
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Minutes of the Meeting of December 2, 2010

The Plumas County Planning Commission (the *Commission*) convenes in a Meeting on December 2, 2010, at 10:07 a.m. in the Plumas County Library Meeting Room, 445 Jackson Street, Quincy, CA; Chair, Mark Dotta, presiding. Members appointed are as follows:

1. Mark Dotta, Chair (District 1);
2. Elizabeth "Betsy" Schramel, Vice Chair (District 2);
3. Richard Rydell, Commissioner (District 3);
4. Larry Williams, Commissioner (District 4); and
5. John Olofson, Commissioner (District 5).

Staff in Attendance: Randy Wilson, Planning Director
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner
Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary

Supervisors in Attendance: None

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

III. ROLL CALL

Present: Mark Dotta, John Olofson, Rich Rydell, Betsy Schramel
Rich Rydell - *Attends the meeting telephonically at 7310 Winding Oaks Drive, Colorado Springs, CO, a public place where other members of the public can participate in the meeting.*

Absent: Larry Williams

IV. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

The agenda is approved as presented.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSC: Olofson/Schramel (4-0) to approve the Minutes of November 4, 2010, as presented.

V. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS

Betsy Schramel presents an article regarding the new requirement for residential fire sprinklers and requests the article be copied and distributed to the Commissioners.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

George Terhune, Acting Chair of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), reports the ALUC currently has a vacancy and appeals to those present if they or someone they know would be interested in filling the vacancy.

VIII. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

A. CONSULTANT TEAM'S REPORT

Coleen Shade of Design Workshop distributes two handouts titled "Examples of Land Use Terms from Other County General Plans" and "El Dorado County's Coordination with Incorporated Cities Policy". Shade states today's objective is to recap the terms talked about previously, talk more about those terms, and look at the pros and cons of each. After that, review the maps using those terms and the draft boundaries of the Community Plan areas, Core Community areas, and Expansion areas. After that, go back to those terms to solidify and get confirmation that that is the right approach. The "right approach" being those boundaries and terms and what the consequences of those terms mean.

1. WORKSHOP WITH WORKING GROUPS: CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF TERMS USED ON PLANNING AREA MAPS

Coleen Shade distributes the draft land use terms. Shade states a "Planning Area" identifies the boundary to which potential future development (dense development) may go. Each community would have a planning area around it. The County is essentially identifying the areas where it sees development continuing. Steve Frisch of Sierra Business Council clarifies that the Planning Area acts as an urban growth boundary. Development outside of the Planning Area would require a General Plan Amendment.

Continuing, Shade explains that the innermost circle within the Planning Area would be called a Village, Town, or Rural Center boundary where denser development would take place. The decision was made to not stay with the term "Opportunity Area" because it implies there is opportunity for growth. The term was used to describe areas in which all of the municipal services were available. Randy Wilson, Planning Director, adds that we're talking about being within the growth boundary near the center core and not tweaking the existing General Plan at this point, but providing the opportunity in the future should the need arise within the growth boundary for a transition to another use. There is the center core with a growth boundary, and then they're policies and opportunities within that to change it. Frisch agrees that is absolutely the intent. The effect in the long run is that we're streamlining the process within the planning area. If you're between the town boundary and the planning area, it doesn't kick in the highest level of environmental review. It helps economic development within that area. The higher level of environmental review is almost automatic outside that planning area, but inside the area it's been anticipated and analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

John Sheehan points out that no entitlements are intended to be diminished by this General Plan update; however, the Forest Service entitlements (land) is going to go away from inside the Planning Area for planning purposes, so we need to figure out a way to say that in a way that everyone understands. Frisch adds that it has implications for environmental review and defensibility of the land. When you look at the Forest Service property that at one time was considered for potential new communities and recognize that is not likely to happen and lower your overall build out number, it is going to make the General Plan more realistic and more legally defensible.

Mark Dotta questions if the higher density zoning would only be within the Planning Area. Wilson replies that the small parcels are what we're saying should go within the growth boundaries; however, we're not looking to downzone, but to recognize that there are tools we're going to look at in terms of how those lands will be divided.

Frisch explains there are two policies being considered. The first is the concept of incentivizing the development you want to occur. The planning area boundaries are generally going to be a guideline for where you want to provide some higher level of incentive for development to occur. If there is a future policy that creates incentives for higher density development within the area you want to have developed more intensely, that line is going to be important. The second policy is if there's a transfer of development rights, the Planning Areas are likely to be the receiving zones for transferring development rights. Areas outside the Planning Areas are likely to be ascending zones.

Wilson points out that the Opportunity Area map has a structure that we're building off of. The mapping is important because it will drive so much in the future. We're trying to capture a 20-year planning horizon. We're looking at land use patterns and refining them, but we can only realistically look ahead 20 years in terms of what will happen with growth. Discussion follows regarding Opportunity Areas on Federal land.

2. WORKSHOP WITH WORKING GROUPS: CONTINUED PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF PLANNING AREA MAPS

Rich Rydell leaves the meeting at 11:35 a.m. The Working Group members break into groups and review the maps from 11:38 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. A lunch break is called at 12:15 p.m. The meeting reconvenes at 12:56 p.m. Working Group members break into groups and review the maps until 1:26 p.m.

Coleen Shade starts by explaining that the next step is to define the lines on the maps and what they mean. The outermost boundary around a town is called a "Planning Area", which is an urban growth boundary. This doesn't mean you can't subdivide outside the boundary, but any development inside the boundary is within the General Plan. The innermost area within the Planning Area is called a "Town" or "Urban Center". This is the area that has services. The next area is called a "Community", which doesn't have all the services, but does have year-round paved access. The next area is the "Rural Service Center", which is a community that essentially has the same boundary as the "Planning Area". They both have services, but we're not looking at opportunities to expand them. Shade suggests a fourth boundary called "Master Planned Community". Randy Wilson suggests thinking about what the people who live in these areas would accept as labels. Following discussion, it is agreed to call the four areas within the Planning Area: 1) Town; 2) Community; 3) Rural Place; and 4) Planned Community.

In conclusion, Shade states they should have the administrative draft of the General Plan to the County by mid-January, and are looking at sometime in February for a Working Group meeting, and probably March for the last round of public workshops on the General Plan, but not the Environmental Document.

B. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY – There are no comments.

C. DRAFT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES – There is no report.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There is no report.

1. **CEQA CHECKLIST** – No report.
2. **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REPORT** – No report.
3. **ON-GOING PROJECT UPDATES** – No report.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE – There is no correspondence.

X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS – This item is not discussed.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Dotta adjourns the meeting of December 2, 2010, at 1:57 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is December 16, 2010, at 10:00 a.m., in the Planning & Building Department Conference Room.



Mark Dotta, Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission



Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary