

# Jackson Planning Commission

## Minutes

### Meeting of June 19, 2006

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:**

Susan Peters, City Planner  
Candy Collins, Accounting Assistant

**CITY STAFF ABSENT:**

Mike Daly, City Manager

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:**

---

**Chairman Works** called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**1. Public Matters Not on the Agenda.**

**No matters presented.**

**2. Approval of Minutes of April 17, 2006 meeting.**

**Moved by Commissioner David Butow, seconded by Vice Chairman Carleton and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of April 17, 2006.**

**3. Caltrans/Local Government Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Guide;** Presentation by Charles Field, Executive Director ACTC.

**Charles Field** reported that all 5 City Council members, the Board Of Supervisors and Caltrans District 10, executed the IGR guide. The IGR Guide is Caltrans' details for reviewing development projects, submitted to local government that may have an impact on the State Highway system. The guide is the result of a 2-year work effort, made possible by a Special Demonstration Project Grant received from Caltrans and the University of California at Davis to the County of Amador.

Mr. Field gave a slide presentation on the Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Guide, which in summary consists of the following:

1. Agency contact list.
2. Annual meetings to review implementation of the Guide and make improvements.
3. Allows cities and County to identify projects, which are ministerially, exempt (projects, which are consistent with the city and county General Plan and zoning ordinance and for which no Planning commission approval is required; only a building permit is necessary for construction to proceed.) and inform Caltrans of them.
4. Specifically identifies which projects are subject to IGR review.
5. Establishes IGR information form for submission to Caltrans.

6. Sets forth timeframes for local agencies submittal of information and Caltrans' review/response to that information.
7. Specifies which types of projects will normally require traffic impact studies.
8. Strongly encourages early consultation with Caltrans District 10 whenever a project may affect State highways or require a Caltrans encroachment permit.
9. Final environmental documents and mitigation monitoring program should be submitted to Caltrans for their records after project approval.
10. Sets forth the difference between Caltrans IGR and its separate encroachment permit process 5=67 and proposes measures that can help eliminate encroachment permit surprises after a land use development project is approved by a local agency.

**Mr. Fields** announced that this IGR guide could be picked up at the Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC) office located at 11400 American Legion Drive, Jackson.

**City Planner Peters** announced that encroachment permits do not stay with the property but with the person. For example, if you have a home off Hwy. 88 with a driveway with an existing encroachment permit and you sell the property, that encroachment permit is no longer valid. The new owner has to obtain a new permit. California State Law requires entitlements to stay with the property, but encroachment permits do not.

**4. Countywide GIS UPLAN Mapping Project;** Presentation by Charles Field, Executive Director ACTC.

**Charles Field** explained that UPLAN is a land use planning tool that uses the Geographic Information System (GIS) to test the cause and effect of different land use decisions on a regional basis by looking at development in and around the city. The UPLAN can be used as a tool to model alternative future land use scenarios in the process of generating new General Plan land use maps. It can be used as a tool to ensure consistency between the five cities and the County General Plan Update efforts.

He further explained that UC Davis developed this and has used it in Merced County and other counties with success. Caltrans has provided Amador, Calaveras and Alpine with a \$400,000 grant for these 3 counties to create the UPLAN tool for their use.

The proposed first step in bringing the cities and County planning organizations together for UPLAN is to schedule the first of several proposed "planner's roundtable" meetings. The first meeting proposed would be to review the GIS base maps that have been developed and to determine how to create a uniform method for modeling land use zones across city boundaries and in the critical sphere of influence areas. On April 24, 2006, the Jackson City Council authorized its Planning Consultant to participate in these bimonthly or quarterly "planner's roundtable" meetings. During development of the UPLAN tool and more importantly when it is put to use, the ACTC will include participation by the City and County Planning Commissions and will provide progress reports to each City Council.

Mr. Field answered an audience member's question on whether the public would be noticed, stating that it was one the grant conditions to have full public participation. These will be noticed through the newspaper, flyers distributed, library, Hometown radio, local television station, as well as the ACTC and City's website.

**5. Public Hearing – Revocation of Conditional Use Permit 01-03, 10578 Ridgecrest, APN 044-440-028.**

**City Planner Peters** read the following report.

Discussion

In July 2001 American Tower Corporation applied for and received a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Commission, Resolution 2001-05 to allow for the construction and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility located in the northeast corner of the Argonaut Heights II subdivision. This facility was to be comprised of a 150-foot monopole along with equipment cabinets or equipment shelters to house electronics associated with the monopole. Also as part of the project, the applicant removed the old telecommunications facility south the site.

At the May 2006 meeting, the Planning Commission approved a planned development amendment to allow for this property to be developed with one single-family residence as opposed to the telecommunications facility and directed staff to place revocation of the CUP on the next available agenda.

Action

Should the Planning Commission choose to revoke Conditional Use Permit 2001-03 for Mr. Ron Regan at 10578 Ridgecrest, APN 044-440-028 it is recommended that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2006-15.

No public comments were made.

**Moved by Commissioner Butow, seconded by Commissioner Faulkner and unanimously carried to approve the revocation of Conditional Use Permit 2001-03, 10578 Ridgecrest, APN 044-440-028.**

**6. Public Hearing - Sign Exception, Sutter Amador Hospital.**

**City Planner Peters** read the following report.

Project Description

The applicant is requesting to install a 50 square foot per side off-site directional sign to be located on the City of Jackson's property on the southwest corner of Highway 88 and Mission Boulevard. The proposed sign exceeds the off-site directional sign size by 25 square feet per side. Chapter 17.60, Sign Regulations includes section 17.60.160 Exceptions which allows the Planning Commission to grant exceptions to the provisions set forth in the chapter if a certain finding, detailed below, can be made.

Discussion

As part of the approval process for the Sutter Amador Hospital Support Services Building, the Planning Commission placed a Condition of Approval on the project to provide new signage to better direct the public to the hospital facility. This application is in attempt to meet the prescribed Condition of Approval.

Environmental Review

While exceptions are typically subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), projects, which have no possibility of causing an environmental impact, can be categorically exempted from CEQA review in accordance with Section 15061(b)(3) of CEQA.

Findings

One of the following findings shall be made for Planning Commission approval:

- A) The proposed exception is required to provide for safe installation of the proposed sign; **or**
- B) The proposed exception is consistent with the purpose and intent of Sign Ordinance as set forth in Section 17.60.010 and the resulting sign will be superior to the sign which would otherwise be allowed by this Chapter in its design, construction, and placement.

Action

Should the Planning Commission chose to approve the exception for Sutter Amador Hospital, the following actions are recommended:

1. Instruct Staff to file a Categorical Exemption; and,
2. Adopt a Resolution approving Variance 06-02 for Sutter Amador Hospital based on the Findings in this report.

**City Planner Peters and Commissioners** discussed sign size and color.

**Chairman Works** opened the public hearing.

**Thornton Consolo** stated that he felt the hospital did a great job in their choice of sign color and size, especially since it's only one (1) sign at the corner of Hwy 88 and Mission and it needs to be seen before you get to the turn into the hospital. Mr. Consolo also thanked the City for allowing the hospital to use the city's property for the location of the sign.

**Kathy duBois** felt the size was a little excessive.

**Jack Georgette** had no problem with the size and questioned again the lighting options.

**Tony D'Arcy** expressed that he felt size was secondary to style. He was in favor of the sign.

**Lynette Lipp** was in favor of the sign, especially for visitors passing through who are not familiar with the City of Jackson.

**Chairman Works closed the public hearing.**

**Moved by Commissioner Garibaldi, seconded by Vice-Chairman Carlton and carried by a 3-2 vote (Commissioners Butow and Faulkner opposed) to approve Sign Exception, Sutter Amador Hospital based on exception B in the findings.**

## **7. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.**

**City Planner Peters answered Chairman Works** when she asked why City Council denied the Planning Commissioner's referral for approval on **Tentative Parcel Map 2728 and Rezone, Susie Simmons & Eve Fenstermaker, APN 020-311-003** by stating there were several denial options brought up but to her best understanding the one that stood out was the City Council did not want to set precedence for other owners to want their lots split.

**Commissioners** felt that the City Council should give them the reasons they denied it in writing.

**City Planner Peters answered Chairman Works** when she asked what was being done for Whitney Smith who had come before the Planning Commissioners requesting access from his parcel onto Thomas Drive by stating that Mr. Smith met with Caltrans and was told it would be highly unlikely to access onto his site. He did, in fact, find out the easement currently on his neighbors property that he is currently using might be able to be turned into a driveway. Ms. Peters further stated that she advised Mr. Smith to contact ACTC and participate in the UPLAN discussion. Staff will continue to work with him.

**City Planner Peters** stated that the LRE workshop would be back on the July agenda. She reminded the Commissions of the **special agenda on July 5, 2006** at 6:00 p.m. for the **General Plan Land Use Element Update, Designation Map Review on APNs 020-070-025, 020-070-027, and 044-010-031 (Surian Property).**

**Chairman Works** reported back on the dinner meetings she has been attending along with other planning commission members from the other cities and from the county on sharing information in regards to the counties "smart growth and general plan". Ms. Works has been asked to go before the City of Jackson's City Council to ask if they would be willing to approve a \$800.00 fair share cost for a full day catered seminar that would enable 35 selected members from all the 5 city's City Councils, Planning Commissions, and Board Of Supervisors to learn more on the General Plan and how to manage smart growth.

**Commissioner Rosemary Faulkner announced that this would be her last Planning Commission meeting because she has decided not to reapply.**

**Staff and Commissioners all expressed their fortune to have had Ms. Faulkner sitting beside them on the Planning Commission and would greatly miss her input. Ms. Faulkner answered by stating it will be nice just to be part of the audience.**

**Meeting adjourned: 7:35 p.m.**

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candy Collins, Accounting Services II

Date Approved: October 16, 2006