



COUNTY OF PLACER
GRANITE BAY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
175 Fulweiler Avenue ▪ Auburn, CA 95603 ▪ (530) 889-4010
County Contact: Ashley Brown (916) 787-8954

NOTE: DATE CHANGE DUE TO LACK OF QUORUM

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Monday, July 11, 2016 7:00 PM
Eureka School District Office, Board Room
5455 Eureka Road, Granite Bay, CA

1. **Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance**
7:04PM
2. **Welcome, Introduction of Members & Statement of Meeting Procedures**
Virg Anderson, Bill Bowen, Ken Prager, John Thacker, Barbara Singleterry and Te Iwi Boyd, Secretary (Eric Bose was absent)
3. **Approval of June 1, 2016 Agenda**
Motion was made to approve the Agenda. Motion seconded and passed, 5-0.
4. **Approval of Minutes**
 - A. **May 4, 2016 Minutes** (Suzanne Jones and Barbara Singleterry absent)
Motion was made to approve the Minutes. Motion seconded and passed, 4-0.
 - B. **June 1, 2016 Minutes**
Motion was made to approve the Minutes with the addition of the roll call for the action item. Motion seconded and passed, 5-0.
5. **Public Safety Reports:**
 - A. **Placer County Sheriff's Office**
It was reported that there have been no major crime trends in the area. Residents were reminded to keep their vehicles locked at all times.
 - B. **California Highway Patrol**
No report was given.
 - C. **South Placer Fire District**
It was reported that it has been a very busy fire season and residents were reminded to be safe.
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).

Patricia McKinney expressed her surprise to learn that a MAC member had departed from the Board and expressed her appreciation for Suzanne Jones' work on the MAC as she felt that Ms. Jones was a good advocate for the Community.

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.



Larissa Berry thanked Ms. Jones for her service and asked that Ms. Jones be reinstated to the MAC. Ms. Berry also reminded attendees that National Night Out is Tuesday, August 2, 2016.

Suzanne Jones expressed her displeasure with being removed from the MAC and that it was an honor to serve on the MAC.

Victor Becket thanked everyone that supported his campaign. Mr. Becket shared his belief that his campaign succeeded in raising awareness in the community, that his campaign unified the community and that he felt he succeeded in being heard.

7. Information Item: (None)

8. Action Item:

A. The Park at Granite Bay

George Rosasco introduced himself and explained that he was late to this project and that residents may have previously dealt with Lisa, who is now in another department within the county. Mr. Rosasco provided attendees of an overview of the project emphasizing the most discussed items related to the project.

A site map of the project location was shown, depicting the project as proposed, with the 56 lot layout. Entitlements required for this project (General Plan Amendment/Granite Bay Community Plan Amendment, Rezone, Variance and Vesting Subdivision Map) were discussed as were the aesthetics of the project. Mr. Rosasco explained that this project will contain fourteen (14) deed restricted lots, indicated on the site plan as the lots with a star to provide a more visual aesthetic to the project. The block wall and other fencing for the project were shown and discussed.

A brief explanation of the infrastructure improvements to the existing localized flooding problem in the Eckerman Road area was provided by Mr. Rosasco. Mr. Rosasco reported that the drainage for this project as proposed is consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan.

MAC Questions:

Member Anderson asked if homes were to be built with the property's current density, how many homes would that be? Mr. Rosasco showed a site map with the current density and 16 lots were shown. A further reduced density map was also shown.

Chairman Prager asked what the maximum number of units is under the medium density designation. Mr. Rosasco reported that it would be slightly over 56 units at 4 units per acre.

Member Singleterry asked for clarification as the alternative does not appear to provide a berm or park. George confirmed that is correct in this alternative. Alternatives were explained per the EIR.

Member Thacker asked for Mr. Rosasco to provide a little assertion that the proposed project is consistent with the Granite Bay Community Plan. Mr. Rosasco confirmed that this was the conclusion staff came to.

Chairman Prager asked Mr. Rosasco with reference to the DEIR, that the proposed project is consistent with the Community Plan in all instances but one. Section 5 was read in an attempt to gain further understanding. Chairman Prager further asked if MDR is to be at 3%, what is the impact. Mr. Rosasco, did not have that information available. Mr. Rosasco referred the MAC to Section 5 of the DEIR, he further read the Section and tried to explain why they came to that finding. Mr. Rosasco went on to explain that there has been an attempt to minimize this impact, however it is not consistent with that policy.

Member Bowen informed Mr. Rosasco that at one of the prior information meetings there was discussion as to comparison with other neighborhoods. Was there any additional looking into that? Mr. Rosasco reported that he did not believe that occurred.

Marcus LoDuca, representative of the property owner introduced himself to attendees. He reported that the Final EIR has been prepared and released. The project history was reiterated for those in attendance, not familiar with the project or its history. Mr. LoDuca went over the lot sizes, as well as the proposed park site and trail. Mr. LoDuca provided attendees of the history of engaging with residents of the community, through various MAC meetings as well as face to face meetings. There were three face to face community meetings were announced and held. Fewer than 20 residents attended those meeting. With the feedback from the community, Mr. LoDuca's client and project team discussed the information received and decided to take a closer look at the island area to see what type of residences already existed in that area. After careful analysis, the project team proceeded to amend the project to reflect those larger lots, this included a 40% reduction in lots than originally proposed. No longer are the houses all 2 story, now the proposed project includes 14 deed restricted lots that will only have single story residences. Mr. LoDuca went on to explain that the variance requested is what is triggering the inconsistency in the DEIR. Mr. LoDuca also explained that in terms of setbacks, the homes will actually have larger setbacks. The park site was retained throughout the redesign of the project. This park is intended for sports practices and will be open during daylight hours. The rose garden, tot lot, and paseo have been removed from the plan. Mr. LoDuca also clarified a number of comments that have been made numerously during this process, those being:

1. Site grading. There will not be a berm around the project. There will be a good neighbor fence.

2. Traffic. No significant impacts associated with the proposed project were found through the traffic analysis.
3. Flooding. The project detaining flows and will be metering water out. This procedure was reviewed with County and the County concurs.
4. Projects Objectives. Background of CEQA was given.
5. Eckerman Road. No access on to Eckerman Road. Eckerman Road will be utilized for emergency access only. Residents will not have keys to that gate.
6. Project applicant is a long time Granite Bay resident. Jon Tattersall's background was given.

Mr. LoDuca concluded by requesting that the MAC recommend approval for this project as proposed.

Further discussion occurred regarding the EIR process and clarification that the EIR consultant works for the County and cannot talk to the applicant.

MAC Questions:

Member Singleterry asked if there will be street parking available. Mr. LoDuca clarified that parking will be allowed on one side of the street and that the other side of the street will be clearly marked no parking.

Member Bose asked for clarification of the improvements to Eckerman Road. Mr. LoDuca clarified that there will be no improvements to Eckerman Road.

Member Singleterry asked if pervious materials are being used in this project. Mr. LoDuca explained other "green" aspects of the project and reiterated that all measures were met.

Chairman Prager asked for clarification regarding access on Eckerman Road as the EIR says that emergency road access on Eckerman Road is out of scope. Mr. LoDuca clarified that the property has a full legal right, at this time, to access project from Eckerman Road.

Public Comments:

Joann Jackson asked what the price point of these homes would start at and asked who is responsible for public use of a private park. Mr. LoDuca reported that because the homes are not yet designed, there is no pricing information available at this point and that the HOA carries the liability for the park.

Marianna Becket asked for the names of housing projects that have public parks within gated communities. She also questioned backyards with additional 15 foot buffer and asked if there a precedence to look at? Ms. Becket then handed a Petition of project that includes comments and signatures. Reasons for the buffer were explained to Ms. Becket.

Lisa Erickson asked if the traffic analysis considered school traffic and wanted to know if the applicant discussed this project with the school district? It was confirmed that the traffic analysis does take into consideration school traffic and are included in the traffic analysis. It was also confirmed that the project applicant discussed the proposed project with the relevant school districts as that is a requirement of development in general.

John Lotz – why are we building now? Where is the water coming from is the building just for taxes?

BJ Baker asked what the homes will look like and wanted to be sure that they are going to enhance the esthetic of Granite Bay

Paul Labresky requested the applicant go with a 16 lot plan.

Catherine Clonicky expressed her concern regarding wasting water and requested the project use native plants and local resources. It was explained that there are water/landscaping requirements that the project will be required to meet. All projects in the state have requirements.

Shannon Quinn expressed her concerns regarding the traffic impact the proposed project would generate. She requested that a copy of the traffic report be made available, specifically the report generated during peak hours. Ms. Quinn also requested an explanation of egress from the project. Mr. Rosasco deferred the questions to another County Staff member who was in attendance who provided the answers to the questions regarding traffic, u-turns and speed flow.

Steve Gall shared his support of the project. Mr. Gall has known the applicant for 10+ years and feels that the community will be proud of the project at the end of the day. He thinks it is the right project for couples who are ready to downsize but want to remain in the community.

Holly Johnson, a resident and business owner thinks that this project takes away from the intention of the Community Plan and asks that the MAC adhere to the Community Plan. Chairman Prager clarified that when the Community Plan was updated it was decided that these issues would be reviewed on a case by case basis.

Katie Demar asked what the school district had to say about the proposed project and asked if the schools have the capacity to handle the growth. It was explained that the school district has been experiencing a declining student population and they would welcome the opportunity to boost enrollment. A history of Mutual Benefit Agreements between the developer and the School District were explained as were the fees associate with development.

Resident Jim expressed his support for the project. He expressed his feeling that the proposed project is justified based on its location. He expressed his appreciation for the modifications to the project based on community feedback over the last 3.5 years.

Jeff DeMur a resident and business man expressed his support for the project. As an architect, he believes that this project brings high quality homes that his children will be able to afford and that his employees can afford.

Stephanie Kerns expressed her support of this project and thinks it will provide for increased funding, volunteerism and parental support for our schools by bringing in families and therefore increasing student enrollment.

Victor Becket expressed his concern regarding the negative impact he believes this project will create. He further expressed his objection of this project based on the acreage available in Granite Bay, property zoning, impact on the school district, that this project requires noise and privacy mitigation and that nothing has been done regarding traffic impacts.

Darcy Slate expressed her support of the project and thinks that it provides an opportunity for the community.

Grant Kinney is in favor of the project. He believes this project to be a smart development/infill development. He believes this project is a great balance between community needs and development.

Michael Murphy is in favor of the project. He thinks the developer's other project is a good project as well. He believes this project will be affordable for young families and will be a great addition to the community.

Dallas Sarts supports the project. He was a student at Granite Bay High School and currently cannot afford to move to Granite Bay. He believes a project like the one proposed would allow him to move back to the community he grew up in and allow his daughter to attend the same schools he attended when he grew up. He would like to see more young residents move to the community.

Glenn Wells, a community member, and business man supports the project as he feels the community needs young families. He encouraged community members to give change a chance.

Jeffery Pollis asked how many of the houses have 2 or 3 car garages? How many street parking spaces would be available? Mr. Rosasco explained that there would be two car garages and that two vehicles could be parked in the driveway. He did not have the on street parking numbers but said that the on street parking met the county code requirements.

Scott McGucken moved here for the schools and is in favor of the project. He believes that the proposed project is a smart investment in the community and that the community needs projects like the one proposed to maintain the relevance of Granite Bay.

Resident Andrew requests that they find an alternative site for this project.

David Harris would like to see more expensive houses and wants to know why these can't be million dollar homes.

Member Thacker made a motion that the proposed project not be approved based on an insufficiently compelling reason why the MAC should approve the project as presented given the concessions required. Member Anderson seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Virg Anderson, Aye
Bill Bowen, Aye
John Thacker, Aye
Ken Prager, Nay
Barbara Singleterry, Nay

Motion passed 3-2.

9. **Adjournment** to next regular meeting on August 3, 2016
Meeting adjourned at 9:07PM