

Jackson Planning Commission Minutes Regular Meeting of April 18, 2005

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Butow,
Warren Carleton, Vice-Chair
Rosemary Faulkner
Wayne Garibaldi, Chairman
Terri Works

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

Susan Peters, City Planner
Sandie Sproviero, Accounting Assistant

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

Chairman Garibaldi called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. Public Matters Not on the Agenda.

None

2. Forecast Homes Tree Removal Request/Pine Meadows Subdivision.

City Planner Susan Peters stated in accordance with Section 17.31.060 of the Landscape Planning Ordinance, the applicant is requesting permission to remove three oak trees ranging in size from 12 inches to 24 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) to accommodate construction of a single family residence and fence located on Lot 2 in the Pine Meadows Subdivision.

Should the Planning Commission choose to approve removal of these trees, the following Conditions of Approval are recommended:

1. Applicant shall provide the Planning Department with a landscape plan, which includes three fifteen gallon oak trees.
2. Pursuant to the Landscape Planning Ordinance all trees to be saved shall be appropriately fenced and any tree maintenance shall be performed by a qualified arborist.

Should the Planning Commission choose to approve the tree removal plan for Forecast Homes the following action is recommended:

1. Adopt a resolution approving the proposed tree removal plan for Lot 2 – Pine Meadows Subdivision subject to the conditions of approval located in this report.

Commissioner Works stated if developers have intentions to cut down trees, why purchase land with oak trees on it. Developers should consider other lots.

The following items were discussed:

- Tree ordinance
- Tree replacement
- Project set backs
- Landscaping

It was agreed to postpone the item, due to applicant not being present.

3. Public Hearing – Amendment of the New York Ranch Road Professional Plaza Planned Development Parking Requirements.

City Planner Susan Peters stated New York Ranch Center, Inc. submitted a request to amend their Planned Development at the New York Ranch Road Professional Plaza from one parking space per 200 square feet of building to one per 210 square feet. The request was granted and the following Conditions of Approval were put on the project:

1. A Certificate of Occupancy for Building D and renovations to the upstairs of Parcel A shall not be issued until the proposed parking reconfiguration and striping has been completed.
2. A parking site plan shall be prepared and submitted for approval to the City of Jackson Site Plan Review Committee prior to the issuance of building permits for Building D and Parcel A upstairs renovations.

The applicant has provided a parking plan that was reviewed and approved by the Site Plan Review Committee. Thus, Condition of Approval No. 2 has been met.

The applicants are now requesting relief from Condition of Approval No. 1 because they believe that the extra parking will no longer be necessary. This would leave the parking approximately 30 spaces short of their required amount.

Should the Planning Commission choose to approve the amended parking plan, staff recommends the following Conditions of Approval:

1. The parking situation shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission in one year to ensure that there continues to be satisfactory parking at the New York Ranch Road Professional Plaza.
2. The applicant shall provide the City of Jackson with a bond in the amount of the cost of the proposed reconfiguration and striping plus 10% for administrative overhead to be utilized by the Building Department in the event that the Planning Commission determines that reconfiguration is necessary.

Should the Planning Commission choose to approve Planned Development Amendment for New York Ranch Center, Inc. the following action is recommended:

1. Adopt a resolution approving the proposed Planned Development Amendment for New York Ranch Center, Inc. subject to the conditions of approval located in this report.

Bob Devlin stated since there will be changes to the fitness center due to growth, the need for additional parking is essential. There is anticipation of proposed reconfiguration and striping, which does not appear it will be a problem. Mr. Devlin went over in detail the spaces needed and the addition of the fitness center.

Commissioner Faulkner inquired how Mr. Devlin feels about the bond.

Mr. Devlin answered he would abide by the bond per staff's request should this be the route to be taken. However, based on the cooperation and good rapport with staff is there is a need for it.

Chairman Garibaldi stated the applicant has met the requirements of parking spaces and does not see this as a problem.

Vice-Chair Carleton applauded the applicant on his project and asked if a pool would be added to the fitness center. Vice-Chair Carleton added at the last meeting it was brought to the applicant's attention that there was a complaint regarding noise coming from the air condition units. What has been done to resolve this situation and has there been any complaints brought to the applicant's attention?

Mr. Devlin stated at this time a decision to add a pool to the facility has not been made. This would be nice however there are many factors to consider, such as cost. Mr. Devlin stated his confusion regarding the air condition units, since they are not visible and no complaints have been received. And added he would be more than happy to converse with the person who made the complaint to Vice-Chair Carleton, however no one has come forward.

Vice-Chair Carleton added he would like to see the bond be for two-years instead of one-year.

Commissioner Works asked why Vice-Chair Carleton recommends two-year bond verses a one-year bond.

Vice-Chair Carleton stated his opinion of one-year appearing to short in order to ensure parking satisfactory.

City Planner Susan Peters addressed the following subjects:

- Determining the cost of bond
- Length of the bond, and
- Parking configured

Chairman Garibaldi opened up public hearing for comments.

Hearing no comments closed public hearing.

After much discussion it was agreed for a two-year bond instead of one-year.

Motion moved by Vice-Chair Carleton, seconded by Commissioner Faulkner and carried by four to one vote (Commissioner Works dissenting) to adopt a resolution approving the proposed Planned Development Amendment for New York Ranch Center, Inc. with parking to be reviewed by the Planning Commission in two years to ensure satisfactory parking.

4. Public Hearing – Notice of Intent to Develop.

City Planner Susan Peters stated the City Council and Planning Commission's made

recommendations for an allocation of 116 Housing Equivalent Units (HEUs) for the year 2005. Subsequent to their decision staff advertised in the Ledger Dispatch and the Sacramento Bee a request for Notices of Intent to Develop. Additionally, staff directly notified area and interested developers along with members of the Amador County Board of Realtors. The following Notices of Intent to Develop were received by March 31, 2005 deadline:

- Jackson Hills Golf Course and Residential Community – 18 hole Golf Course and 540 housing units.
- Stonecreek Development (Bob Hix) – 8 single family residential units on 4.27 acres
- Shealor Property – 28 single family residences on 6.25 acres
- Reynen & Bardis single and multi family residences on 227 acres

Developers of projects requesting an allocation which exceeds the 2005 allotment of 116 HEUs will need phase their projects and ask for future allotments for completion of their projects.

City Planner Susan Peters stated the Planning Commission is to review the Notices of Intent to Develop and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding award allocations of no more than 116 HEUs based on the specific criteria established in the Resource Constraints and Priority Allocation Policy.

The following items were discussed in detail:

- Establishment of Development Criteria for Allotment of HEUs
- Overall project quality of proposed projects
- Environmental and site constraints
- Internal/external street circulation/layout
- Open space preservation
- Landscaping/architectural design quality
- Contribution to City facilities
- Affordable/workforce housing contribution
- Economic impact on the City of Jackson
- Environmental and historic preservation features

After much discussion regarding:

- No developers attending meeting
- Future growth in the city, and
- Determining how to evaluate the proposed projects.

It was agreed to have a matrix put together to help with ranking the proposed Notice of Intent to Develop.

City Planner Susan Peters went over the grading and rating process and encouraged commissioners to not discuss the grading process with other commissioners once the matrix is given to them. This is to ensure the Commissioners to do their best to tally up their own score.

It was agreed to postpone the recommendation for the allocation of HEUs to a Special Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for May 2.

5. Circulation Element Amendment.

City Planner Susan Peters stated the Planning Commissioners directed staff at the March 21 meeting to bring more information regarding potential amendments to the City's Circulation Element of the General Plan. Subsequently staff met with Joe Holland and Charles Field from the Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC). After some discussion with ACTC staff it was determined that a review of the entire Circulation Element, as opposed to just the policy section, would be more efficient particularly since the City will already be preparing an Environmental Impact Report on amendments to the policy section.

City and ACTC staff will be meeting April 20, 2005 to review potential amendments to the entire Circulation Element. We would like to present these potential amendments to the Planning Commission at a special meeting on May 2, 2005.

Commissioner Butow stated his concern was regarding the Amador County New Administration Bldg, 810 Court Street tree removal and his suggestion that the County put in a sidewalk along their property and as far down Court Street to their property line. He stated John Hopkins called to tell him that the County does not own the portion of property. This information was submitted to City Manager Daly to determine who owns the parcel that original was designed a future parking for the County. He proposed that the parcel be used for a City park and that the City and County would benefit. City Manager Daly stated he would look into this matter and will report back.

Adjourn 8:30 pm.

Attest:

Sandie Sproviero, Accounting Assistant

Date Approved: July 5, 2005