

MINUTES

Wednesday, January 25, 2017
6:30 PM

FAIR OAKS COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL

**MCMILLAN CENTER
8020 TEMPLE PARK ROAD
FAIR OAKS, CA 95628**

<http://www.per.saccounty.net/CPAC/Pages/CPAC-FairOaks.aspx>

Note: Applicant or appointed representative should be present. If unable to attend, please contact the Fair Oaks CPAC Chairperson, Elisa Sabatini at (916)-402-3985. For additional information, please contact the Sacramento County Planning and Environmental Review Division representatives, Jessica Brandt at 916-875-2593 or brandtj@saccounty.net and Kevin Messerschmitt at (916) 874-7941 or messerschmitt@saccounty.net. To contact the Planning and Environmental Review Division CPAC Secretary, please call (916) 874-5397.

Note: To receive notification of Sacramento County public meetings sign up for Sac County news. Visit the following website and enter your e-mail address: <https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CASACRAM/subscriber/new?>

*Note: To receive additional information regarding Current Planning projects visit the Planning Projects Viewer website at <https://planningdocuments.saccounty.net/> Select the appropriate community from the drop down field, click the search button and a list of projects will be generated. Scroll down the list until the project is located and click on it for additional information. **For direct access to information on projects in this agenda, use the link provided below the Control Number.***

Note: To submit project comments to CPAC members, email them to CPAC-FairOaks@saccounty.net. Please identify the relevant project using the project name, control number or address.

OFFICERS:	ELISA SABATINI	P	<u>CHAIR</u>
	HARRY AZAR	P	<u>VICE CHAIR</u>
	BECKY WOOD	P	<u>SECRETARY</u>
MEMBERS:	REBECCA LUND	EXA	RAYMOND IRWIN P
	ROBERT LUSCOMBE	P	REBECCA FRIEDMAN P

REPRESENTATIVES: JESSICA BRANDT– COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
 KEVIN MESSERSCHMITT – COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

EXA – EXCUSED ABSENCE **R** – RESIGNED **U** - UNEXCUSED ABSENCE **TE** - TERM EXPIRED **P** – PRESENT

QUORUM DETERMINATION:	Yes	No
COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE:	Yes	No

Matters under the jurisdiction of the CPAC and not on the posted agenda may be addressed by the general public following completion of the regular agenda. The CPAC may limit the length of any off-agenda testimony.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

- CALL MEETING TO ORDER 6:42 pm
- EXPLANATION OF ROLE OF THE COUNCIL
- ROLL CALL
- INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS, STAFF, AND COUNTY REPRESENTATIVES

PLANNING ITEMS FOR REVIEW:

1. **Control No.:** [PLNP2016-00292](#)

Project Name: Fruitwood Court Tentative Parcel Map

Assessor’s Parcel No.: 246-0441-021 /022

Location: The project is located on the western end of Fruitwood Court, approximately 750 feet west of Illinois Avenue in the Fair Oaks community.

Owner/ Applicant/Phone/Email: D.N. Burford Construction, Inc.
8475 Burford Lane
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
Attn: David Burford
davenburford@gmail.com

Other: Area West Engineers, Inc.
7478 Sandalwood Drive #400
Citrus Heights, CA 95621
(916) 725-5551
Richard@areawesteng.com

County Project Manager: Thomas Vogt, Assistant Planner, (916) 875 5563, vogtt@saccounty.net

Request:

1. A **Tentative Parcel Map** to divide approximately 2.64 acres into three lots in the RD-2 zone.
2. A **Special Development Permit** to deviate from the required 75 feet of public street frontage of the RD-2 zone.
3. A **Design Review** to comply with Countywide Design Guidelines.

Investigating Member:
Elisa Sabatini, Becky Wood, and Robert Luscombe

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION:

Continuation so the applicant has time to address the frontage issue

Motion by: Elisa Sabatini		Seconded by: Becky Wood		
Vote:	Yes 6	No 0	Abstain 0	Absent 1

Action:
See notes at end of agenda.

Note: This CPAC has the right to file an appeal with the County of Sacramento when the committee, commission or official takes an action or determination that conflicts with community-wide policies as understood by the respective CPAC and its constituency.

Motion by:		Seconded by:		
Vote:	Yes:	No:	Abstain:	Absent:

PLANNING ITEMS FOR REVIEW:

Comments:

2.

Control No.: [PLNP2016-00431](#)

Project Name: Greenback Lane Wireless Facility Use Permit Amendment

Assessor’s Parcel No.: 261-0010-051

Location: The project is located at 8147 Greenback Lane, off of Hayworth Lane and approximately 500 feet east of Fair Oaks Boulevard in the Fair Oaks community.

Owner: Winter Water LLC
 P.O. Box 654
 Citrus Heights, CA 95611

Applicant/Phone/Email: SiteCom, Inc.
 25 Cadillac Drive, Suite #208
 Sacramento, CA 95825
 Attention: Timothy Miller
 (916) 826-4232
Timothy@sitecomwireless.com

Other: Peek Site-Com
 12852 Earhart Ave, Suite #101
 Auburn, CA 95602
 Attention: Todd Peek
 (530) 885-6160
irifo@peeksitecom.com

County Project Manager: *Thomas Vogt, Assistant Planner, (916) 875 5563, vogtt@saccounty.net*

Request: A **Use Permit** Amendment (1996-0418) to add three antennas and associated equipment to an existing 92-foot monopole, for a total of nine antennas, on approximately 1.33 acres in the RD-10 zone. Three existing antennas will also be replaced.

Note: This CPAC has the right to file an appeal with the County of Sacramento when the committee, commission or official takes an action or determination that conflicts with community-wide policies as understood by the respective CPAC and its constituency.

Motion by: Rebecca Friedman		Seconded by: Raymond James Irwin		
Vote:	Yes:6	No: 0	Abstain: 0	Absent:1

Comments: Applicant introduced the items - request to add 3 of similar size and replace 3 antennas. This is a modification for the Currently permitted for 9. Minimal impact. Proposed and existing configuration photos presented to CPAC members. Raymond James asked why the original permit was capped at 6. Applicant responded that the original permit requested 6. Raymond James asked any safety concerns? This is within the FCC (they set the rules) guidelines.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Elisa Sabatini motioned to move 2nd item to 1st on agenda. Harry Azar seconded. All approved.

No meeting in February

PUBLIC COMMENT:

NO SEPARATE PUBLIC COMMENTS.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**ADJOURNMENT: 9:15 PM**

CPAC Member forwarding minutes to County Planning and Environmental Review Division:

Becky Wood

The meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for interpreting services, assistive listening devices, or other considerations should be made through the County Planning and Environmental Review Division at (916) 874-5397, no later than five working days prior to the meeting. California Relay Service (CRS) is a third party interpretation service for deaf, hard-of-hearing, and/or speech-impaired persons. CRS can be reached by dialing 711 or 1-800-735-2929

Notes for Item 1 – Fruitwood Court

Jessica Brant from county planning introduced the project. Clarified that for a cul-du-sac the street frontage is measured 20 feet back from the street.

The applicant needs a variance for street frontage, septic tank, and general design standards for the project as submitted.

Applicant's engineer discussed the history of the project and explained why they are going with the design submitted. Frontage is less than code requires. This is to limit the number of trees needed to be removed and limit the amount of grading.

Questions from the CPAC

Bob - What is the construction next door? The owners of that home are present and will have comments.
Swimming pool staying? Yes, that is the current plan.
Is the retention pond staying? Yes
Is the slope of lot 1 topography driving the lots? Somewhat but plan is to keep the house flat

Raymond - How many cars could park off the street at each of the lots? Four to seven

Rebecca - Glad the arborist report is included. Which trees were recommended for removal? 23 recommended. Not all will be removed

Harry - Did you look at rotating the house on lot 1? Yes but there are other concerns for placement.

Elisa. No questions at this time

Open public comment

Florence Brady – lived here since 1962. 1923 was when the original house on these lots was built. Drainage flows to open creek. Would like to see sewer connection for all properties

Daniel McKeown - Main issue is congestion in the cul-de-sac. Emergency vehicles cannot turn around in the cul-de-sac currently. If there are cars parked on the street it will be even more difficult.

Stephanie Lucchesi - Presented the required "Findings for Approval" of a special development permit. She does not feel that the findings can be made for this project.

Rodger Britton and Charlene Britton - Thinks there are too many places to park. Does not think the builder has followed the rules and on an adjoining property had several agencies look into violations and place stop work orders on construction. Public safety is a concern with the tight cul-de-sac.

Hugh Brady - Concerned about the frontage on both cul-de-sacs that this project touches as both have the same tight radius.

Chris Olsen - Concurs with others. Concerned about density

Rodger Britton - Wondered about what the zoning means?

Jessica Brandt from the County explained about zoning, what high density means, that this is zoned 5 homes per acre, and is not considered high density.

Matt Lucchesi - Concerned about the side setbacks

Paul Dietrich - Married the daughter of the original owner. He gave the history of the property, including when the existing subdivision was built. Wants people to be realistic. Does not think parking will be a problem.

Steve Sturch - Sewer is an issue and if in the future they fail perk tests then the county will have to bring in sewer.

Clay Mattison - Concerned with street parking. If there were three houses instead of four it would be better.

Jessica Brandt from the County said zoning is for 2 off street places to park and there is no requirement for on street parking.

Valerie Welsh – Has concerns with all that has been brought up. Thinks Mr. Burford, the developer, did not communicate with the neighbors.

Mary Dietrich - Daughter of the original owner wants to see this thing finished and the neighbors to stop fighting.

Public hearing was closed.

Raymond asked if the neighbors would be ok with two lots. Some would be. But most want a specific plan before they would say.

Bob asked about the configuration of the lots and if one lot could be accessed from the other cul-de-sac. Response was that it would be difficult with the creek and the slopes.

Engineer for the applicant discussed the other options for how to minimize the variances required and why they are sticking with what they proposed.

Raymond asked about the trees that were removed and Mr. Burford explained that one tree was down and several others were rotten and for safety they were removed.

Harry commented that he lives in a similar cul-de-sac and understands the parking issues and agrees that there is not enough room. Also, he is concerned about septic systems so near the creek. Sometimes the builders do not follow the rules so there are no guaranties. He would prefer 2 lots or access off the other cul-de-sac for a third lot.

Rebecca stated that this residential density is compatible with the neighborhood. She requested that the existing residents please welcome the new neighbors and bring them into your vision of the neighborhood

Raymond also expressed that he appreciates the neighbor's interpretation of the code but disagrees with the interpretation. Thinks the speculation about parking is unfounded. More trees would be removed to do some of the other configurations. Reiterated that this is not high density

Becky said that she understands the neighbors not wanting change but that this was a reasonable proposal. The owner is within his rights to ask for this.

Bob suggested that he would approve three lots but with one having access from the other cul-de-sac. No parking in the cul-de-sac with the current configuration might be an option.

Elisa. This will change the visual access of the block with them so far forward. Does not like the odd shapes and would want to see one come off the other cul-de-sac.

Bob made motion to deny and Elisa second. Vote Harry, Elisa, and Bob for. Raymond, Rebecca, and Becky against.

Harry then made motion to either have two lots or three with one from other cul-de-sac. No second

Raymond motion to approve as is. Rebecca second. Vote Raymond, Rebecca, Becky for. Harry, Elisa, and Bob against.

Final motion was to return with a different lot layout. This passed.



**YOUR LINK
TO COUNTY SERVICES
ONLINE, OR ON THE GO!**

www.311.SacCounty.net | Dial 3-1-1
Outside unincorporated Sacramento County
Dial 916-875-4311