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 yield 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 Keeler, 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 was 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.
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