



## Jackson Planning Commission Agenda

Monday, October 19, 2020 – 6:30 PM Regular Meeting  
Jackson City Hall, 33 Broadway, Jackson, CA 95642

**Public Teleconference Line: 1 623-404-9000**

**Meeting ID: 148 434 2305**

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: <https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/1484342305>

Zoom participants will be muted upon entry. Should you wish to speak upon Public Comment, please “Raise your Hand”, you will be unmuted one at a time and asked to state your name.

**NOTE: Public attendance is optional. Those who wish to attend this meeting in person will be required to wear a face covering to enter the building and throughout the duration of the meeting. Seating is limited due to social distancing guidelines.**

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

#### **1. PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA.**

Discussion items only, no action will be taken. Any person may address the Planning Commission at this time on any subject within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. Please note – there is a three (3) minute limit. Any matter that may require action may be referred to administration for review and appropriate administrative and/or legislative action.

#### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

Approve the minutes of the August 17, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting.

#### **3. DISCUSSION CALENDAR.**

- a. Planned Development Amendment, 126 & 134 Emerald Lane (APN 044-520-027 & 044-520-028) and possible approval of Resolution No. 2020-02 Approving a Planned Development Amendment and Categorical Exemption for Jackson View Partners, LP for Jackson View Lots 26 & 27 – 126 & 134 Emerald Lane (APN 044-520-027 & 044-520-028).

#### **4. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.**

This section is to provide staff and Commissioners an opportunity to present oral status reports on issues. No action is expected to be taken by the Planning Commissions.

**5. ADJOURNMENT.**

Regular meeting adjournment.

*Posted:* City Hall, Jackson

*Agenda materials will be available for review (pursuant to §54957.5 Government Code Section) in the City Clerk's office in City Hall.*

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, you should contact the Office of the City Clerk at (209) 223-1646 (voice) or (209) 223-3141 (fax). Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.*

**Visit our website at <http://ci.jackson.ca.us>**  
for copies of previous agendas, minutes and City budget.



**CITY OF JACKSON**  
**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
 August 17, 2020

Steve McLean, Chairman Debby Collins, Vice-Chairwoman George White – Commissioner Thornton Consolo – Commissioner Chad Simmons - Commissioner  <b>COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:</b> None	Susan Peters –City Planner Patti Ungaro – Administrative Assistant
--	---

Chairman McLean called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG.**

Chairman McLean led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**1) PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA.**

Chairman McLean opened for Public Matters not on the Agenda.

George White, Jackson resident, stated that at the top of Schoeber and Perry Street there is a stop sign that nobody sees and runs right through them. Who do we talk to about this? He’s talked to Public Works at the Corp yard. City Planner, Susan Peters said she will submit a Work Request to cut tree limbs from view of signs.

After no further Public Comments, Chairman McLean moved onto next item.

**2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

*Motion to approve the minutes of June 15, 2020. Moved by Commissioner Consolo, seconded by Commissioner White, and carried by a 4 to 1 roll call vote:*

- AYES: McLean, White, Consolo, Simmons
- NOES: None
- ABSENT: None
- ABSTAIN: Collins

**3) DISCUSSION CALENDAR.**

**a. Rezone and General Plan Amendment from Public/Institutional to Historic Commercial with a Planned Development Overlay, 108 and 204 Court Street and 42 Summit Street (APN’s 020-243-001 & 020-243-009).**

City Planner, Susan Peters provided overview of the Rezone and General Plan Amendment per the Planning Staff Report included in the Meeting Packet.

The applicant is requesting that the properties located at 108 & 204 Court Street and 42 Summit Street be rezoned and General Plan re-designated from Public/Institutional to Historic Commercial with a Planned Development Overlay. No development is planned at this time. Future development will be subject discretionary review per the Planned Development Overlay requirements.

While rezones 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. The proposed rezone does not increase the intensity of the use since the proposed zoning and General Plan designation allow for what the building has historically been used for. Additionally, the Planned Development Overlay will require project specific CEQA review as part of amending the current use.

Should the Planning Commission choose to recommend approval of the requested rezone and general plan amendment to the City Council the following findings should be made in accordance with Article VI, Section 17.160.060 Findings for Amendments:

An amendment to the General Plan, the Zoning Map, or this Development Code may be approved only if all of the following findings are made, as applicable to the type of amendment.

- A. Findings for all amendments.
  - 1. The proposed amendment ensures and maintains internal consistency with all of the goals, policies, and actions of all elements of the General Plan and any applicable specific plan; and
  - 2. The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the City.
  
- B. Additional finding for Zoning Map amendments. There is adequate capacity available in the community sewer and water systems to serve the potential development, and the site is physically suitable for the requested zoning designation(s) and anticipated land use development(s). Factors considered to evaluate suitability shall include access, provision of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses, and absence of physical constraints.
  
- C. Additional finding for Development Code amendments. The proposed amendment ensures and maintains internal consistency with other applicable provisions of this Development Code.

It is recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing on the Rezone and General Plan Amendment and forward the application and its associated categorical exemption to the City Council for adoption based on the Findings in this report.

Planning Commission discussed the vacant lots with concerns over street parking. Vice Chairwoman Collins questioned if there were any sewer concerns.

Chairman McLean opened for Public Comment.

Jill Keelor, 103 Court St., expressed concern with narrow streets and requests to be part of any parking discussion. She also questioned what is planned to go in the building.

Ron Regan, applicant, explained there are currently no project ideas, concepts only. Thought of housing, senior care facilities, various concepts.

Jill asked about the Historic Commercial zoning and because the building is historic, will it be blended? City Planner Peters explained regardless of what it is zoned, that property is in the historic district and if there are any changes being made to the appearance, it would require a building permit to change the appearance of the building and would also have to go through the Design Review Committee (DRC).

Stephen DeSilva, Jackson resident, questioned if asbestos was in the building and would it be cost prohibitive in addition if the building was condemned. Ron Regan, applicant, answered, yes, there is asbestos. He obtained a complete study on it from the Amador County prior to the purchase. It is not condemned; because it is a historic structure and the building will not be demolished. They had a number of engineering studies done and the structure is sound but one issue came up that it will require an elevator to be ADA compliant. It will not be cost prohibitive, although there is asbestos, it is not that big of an issue, and there is some lead paint. They will take all the proper prohibitive procedures for the removal of the asbestos and lead paint. As a contractor, he also holds a mediation license.

Chairman McLean closed Public Comment after no further comments and moved back to the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission discussed any potential water/sewer issues or any capacity problems.

Commissioner Consolo made a proposal and a motion to approve the project consistent with the general plan and with the neighborhood. It also does not appear to have any capacity issues or any problems with water and sewer at this point.

***Motion by Commissioner Consolo, seconded by Vice Chair Collins, and carried by a 5 to 0 vote to make a recommendation to the City Council to approve the Rezone and General Plan Amendment from Public/Institutional to Historic Commercial with a Planned Development Overlay as presented.***

**AYES:** McLean, Collins, White, Consolo, Simmons

**NOES:** None

**ABSENT:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**4. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS.**

City Planner Peters announced there is a General Plan kickoff meeting tomorrow and to be aware of more information coming later this week. She also recommends the League of California Cities who provides training, educational opportunities, and webinars related to cities in California. They have Planning Commission courses, City Council courses and holds an annual Conference. This year they are having a virtual conference at a great price of \$50 and will forward Registration info to each of you. Vice Chairwoman Collins requested Susan to mark the courses she recommends that would be relevant. CP Peters stated the Conference is still in planning mode therefore a lot of the courses are not posted yet but recommends anything related with planning and development would be beneficial for Planning Commission; also Brown Act and Media since you will be going through a General Plan Update dealing with the public and media which tends to get controversial. Foothill Conservancy is also putting together a “What is a General Plan Workshop” which will give all the ins and outs of a General Plan.

Commissioner Consolo asked if there was anything happening on New York Ranch Rd. CP Peters answered there still no plans at this time and discussed the process of applications and being contacted by any tribes.

**5. ADJOURNMENT.**

Chairman McLean adjourned the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Patti Ungaro, Administrative Assistant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved

**CITY OF JACKSON  
Planning Staff Report**

Date: October 19, 2020  
Application Type: Planned Development Amendment  
Proposed Project: Single Family Residential Driveway Length  
Applicant: Jackson View Partners, LP  
Location: 126 & 134 Emerald Lane (APN 044-520-027 & 044-520-028)

Project Description

Jackson View Partners, LP, represented by Mr. Tom Dashiell, has applied for a Planned Development Amendment to allow the driveways at 126 & 134 Emerald Lane to be a minimum length of 20 feet to allow for corrective grading (see attached letter dated July 1, 2020). In 2004 the Planning Commission approved a Planned Development Amendment that allowed for the front setback to be reduced from 25 feet to 15 with a requirement to maintain a 25-foot driveway.

Environmental Review

While Planned Development Amendments 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.

Conditions of Approval

Staff has no recommended Conditions of Approval for the proposed Planned Development Amendment.

Findings

Should the Planning Commission choose to approve this Planned Development Amendment the Commission must the following findings:

A. The proposed development is:

1. Allowed within the subject zoning district;
2. Generally, complies with all of the applicable provisions of this Development Code and Public Improvement and Engineering Standards relating to both on- and off-site improvements that are necessary to accommodate maximum flexibility in site planning and property development and to carry out the purpose, intent, and requirements of the respective zoning district, including prescribed development standards and applicable design guidelines; and
3. Consistent with the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan.

B. The proposed project would produce a comprehensive development of superior quality (e.g., appropriate variety of structure placement and orientation opportunities, appropriate mix of land uses and structure sizes, high quality architectural design,

increased amounts of landscaping and open space, improved solutions to the design and placement of parking facilities, etc.) than which might otherwise occur from the strict application of the provisions and standards identified in this Development Code;

C. The proposed development is consistent with the design guidelines, achieves the overall design objectives of the design guidelines, and would not impair the design and architectural integrity and character of the surrounding neighborhood;

D. There are adequate provisions for public and emergency vehicle access, sanitation, water, and public utilities and services to ensure that the proposed development would not be detrimental to public health and safety. Adequate provisions shall mean that distribution and collection facilities and other infrastructure are installed at the time of development and in operation prior to occupancy of buildings and the land, and all development fees have been paid prior to occupancy of buildings and the land;

E. The design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed development would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of the City, or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and zoning district in which the property is located;

F. The approval of the Planned Development is in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and there would be no potential significant adverse effects upon environmental quality and natural resources that could not be properly mitigated and monitored, unless a Statement of Overriding Considerations is adopted; and

G. The subject site is:

1. Physically suitable for the type and density/intensity of development being proposed;
2. Adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use and all fences and walls, landscaping, loading, parking, yards, and other features required by this Development Code; and
3. Served by streets adequate in width and pavement type to carry the quantity and type of traffic generated by the proposed development.

H. The proposed development is consistent with all applicable regulations of the Amador County Department of Environmental Health and the City of Jackson Fire Department for the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.

### Action

Should the Planning Commission choose to approve Planned Development Amendment for Jackson View Partners, LP, the following action should be taken:

1. Approve Resolution No. 2020-02 approving a Planned Development Amendment to allow for Jackson View Lots 26 & 27 to have a minimum driveway length of 20 feet.
2. Instruct staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Recorder.



# Jackson View Partners, LP

898 Francisco Street San Francisco, California, 94109 (510) 919-1969

July 1, 2020

Ms. Susan Peters, Planning Director  
City of Jackson Planning Department  
33 Broadway  
Jackson, CA 95642



Re: Jackson View Senior Development – Subdivision Map No. 106  
Request to amend the Planned Development with respect to Lots 26 & 27

Dear Susan,

The Jackson View Senior Development was approved in 2003 with a Planned Development overlay (Resolution 2003-08), and in 2004 the Planned Development was amended by Resolution 2004-05 to clarify aspects of the Planned Development and to establish setback requirements for homes constructed within the development. Resolution 2004-05 provides for building setbacks as follows:

1. *Where there is a sidewalk, structure shall set back a minimum of 15 feet from back of sidewalk.*
2. *Where there is no sidewalk, structure shall set back a minimum of 15 feet from the back of curb.*
3. *Driveways shall be a minimum of 25 feet long between garage door to the back of the sidewalk or the curb where there is no sidewalk.*

Throughout the subdivision, lots have been re-graded and homes carefully selected to accommodate the setback provisions of the amended Planned Development. However, Lots 26 and 27 present unique challenges because they were constructed by a prior owner with fill slopes steeper than allowed by both the Building Code and the project's geotechnical report. To correct this condition, we will be removing and reconstructing the fill to the proper slope angle, which will ultimately reduce the depth of the pad as measured from the street. The home has been moved as far forward as current setbacks allow, however we find that the distance between the rear wall of the home and the top of the fill slope is uncomfortably small, resulting in a rear yard which is much smaller than, and inconsistent with, other rear yards in the neighborhood.

At this time, we request that the Planned Development be amended with respect to Lots 26 and 27 as follows:

4. Driveways for Lots 26 and 27 only shall be a minimum of 20 feet long between garage door to the back of the sidewalk or curb where there is no sidewalk.

City of Jackson Planning Department  
July 1, 2020  
Page 2

Our requested amendment to the Planned Development is based on special circumstances applicable to Lots 26 & 27 which do not apply to other properties in the neighborhood and which prevent the enjoyment of reasonable rear yards otherwise enjoyed by other properties in the neighborhood. Additionally, we note that a conventional City-standard parking stall is 20 feet deep, so a reduction in driveway length to 20 feet for Lots 26 & 27 would not be inconsistent with the City's adopted improvement standards for vehicular parking overall, and as such would not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please be certain to contact me with any comments or questions.

Very truly yours,  
Jackson View Partners, LP

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Dashiell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "D".

Tom Dashiell, agent for owner

TCD:rp

# Planning Commission Resolution No. 2020-02

## A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Jackson Approving a Planned Development Amendment and Categorical Exemption for Jackson View Partners, LP Jackson View Lots 26 & 27 - 126 & 134 Emerald Lane APN 044-520-027 & 044-520-028

**WHEREAS**, Jackson View Partners, LP, represented by Mr. Tom Dashiell, has applied for a Planned Development Amendment to allow the driveways at 126 & 134 Emerald Lane to be a minimum length of 20 feet to allow for corrective grading.

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has held a duly noticed Public Hearing to solicit public comment on the application:

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

A. The proposed development is:

1. Allowed within the subject zoning district;
2. Generally complies with all of the applicable provisions of this Development Code and Public Improvement and Engineering Standards relating to both on- and off-site improvements that are necessary to accommodate maximum flexibility in site planning and property development and to carry out the purpose, intent, and requirements of the respective zoning district, including prescribed development standards and applicable design guidelines; and
3. Consistent with the General Plan and any applicable Specific Plan.

B. The proposed project would produce a comprehensive development of superior quality (e.g., appropriate variety of structure placement and orientation opportunities, appropriate mix of land uses and structure sizes, high quality architectural design, increased amounts of landscaping and open space, improved solutions to the design and placement of parking facilities, etc.) than which might otherwise occur from the strict application of the provisions and standards identified in this Development Code;

C. The proposed development is consistent with the design guidelines, achieves the overall design objectives of the design guidelines, and would not impair the design and architectural integrity and character of the surrounding neighborhood;

D. There are adequate provisions for public and emergency vehicle access, sanitation, water, and public utilities and services to ensure that the proposed development would not be detrimental to public health and safety. Adequate provisions shall mean that distribution and collection facilities and other infrastructure are installed at the time of development and in operation prior to occupancy of buildings and the land, and all development fees have been paid prior to occupancy of buildings and the land;

E. The design, location, size, and operating characteristics of the proposed development would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of the City, or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and zoning district in which the property is located;

F. The approval of the Planned Development is in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and there would be no potential significant adverse effects upon environmental quality and natural resources that could not be properly mitigated and monitored, unless a Statement of Overriding Considerations is adopted; and

G. The subject site is:

1. Physically suitable for the type and density/intensity of development being proposed;
2. Adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use and all fences and walls, landscaping, loading, parking, yards, and other features required by this Development Code; and
3. Served by streets adequate in width and pavement type to carry the quantity and type of traffic generated by the proposed development.

H. The proposed development is consistent with all applicable regulations of the Amador County Department of Environmental Health and the City of Jackson Fire Department for the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that a Categorical Exemption is approved in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the Planned Development Amendment is granted.

The foregoing resolution was duly passed and adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Jackson at a regular meeting on the 19th day of October 2020, by the following vote:

**AYES:**  
**NOES:**  
**ABSENT:**  
**ABSTAIN:**

**CITY OF JACKSON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve McLean, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Georgette, City Clerk