



TOWN OF LOOMIS
ACTION MINUTES
ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF
LOOMIS TOWN COUNCIL
LOOMIS DEPOT
5775 HORSESHOE BAR ROAD
LOOMIS, CA 95650

SATURDAY

FEBRUARY 13, 2010

1:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Call to order by Mayor Liss at 1:10 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present:

Mayor Liss
Councilmember Kelley
Councilmember Morillas
Councilmember Scherer
Councilmember Ucovich

Absent: None

All items on the agenda will be open for public comment before final action is taken. Speakers are requested to restrict comments to the item as it appears on the agenda and stay within a five-minute time limit. The Mayor has the discretion of limiting the total discussion time for an item.

Written Material Introduced Into the Record: Citizens wishing to introduce written material into the record at the public hearing on any item are requested to provide a copy of the written material to the Town Clerk prior to the public hearing date so that the material may be distributed to the Town Council prior to the public hearing.

PUBLIC COMMENT: This time is reserved for those in the audience who wish to address the Town Council on subjects that are not on the Agenda. The audience should be aware that the Council may not discuss details or vote on non-agenda items. Your concerns may be referred to staff or placed on the next available agenda. Please note that comments from the public will also be taken on any item on the agenda. The time allotted to each speaker is five minutes. No public comment.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA: Council will typically adopt the agenda in the order listed or modify the order in a way that can best accommodate the time of people in attendance who wish to speak on particular items.

A motion was made to adopt the Agenda. On motion by Councilmember Ucovich, seconded by Councilmember Scherer and passed by voice vote (5-0).

BUSINESS

- Open Space Committee 2 Recommendations Review** (Continued from 2/9/10, item 16)
Council completed most of its review of Open Space Committee 2 recommendations however there were some items that were slated to return to Council for further deliberation and decision
Recommended action: Decide on the recommendations, determine which, if any, to forward to the Park, Recreation and Open Space Committee for inclusion in the draft Park Master Plan
Public comment:

Section C

1. Communicate to developers an expectation for "set asides" for park areas and open space. On larger developments, this expectation should be at least 30% of the land area.

Jean Wilson, 4301 Barton Road, pointed out that this is a huge amount to ask for and questioned if it can be justified as a standard to be followed in every situation.

Following further discussion on the matter, a motion was made to table this item. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Ucovich and passed by voice vote. (5-0)

3. Clarify and formalize the review/approval process for Final Maps, including the approval of Building Envelopes, Notebooks and CC&Rs prior to Final Map approval. Ensure that Final Map is not a substantial change from approved Tentative Maps.

Jean Wilson suggested the following:

- clarifying what the process is, who does what, and what follows, so people can understand more easily how the process works
- add the words "where appropriate" to give some discretion to the Planning Department and the Planning Commission

Janet Thew, 5572 St. Francis Circle, pointed out that one advantage to having a building envelope/notebook is to encourage smaller homes.

Following further discussion on the matter, Council directed staff to make the revisions and return to Council after the following amendments have been made: adding "where appropriate" and adding the sentence, "Planning Commission or staff should define elements to be considered, when making decisions as to whether a map is in substantial conformity or not." On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote. (5-0)

7. In the RR, RE & RA zoning areas, limit the clearing and grading of parcels to well defined Building Envelopes, documented via Notebooking on all parcels.

Jean Wilson stated the following:

- an applicant already has to meet grading standards
- we have agriculture in the grading ordinance already, this is not needed, given the other restrictions we already have

Pat Miller, 4395 Gold Trail Way, stated the following:

- she supports Roger Smith's comments on this, with emphasis on "before it is sold"
- on OSC 2 they saw cases where a developer wanted to clear everything in advance just in case someone might want to build on a large lot
- this item just gives more support to what is already in place and clarified that OSC 2 intent for this item was to be only for developments

Following further discussion on the matter, Council directed staff to revise this by saying "In the RR, RE & RA zoning areas, grading plans should limit the grading of building parcels to well defined Building Envelopes in the initial project approval process." On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Ucovich and passed by voice vote. (5-0)

8. Require developments to be designed to respect and maintain wildlife corridors. Any fencing used should not unnecessarily restrict wildlife movement.

Jean Wilson stated the following:

- one of the problems will be enforcing this until we have the studies completed to know which wildlife corridors we need to maintain
- if we don't have any definition as to what we are suppose to protect it will make it difficult to know what kind of provisions to put on it

Pat Miller stated the following:

- she is disappointed that we are allowing rod iron fences with spikes on top because of the danger to the deer
- she has seen wildlife fencing that is reasonable, she would like to echo Roger Smith's comments
- she tries to do things that discourage the wildlife

Following further discussion on the matter, a motion was made to refer this item to the PROSC with the following revision: Require developments to be designed to respect, maintain and *Identify* wildlife corridors *in the PROSC Master Plan*. Any fencing used should not unnecessarily restrict wildlife movement or *private animal movement*. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Ucovich and passed by voice vote, with Councilmember Morillas voting no (4-1).

Section E

5. Re-create a Design Review Board, as existed prior to formation of the Town.

Jean Wilson stated the following:

- we don't need a design review board, it's expensive and time consuming
- the Planning Commission is already doing design review on commercial and industrial uses and for proposed subdivisions
- we can have more design guidelines to work with

Janet Thew stated the following:

- she agrees with Ms. Wilson, a design review board is not necessary
- we do need more design guidelines, they are going to be facing that problem Tuesday night with Brace Ranch Estates
- staff has to determine if a subdivision house design is what Loomis wants, that is a tuff decision, so it will be coming to the Planning Commission to decide
- if we had clear guidelines and pictures of what Loomis wants it would be easier for staff and the Planning Commission

Following further discussion on the matter, a motion was made to table this item and direct staff to bring forward a set of design guidelines to be adopted by Council for staff and Planning Commission's use. On motion by Councilmember Morillas, seconded by Councilmember Liss and passed by voice vote. (5-0)

Further review of proposed projects:

3. Town should clearly define the staff responsibility for review and approval of project CC&R's and Development Notebooks (for individual lots).

No public comment.

Following further discussion on the matter, Council directed staff to include this with Section C. 3. recommendation and delete "individual lots". On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote. (5-0)

2. Make public aware of specific projects even before the Planning Commission reviews them; organize educational programs and events to keep public informed.

No public comment.

Following further discussion on the matter, Council directed staff to refer this to the public outreach person when we contract with them. On motion by Councilmember Scherer, seconded by Councilmember Morillas and passed by voice vote. (5-0)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

2. Placer County Community Services Commission - Kelley
3. Placer County Economic Development Commission – Ucovich
4. Placer County Flood Control/Water Conservation District – Morillas/Liss
5. Placer County Transportation Planning Agency – Ucovich/Kelley
6. Placer County Mosquito Abatement – Kelley
7. Placer County Air Pollution Control District – Ucovich/Morillas
8. Sacramento Area Council of Governments – Scherer/Liss
9. Placer Land Trust ex-officio representative – Scherer
10. Borders Committee – Scherer/Liss
11. Business Committee – Scherer/Liss

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn at 3:04 p.m. On motion by Councilmember Ucovich, seconded by Councilmember Scherer and passed by voice vote.



Mayor



Town Clerk

