

SHASTA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES

Meeting

Date: August 9, 2018
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Place: Shasta County Administration Center
Board of Supervisors' Chambers

Flag Salute

ROLL CALL

Commissioners

Present:

Tim MacLean	District 2
Jim Chapin	District 1
Steven Kerns	District 3
Roy Ramsey	District 4
Patrick Wallner	District 5

Staff Present:

Richard W. Simon, Director of Resource Management
James Ross, Assistant County Counsel
Kim Hunter, Planning Division Manager
Luis Topete, Associate Planner
Jimmy Zanutelli, Shasta County Fire Marshal
Eric Wedemeyer, Public Works/Subdivision Engineer
Jessica Cunningham-Pappas, Staff Services Analyst II/Recording Secretary

Note: All unanimous actions reflect a 5-0 vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - OPEN TIME: No Speakers.

R1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

By motion made, seconded (Wallner/Ramsey) and carried by a 4-0 vote, the Planning Commission approved the Minutes of July 12, 2018, as submitted. Commissioner Chapin abstained from voting due to not being in attendance at the July 12, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS: Chairman MacLean declared a conflict of interest for Item R3 due to his employment association with Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., who has completed work on behalf of some of the property owners residing in those areas.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Ex-parte Communications Disclosures: None.

R2: Variance 18-0003 (Kronick): The applicant has requested approval of a variance from the maximum 15-foot building height limit for residential accessory buildings to construct a 900-square-

foot RV garage with a height of 19-feet, 6-inches from the edge of the road easement and a variance from the 20- foot front yard setback requirement in the National Recreation Area, Shasta unit (NRA-S) district. Applicant: John and Charlene Kronick; Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 085-320-032-000; Project Location: Lakehead Area on a 4.14-acre parcel approximately 0.1 miles south of the intersection of O'Brien Mountain Road and Grey Fawn Trail (17528 Grey Fawn Trail); Supervisor District: 4; Recommended Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt; Planner: Luis Topete, Associate Planner. Simple Majority Vote.

Associate Planner Luis Topete presented the staff report.

Chairman MacLean opened the public hearing.

Speaker's Name

Comments/Concerns/Questions

Tracy Novogrodsky

Ms. Novogrodsky expressed concern over the proposed building's limited distance from the road easement and potential erosion.

Erik Mickelsen

Mr. Mickelsen expressed concerns about egress from his driveway in the event of a fire, erosion and drainage. He described the steep bank next to the proposed project and his assertion that if the proposed structure were to catch fire, it could fall into Grey Fawn Trail. Commissioner Kerns asked Mr. Mickelsen if his concerns would be addressed if the proposed building was in a different location. Mr. Mickelsen indicated relocating the building to the west side of the property would likely address most concerns.

Chairman MacLean asked if the applicant or their representative was available and called for any other speakers. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Kerns asked Mr. Topete if the applicant would consider moving the structure to the west side. Mr. Topete stated he was unsure without speaking with the applicant. Chairman MacLean asked if the gravel pad was level. Mr. Topete confirmed it was and noted that the project was compliant with fire safety standards. Chairman MacLean asked if most exceptions for setbacks were as extreme as the proposed project. Mr. Topete stated that in his experience they vary. Commissioner Chapin stated he saw no reason to have the building so near the right-of-way of the road when there were several other options for where the project could be located. Commissioner Wallner agreed with this thinking given the limited ingress and egress for the project's proposed location.

At Commissioner Kerns request, Chairman MacLean reopened the public hearing. Commissioner Kerns asked Ms. Novogrodsky if her concerns would be alleviated with respect to fire, escape, and aesthetics if it was possible to move the project to the west and north. Ms. Novogrodsky stated it would.

Chairman MacLean closed the public hearing and asked for feedback from Mr. Simon on the possibility of staff working with the applicant to see if they would consider adjusting the plan. Mr.

Simon commented that because the applicant was absent and they may have rationale unknown to the Planning Commission, it would be appropriate to consider a continuation.

By motion made, seconded (Kerns/Chapin) and carried unanimously, the Planning Commission continued Variance 18-0003 to the September 13, 2018 Planning Commission meeting to allow staff time to work with the applicant to explore the possibility of another location for the project.

Chairman MacLean left the room.

Ex-parte Communications Disclosures: None.

R3: **General Plan Map Amendment GPA18-0001 and Zoning Plan Map Amendment ZA18-0002**
Consider a proposed amendment to the Shasta County General Plan Land Use Map and related County Zoning Plan Map as part of the 2014-2019 Housing Element Update program to bring the County's General Plan Housing Element into compliance with State Housing Law. GPA18-0001 and ZA18-0002: *East Redding - 299 East Corridor/Collyer Drive and Old Oregon Trail* (Area 1) consists of approximately 48 acres currently designated Commercial (C) and Suburban Residential (SR) in the General Plan, and zoned Community Commercial (C-2), Commercial Light Industrial (C-M), and Interim Residential (IR). Area 1 in its entirety would be designated UR(25) and would be rezoned to R-3-25 on 33.3 acres, and Open Space on 14.6 acres. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 076-070-012; 076-070-016; 076-100-018; and 076-060-018.

Planning Manager Kim Hunter stated that due to circumstances related to the Carr Fire, additional time was needed to complete necessary documents for the Planning Commission's consideration of Items R3, R4, R5, and R6. Staff recommended the Planning Commission open the public hearing for each item as scheduled, accept all testimony and continue the hearing to a Special Meeting on Thursday, August 23rd.

Vice Chairman Chapin opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, the public hearing was closed.

By motion made, seconded (Kerns/Ramsey) and carried 4-0, the Planning Commission continued Item R3 to a Special Meeting on Thursday, August 23, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

Chairman MacLean returned to the meeting.

Ex-parte Communications Disclosures: None.

R4 **General Plan Map Amendment GPA18-0002 and Zoning Plan Map Amendment ZA18-0003**
Consider a proposed amendment to the Shasta County General Plan Land Use Maps and related County Zoning Map as part of the 2014-2019 Housing Element Update program to bring the County's General Plan Housing Element into compliance with State Housing Law. GPA18-0002 and ZA18-0003: *North Redding - Old Oasis Road/I-5 Corridor* (Area 2) consists of approximately 52 acres currently designated Suburban Residential (SR) in the General Plan, and zoned Interim Residential (IR) and Designated Floodway (F-1) and Restrictive Flood (F-2). Area 2 would be designated UR(25) and rezoned to R-3-25 on 10.2 acres; designated UR on 41.7 acres and rezoned as follows: R-3-10 on 13.1 acres; and Open Space (OS) on 20 acres; the Designated Floodway portion would be unchanged. Assessor's Parcel Number 073-010-006.

Chairman MacLean opened the public hearing.

<u><i>Speaker's Name</i></u>	<u><i>Comments/Concerns/Questions</i></u>
Michael Elrite	Mr. Elrite expressed concerns about high density housing being placed in a low-density area and increases in crime.
Mose Perizzolo	Mr. Perizzolo stated he didn't think it was a good idea and that there was already a crime problem.
Richard Janssen	Mr. Janssen expressed concern about access, traffic, declining property values, and a crime rate that he noted was already high. He pointed out that numerous high speed chases had occurred in the area.

Chairman MacLean called for any other speakers. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Kerns inquired about the current size limitation on lots. Mr. Simon stated the property was designated Suburban Residential (SR) and Interim Residential (IR) zoning with a minimum parcel size of 5-acres, until services were brought to the site. The property would be served by City of Redding water and sewer under an existing agreement. The proposed change would be land use designation to Urban Residential with a density of 20-25 units per acre. Commissioner Wallner asked if the City of Redding would be able to serve the property with the increased density. Mr. Simon stated his understanding was that they would, however, he was not aware on whether this would require improvements. Chairman MacLean indicated he understood this item was for a zoning proposal and that there was not a current high density project at this time. Mr. Simon affirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Kerns asked if any analysis had been done on how property values would be affected for build outs in the proposed areas. Mr. Simon responded, noting information was available that indicated arguments on both sides. Mr. Simon noted an environmental analysis (EA) was available to the public through the department's website and at the department and that Planning Manager Kim Hunter was available as a contact. Commissioner Chapin asked how existing infrastructure (road system) would handle new traffic generated for a high density project. Mr. Simon responded any proposed project would be reviewed by Public Works, Environmental Health, and all agencies involved in approving a project, including any mitigation or constraints identified in the environmental assessment, which would be the developer's responsibility to mitigate.

Chairman MacLean reopened the public hearing. Mr. Elrite questioned why there was a proposed change in zoning when there was no current project planned. Mr. Perizzolo noted he hasn't seen the curve on Old Oasis fixed and he re-asserted his concern about traffic. Mr. Janssen asked if he would have the opportunity to address the Planning Commission again at the next meeting. Chairman MacLean closed the public hearing.

By motion made, seconded (Ramsey/Wallner) and carried unanimously, the Planning Commission continued Item R4 to a Special Meeting on Thursday, August 23, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

Ex-parte Communications Disclosures: None.

R5 **General Plan Map Amendment GPA18-0003 and Zoning Plan Map Amendment ZA18-0004**
Consider a proposed amendment to the Shasta County General Plan Land Use Map and related County Zoning Map as part of the 2014-2019 Housing Element Update program to bring the County's General Plan Housing Element into compliance with State Housing Law. GPA18-0003 and ZA18-0004: *Southwest Palo Cedro - Gilbert Drive* (Area 3) consists of 9.8 acres currently designated Commercial (C) in the General Plan and zoned Community Commercial (C-2). Area 3 in its entirety would be designated UR(25), and would be rezoned to R-3-25 on 8 acres, and Open Space on 1.8 acres. Assessor's Parcel Number 059-360-019.

Chairman MacLean opened the public hearing. There being no speakers, the public hearing was closed.

By motion made, seconded (Wallner/Ramsey) and carried unanimously, the Planning Commission continued Item R5 to a Special Meeting on Thursday, August 23, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

Ex-parte Communications Disclosures: None.

R6 **General Plan Map Amendment GPA18-0004 and Zoning Plan Map Amendment ZA18-0005**
Consider a proposed amendment to the Shasta County General Plan Land Use Map and related County Zoning Map as part of the 2014-2019 Housing Element Update program to bring the County's General Plan Housing Element into compliance with State Housing Law. GPA18-0004 and ZA18-0005: *Southwest Cottonwood/I-5 Corridor* (Area 4) consists of approximately 13 acres currently designated Urban Residential – 8 dwelling units per acre (UR(8)) and zoned Planned Development (PD). Area 4 would be designated UR(25) and rezoned to R-3-25 on 10 acres; designated and zoned Open Space on 1.6 acres; and designated Commercial (C) and rezoned to Community Commercial (C-2) on 1.4 acres. Assessor's Parcel Number: 087-270-031.

Chairman MacLean opened the public hearing.

Speaker's Name

Comments/Concerns/Questions

Ralph Adams

Mr. Adams expressed concerns about water, drainage, traffic impacts and the devaluation of subdivision houses he had built. He referenced a low-income project in Anderson in which the Anderson Police Department reported seventy-percent of their work was in response to that area. Mr. Adams noted Cottonwood's lack of law enforcement and concerns related to growth.

James Seale

Mr. Seale expressed concern over impacts on schools and water and sewer systems. He questioned where sewer allotments would come from since Cottonwood's system was nearing capacity. Mr. Seale expressed concern over increased traffic on 1st Street. Mr. Seale noted Crowley Gulch floods annually, lack of law enforcement and road access for some of the property zoned Commercial.

Kayle Spoon

Mr. Spoon asked if there was an existing project. He expressed concern over lack of sidewalks on 1st Street for pedestrians, flood, sewer and traffic issues. He noted the safety issues inherent with the current lack of infrastructure for pedestrians and the existing overpass. Mr. Simon responded that the proposal was a County initiated rezoning, that there was no specific proponent for a project, and that this was an effort to seek out properties that have access to services (primarily water and sewer) with the potential for higher density development should a future project be proposed.

Tom Semingson

Mr. Semingson expressed concern over traffic on 1st Street, the impact of which he believed would render a project unfeasible.

Vickie Wolf

Ms. Wolf asked if a developer proposed a different number of units, would they be allowed to divert from the new zoning. Chairman MacLean responded, noting any landowner could propose a project and that zoning was a guideline for proposals. Ms. Wolfe asked for a definition of uses in C2. Mr. Simon responded and referenced Chapter 17.44 of the Shasta County Zoning Plan.

Mr. Simon noted the County was obligated as an arm of the State to participate in the State's declared housing crisis and that part of the County's obligation was to adopt a Housing Element as part of the General Plan. He further explained the County was required to accommodate a certain number of housing units at various income levels by rezoning properties to allow for potential future development at the default density. To fulfill this obligation, the County is required to rezone properties where it may be found suitable for higher density development. Commissioner Kerns commented the difficulty was meeting the County's obligations under state law. He encouraged the public to stay involved in the process. Commissioners acknowledged public concerns related to the proposed rezones and encouraged continued public input.

Chairman MacLean closed the public hearing.

By motion made, seconded (Ramsey/Kerns) and carried unanimously, the Planning Commission continued Item R6 to a Special Meeting on Thursday, August 23, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

Ex-parte Communications Disclosures: None.

R7

General Plan Amendment GPA13-003 Revised Draft Shasta County 2014-2019 Housing Element

Shasta County completed the Revised Draft 2014-2019 Housing Element Update (Revised Draft) consisting of five Sections as follows: Section I Introduction, Section II Housing Needs Assessment, Section III Housing Constraints, Section IV Regional Housing Needs Allocation, Section V Programs; and ten supporting appendices.