Administrative Review is required.
- Temporary Outdoor Events: 6
- Tasting Rooms: On site consumption by glass or bottle

- Noise Regulations: 55-70 db from 7:00 am to 7:30 pm and after 7:30 pm, noise to be reduced to 20 db or less.
- Code Enforcement: On Call-After hours officer
- Temporary Outdoor Event Permits: Max of 6 event days per year, permit required
- Private Roads: Winery with tasting room must provide proof of legal access and 2/3 of the property owners on same road must approve

Vintners' Association proposed revisions:

- Unlimited number of Routine Events – No permit required
- Routine Events: 10 acres or less – up to 75 people. 10 acres or more, up to 200 people
- Special Events: 10 acres or less – up to 100. 10 acres or more, up to 200 people
- On-site consumption by glass or bottle
- Noise: Same decibels and time as Existing Winery Ordinance

Final revisions to Proposed Winery Ordinance will be in April/May 2015.

Public discussion of the proposed winery ordinance were concerns on issues of noise, private roads, availability of parking, number of people for events, ARP permits and costs.

Comment from County and Visitors Bureau President – The wine industry attracts tourism and it is a good investment, as revenues from travel spending will impact the economy by 2017-22; tourism is an economic driver and the income from tourism will generate substantial revenues, and Placer County, with its wineries, will be a premier travelling destination.

Vintners present at meeting stressed the importance that the information regarding wineries be factual and county specific. Most of their wines are made at their local wineries, but some grapes have to be bought somewhere else because they are very rare.

Tina Wilcox of Villa Castellano - Revenues from the winery made possible donations to 22 charities, working in partnership with local hotels, employment of older people, hiring of local professionals; in 2013 her winery reported a \$3,000 profit, four times/yr., local charities use her facilities for fund raising events.

Carol Rubin, Newcastle Resident – Urge rejection of the Vintners' Proposal, and requests the Planning Commission to continue to work on the Nov. 13th, 2014 proposal that contained the MAC's and Ag Commission's recommendations.

Gary, Newcastle resident and former Mayor of Loomis – Planning Commission should address vintners' concerns and decision should not be made just on residents' personal concerns.

Kevin Stevenson of Casque Winery – Urges the MAC consider the Vintners' proposal and reject the Planning Commission's revised winery ordinance. There is a lot of hard work and long hours for vintners to generate an income. Making wine and providing for tasting room,

wine club - these are routine activities for vintners. Vintners want to sell their product – wine, not events.

Greg Wilcox, of Villa Castellano – This proposed winery ordinance is the most restrictive of all winery ordinances. There is no comparison to Napa. Napa is revisiting their winery ordinance, but Napa has 400 wineries. He urges the MAC to support the vintners’ proposal.

Russell: Made a point of visiting wineries to observe if any of the issues voiced at prior meetings by residents were valid. He never saw any problems. Wine making is a nascent industry, and he is proud of the vintners’ efforts and hard work to make this industry successful. Not a single MAC has adopted the proposed Planning Commission winery ordinance. He asks that the Vintners’ proposal be adopted.

Two prior motions for recommendations did not pass.

Motion made by Russell, 2nd by Maggert to recommend the Planning Commission adopt the Placer County Vintners’ Association proposal as requested, 4 ayes, 3 nays, motion passed.

MOTION: Bishop, Russell, Yoder, Maggert – YES
Neifer, Mahoney, Nicholas – NO

10. MAC Committees Reports: Postponed

Chair report/correspondence – Patty Neifer –None
School Report – Patty Neifer – None
Parks, Recreation and Service – Diane Nicholas
Traffic, Safety and Fire – Mike Bishop – None
Land Use and Planning – Anita Yoder – None

Next meeting MAC will discuss any vacancy. Postponed to May 26, 2015

11. Future Agenda Items: None for now.

12. Next Meeting: May 26, 2015

13. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m.