I. Call To Order

1. Roll Call

   Present: Gil Labrie, Chair
             Michael Steinbacher, Vice-Chair
             Amelia Wareham, Secretary
             John Baranek
             Joseph Salman
             William Schauer
             Sally Shanks
             Topper van Loben Sels
             Sandra Waterhouse

   Excused: Stan Eddy, Brad Pappalardo, William Schauer
   Absent: None.
   Quorum Present: Yes (8)

2. Introductions:

   County Planning Representative(s): Manuel Mejia, Sr. Planner. Desirae Fox, Assistant Planner.
   Guest Speaker(s): None.
   Public Attendees: None.

3. Role of Council -- Not covered.
4. Old Business

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from 01/08/20.
   Motion To: Approve Minutes as written.
   Motion By: Topper Van Loben Sels
   Motion 2nd By: Sandra Waterhouse
   Vote: Ayes = 8. Noes = 0. Abstains = 0. County took roll call vote.
   Result: Motion carried.

II. New Business


   Request: Use Permit to allow Event Center/Reception Hall use at an existing structure.
   Special development permit to allow: Valet Parking, deviation from fencing requirements, deviation from landscaping requirements, deviation from bicycle parking requirements.

   Assistant Planner, Desirae Fox, stated that the project would go through the design review process to comply with countywide requirements.

   Discussion/Comments:

   Topper Van Loben Sels: Courtland Volunteer Fire Department and Fire Marshall are concerned about the building and do not want to see what happened in Oakland repeated. Gill Labrie commented: a Design Review condition could be recommended by DCMAC. Manuel Mejia, Sr. Planner: The County would work with the Fire Department regarding this concern.

   Sandra Waterhouse: Is the special permit for all of these items?

   Sally Shanks: Made an observation that the owner(s) have been open for business for a long time with no ADA accommodations, nor have they followed the rules required for businesses legally putting on special events. Also, asked if ADA Compliance has been incorporated in the proposal?

   Gill Labrie Comments: The facility has already been being used as an event center for some time. They are trying to get permits for what's been happening; essentially legalize the current practices. The Use Permit process will likely lead to some building permit requirements which will ensure that ADA requirements are met. Changing the use from an office/warehouse complex to assembly spaces should trigger building code changes. The
local fire department would be part of the review process and ultimately have to sign off on the changes.

Motion To: Approve the matter as presented.
Motion By: Sandra Waterhouse
Motion 2nd By: Topper Van Loben Sels
Result: Motion carried.

2. Planning Item: PLNP2020-00041 Meiliang You Farming Tentative Parcel Map

Request: Special Development Permit to deviate from minimum lot size for a parcel in AG-40 Zone where the resultant parcel will be 5.0 acres and will house a single family residential development pursuant to Section 6.4.6.1 of Zoning Code.

Assistant Planner’s comments: project was previously approved. Originally was to divide parcel so that there was a 6.9 acre piece. Williamson Act requirements have expired.

Discussion:

Gil Labrie: stated he was familiar with the first approval.
Topper VLS: Are the water rights for the 5 acres protected?
John Baranek: If they divide it right, the water rights can be protected. The applicant needs to talk to a lawyer specializing in water rights.
Sally Shanks: Can the 41.9 acres be split later? Gil’s response: “No”. It would need to be re-zoned.
County Staff: No public comment was received on this item.

Motion To: Approve the matter as presented.
Motion By: Sally Shanks
Motion 2nd By: Topper Van Loben Sels
Vote: Ayes = 8. Noes = 0. Abstains = 0. County took roll call vote.
Result: Motion carried.

3. Planning Item: PLNP2019-00202 Franklin Boulevard Tentative Parcel Map

Request: Tentative Parcel Map and Design Review to divide 7.65 Acres into three parcels, two of 2 acres and one of 3.87 acres.

County Staff, Stephanie Townsend, DCMAC Secretary, read public comment letters submitted arguing against this matter.
Discussion:

Pastor of Church: currently just want to split the property. No development is planned. If they want to build a church, they will need to go through Design Review Process.

Sally Shanks: She drove by property and looked at site. The railroad has the road chopped up. It is next to the Franklin Veterinary Hospital.

Amelia Wareham: Why divide the property if the Church isn't going to develop the land? Pastor's comments: They are looking to divide the property to get the best value out of the acreage. They bought the property thinking they would divide it and see where to go from there. Might ask for a Church on the largest parcel. If that was not approved, it would be easier to sell a smaller parcel.

Topper VLS – Public comments raised concerns about potential church building to be built on the properties. The matter before the Council was about dividing the property, not about potentially constructing a Church.

Motion To: Approve the matter as presented.
Motion By: John Baranek
Motion 2nd By: Sally Shanks
Vote: Ayes = 8. Noes = 0. Abstains = 0. County took roll call vote.
Result: Motion carried.

III. Other Business

County Secretary: There are no off-agenda items.

Staff Update: None.

Discussion Items:

Council to Consider Meeting Time Change

Sandra Waterhouse proposed changing the meeting time to 7:00 PM based on discussions at the January DCMAC meeting.

Discussion:
Sally suggested 6:30 PM. Support for 6:30 – Gil, Amelia, Topper.
Meeting Minutes

Sally Shanks: concerned that 6:30 might be too early for farmers.
Joe Salman: stated he doesn't like change. Prefers 7:00 which allows for Council members
time to have dinner with their families then come to the meeting. Added that since it’s
always been at 7:30, it’s worked for a long time, why change it? Also, questioned whether
County staff could make it to an earlier time. County Staff said they would accommodate
any time the Council selected.

Motion To: Change DCMAC meeting time to 7:00 pm.
Motion By: Sandra Waterhouse
Motion 2nd By: Topper Van Loben Sels
Vote: Ayes = 8. Noes = 0. Abstains = 0. County took roll call vote.
Result: Motion carried.

Council Member Comments:

1. Meeting Format: Teleconference/Video Conference / Use of Jean Harvey Center
   Gil Labrie: would prefer to meet at Jean Harvey Center in the future. In lieu of that, he
   would prefer video conference meetings, instead of teleconference meetings. Sally Shanks
   questioned why the meeting wasn’t on Zoom. County said they don’t use it. Sally asked who
decided it was not advantageous to use video? Clerk’s Office staff said that we can use video
and that they would work on making that happen next time. Sally prefers video meeting
until Jean Harvey Center is open. Amelia contended there was ample room in Jean Harvey
auditorium to have in-person meeting and manage social distancing.

2. Request for Updates – Items for next meeting agenda.
   Amelia Wareham: Requested updates on two items from January meeting at the next
DCMAC meeting: 1) Dog Food Factory matter and 2) County Planning’s re-design of CPAC’s
roles. Requested a discussion of these matters be added to the next agenda.

Public Comments: – None received by County Staff.

IV. Attachments/Attendee List – See attached public comments.

V. Next regular meeting date: 7/8/20.

VI. Motion to Adjourn:
Motion To: Adjourn meeting.
Motion By: Sandra Waterhouse
Motion 2nd By: Sally Shanks
Vote: Ayes = 8. Noes = 0. Abstains = 0.
Result: Motion carried.

Attachments: Public Comments
EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments.

To Whom It May Concern:

We received a Courtesy Meeting Notice a couple days ago regarding the division of a large parcel into three parcels. Despite looking through the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors web site, and trying to get information from the Board Clerks web site, I can't find any information about this parcel split (reason for doing so, plans for parcels, are they rezoning, etc.). As it stands now, with the skimpy information we've been given, my husband and I would be against this split. It seems to us that it can't be a good thing if you cannot give neighbors anymore information than that which is provided in the meeting notice or online (which is none).

More information would be appreciated.

Thanks you,

Dennis and Donna Glimstad
10381 Dennis Way
Elk Grove, CA 95757
ITEM 4 CPAC PUBLIC COMMENT 2

From: Carlos Rodriguez
To: Clerk of the Board Public Email
Subject: Closed meeting 6/10/20 for control # PLNP2019-00202
Date: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 6:58:14 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments.

I received notification of this meeting and mistakenly believed this would be a "zoom" based meeting. I mistakenly thought I could log on and voice my concerns, but in reading the notification more closely, I now see that it is a closed meeting. Please excuse the late email. I have spoken to four (4) other neighbors in our small neighborhood here on Franklin Blvd, Kenneth, and Dennis Street. All my neighbors that I have spoken with once I received the notice a few days ago (notification was postmarked 6/1/20), have voiced strong opposition to a church being built or established in our small, agricultural and rural neighborhood. There is no opposition to religious worship, but a church building/congregation/activities would be detrimental to maintaining the historical value and integrity of this neighborhood. We have numerous and significant concerns about the property in question. It is my understanding that it was being used as a commercial staging point for a construction company. There were too many early mornings to count, that I was startled by the loud banging of heavy equipment being loaded onto truck and trailers during very early morning hours including 4:00 am. I mention this concern because it is also my understanding that the property where the commercial business was being operated is owned by the same organization.

If parameters are put in place and restrictions are imposed, it is my belief that they will be disregarded and dismissed by this group. I came to this belief based on my own observations of this group. The issue previously mentioned about using a non-commercial property for commercial activity is the first action. The second incident occurred over the spring break. At least 15 young adults that appeared to be college age, were congregating on the property. They were engaged in physical activities like soccer, some sort of tag, and walking. This was in direct violation of the State-wide shelter in place order right at the beginning of the covid19 lock down. The group also disregarded the essential travel restrictions by placing easter eggs in some of the yards of the residents in this neighborhood. The disregard for government restrictions should be a clear demonstration that even if restrictions are put in place, they will be ignored.

The agricultural value of this area is already being infringed upon and adding a church would not only damage the historical value, but also the value of the surrounding properties as agricultural properties. The land on the west side of Franklin Blvd is federally protected and utilities being constructed to accommodate a church could have a hugely detrimental impact. My family moved to this little neighborhood with the excitement of being in a rural area still close to suburban conveniences. We never thought a church would be built just a couple hundred yards up the road.
Please accept this opinion as representative of at least 5 different residences within this historical neighborhood as well as the potential opinion of at least 4 more additional residents. Those numbers reflect one per household/address.

Although an in-person meeting does not seem possible at this point in time, an online meeting where opinions could be shared verbally would be greatly beneficial and appreciated. A notification that was received only a few days prior to such a significant meeting did not allow for a proper written opinion to be generated (add in the initial mistaken interpretation). Again, no one was opposed to religious worship or even worship activities. The opposition is strictly to having a non-agricultural/rural/residential project being approved in this historic neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and attention in this matter,
Concerned residents of the Buscher tract #1