

TEMPLETON AREA ADVISORY GROUP (TAAG) NOTICE OF TAAG BOARD MEETING AND AGENDA

Thursday, APRIL 15, 2021 5:30 pm

The Zoom meeting of the Templeton Area Advisory Group (TAAG) will be held by telecommunication. To join the meeting with a computer, go to [Zoom.us/join](https://zoom.us/join) and enter the meeting ID: 968 5289 7716. The passcode is 12345 when you are asked to put that in. To join the Zoom meeting using a phone, either cell or land-line (audio only), Dial 669-900-6833 and enter the meeting ID 968 5289 7716#. The passcode again is 12345#.

2021-2022 TAAG BOARD MEMBERS

Bruce Jones, Delegate/Chair
Murray Powell, Delegate/Treasurer/Vice-Chair
Erik Gorham, Delegate/Secretary
Dede Davis, Delegate
Doris Diel, Delegate
John Donovan, Delegate
Don Potts, Delegate

RECORDING SECRETARY

Harley Wood

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. AGENCY REPORTS AND UPDATES

Written reports will be read at the meeting. In-Person Reports will be live.

- 3.1. Sheriff's Office
- 3.2. California Highway Patrol
- 3.3. Supervisorial District One
- 3.4. Supervisorial District Five
- 3.5. County Planning Department
- 3.6. Templeton Community Services District

4. PUBLIC COMMENT Members of the public who wish to speak on any topic not on the Agenda that is within the purview of the TAAG may approach the podium on being recognized by the Chair. Please state your name (and representation, if any) for the minutes, and limit your comments to three minutes. Per TAAG's Bylaws, no action will be taken on items not on the agenda, though Board members may ask questions of

the speaker. When speaking please announce your name and place of residence for our records.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- 5.1 Approval of Minutes from March 18, 2021 TAAG Board meeting
- 5.2 Approval of Treasurer's Report

6. OLD BUSINESS

Call for candidates to fill two Alternate Delegate positions on TAAG Board.

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 **SUB2020-00027 TR3138 SARA STREET PROPERTIES SUBDIVISION**—

Consider TAAG Project Review Committee's proposed recommendations concerning Proposed Tract Map and CUP for a 15-lot subdivision with 1 affordable housing unit/parcel and bonus-density parcels. Located on Bennett Way in Templeton. See **Addendum** for PRC Chair's report to TAAG Board from 2 meetings and also three letters from the community regarding this project that were received after the 4/1/21 PRC meeting.

7.2 **DRC2021-00054 UDSEN**

Consider TAAG Project Review Committee's proposed recommendations concerning request for a Minor Use Permit for Castoro Cellars for a new Wine Storage Building located at 1315 N Bethel Road in Templeton. The 21-acre site is comprised of 2 parcels.

7.3 Record each TAAG committee's Chair designation and Alternate Delegate where applicable.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM COMMITTEES

- 8.1 Project Review Committee
- 8.2 Cannabis Project Review Committee
- 8.3 Community Outreach and Relations Committee
- 8.4 Traffic Circulation Committee
- 8.5 Bylaws Special Committee
- 8.6 Water/Toad Creek Special Committee
- 8.7 Elections Committee

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM DELEGATES (on items not on the agenda)

10. ADJOURNMENT

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The reports of the chairs of the Project Review Committee and the Cannabis Project Review Committee, concerning applications for review at this meeting (if any), and reports of any other committees, may be available for viewing (and downloading and printing) three days before the TAAG meeting at TAAG's website (<http://www.taaginfo.org>), on the "Committee Reports" page. A limited number of paper copies of the reports may be available at the meeting.

APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS

1. Chairperson will call the agenda item.
2. The project applicant or agent will present the application.
3. The Project Review Committee will present its report.
4. Chairperson will open the floor to Delegates' questions of the applicant or agent.
5. Chairperson will open the floor for public comment. Please direct public comments to the Chairperson, not to the applicant.
6. Applicant or agent addresses public comments by responding directly to the Chairperson.
7. Public comment portion of the proceedings on this item will be closed, and no further testimony will be taken.
8. The TAAG Delegates will discuss the application and, considering all public comments, will consider making a recommendation

GUIDELINES FOR PRESENTING ORAL COMMENTS

It is important that all participants conduct themselves with courtesy, dignity, civility, and respect for all parties involved. If you wish to present oral comments, please observe the following guidelines:

1. Identify yourself by your full name (and representation, if any) for our minutes, and speak from the rostrum so other attendees will have the opportunity to listen to the comments. (We do not currently use speaker slips, but we ask that speakers sign in on the list provided at the rostrum so that we can include the names of speakers in the minutes.)
2. Address your comments to the Chair. Conversation or debate between a speaker at the podium and a member of the audience is not permitted.
3. Oral comments should be brief and to the point. Your comments should be about issues, and not about any individuals involved.
4. Public oral comment is limited to three minutes per individual unless the Chair permits otherwise.
5. Please -- no audience reaction (applause or otherwise) during or after comments.
6. Written testimony (letter, e-mail, etc.) is acceptable, but should be distributed to TAAG members at least three days before the meeting.
7. Once the public comment portion of the meeting is closed, there will be no further public oral comments unless requested of and permitted by the Chair.
8. Please clearly identify yourself each time you speak during a ZOOM teleconference meeting or by phone call-in.

ADDENDUM

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE ZOOM MEETING Report to TAAG

April 1, 2021

Project Review Committee meeting on April 1, 2021 was attended by the four TAAG Delegates on that committee, including Erik Gorham, Murray Powell, Dede Davis, and Bruce Jones. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the two reviewed projects and members of the public.

Three agenda items were addressed at this meeting:

1, The committee designated Erik Gorham as PRC Committee Chair and Bruce Jones as non-voting Alternate Delegate.

2. SUB2020-00027 TR 3138 SARA STREET PROPERTIES SUBDIVISION

Proposed Tract Map and CUP for s 15-lot subdivision with 1 affordable housing unit / parcel. This project was previously reviewed on Nov. 5, 2020 by the PRC. See Addendum to review that report. This plot of land is 10.88 acres and is zoned residential suburban with a 1-acre lot size minimum. The developer proposed a 15-lot subdivision based on providing 1 affordable housing unit. At the November 2020 review, Dr. Sani, the parcel owner, said he would consider making new plans that reduced density to be consistent with the neighborhood of 1-acre lots. Dr. Sani has since decided to continue pursuing a 15-lot subdivision on this 10.88 acres.

A motion was made and seconded that this project be limited to ten 1-acre lots compatible with surrounding development. This motion passed unanimously.

3. DRC2021-00054 UDSSEN

Request for a Minor Use Permit for Castoro Cellars for a new Wine Storage Building located at 1315 N. Bethel Road in Templeton. The 21-acre site is comprised of 2 parcels. PRC Chair Erik Gorham recused himself because of previous business relationship with Castoro Cellars.

A motion was made and seconded that this project be approved as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Erik Gorham, PRC Chair

Report from PRC Chair to TAAG Chair for 11/5/2020 PRC zoom meeting

Project Review Committee Report for November 5, 2020.

The Templeton Area Advisory Group Project Review Committee held a meeting on November 5, 2020 to discuss SUB2020-00027, which is a proposed 15 house development off Bennett Way in Templeton. Scott Stokes from Above Grade Engineering presented the project. The owner, Javad Sani was in attendance as well. There were also 10-15 members of the public in

attendance, many who were owners of property close or adjacent to the proposed development. The plot of land is 10.88 acres, and is zoned Residential Suburban, with a 1-acre lot size minimum. The proposed development included 1 very low -income unit, so the developer was entitled to a 30% bonus density.

The developer described that to arrive at 15 units, the 10.88 acres was rounded up to 11 for the base density. Then, with a bonus density of 30%, this gives 14.3 units, which then rounded up again gives 15 units allowed. The chair (Joe Jarboe) argued that the base density should be exactly 10, based on Title 22 section 22.12.080.6.c: Other land use categories. The base density for a site in a land use category other than Residential Single-Family or Residential Multi-Family is the maximum number of residential parcels that are allowable under this Title, not including any density bonus as provided under this Title. With a base density of 10, there would be a bonus density of 32.5%, so the number of allowed parcels would be 14 ($10 * 1.325 = 13.25$, rounded up to 14). Scott said that state law allowed rounding, so we agreed to disagree and moved on.

Members of the public were allowed to speak, with all voicing opposition to the 50% increase in density of the project (10 units to 15 units), as well as the fact that 8 of the proposed lots were only about a half-acre in size (an effective 100% density increase compared to lots in the surrounding area). It was also noted that none of the surrounding plots had such high density. As examples, the parcel of land of similar size adjacent to the east of the proposed development has 8 houses and another similar parcel adjacent to the southwest has 8 houses. In the end, the chair asked the owner (Javad Sani) if he would consider reducing the density of the project to comply with the normal zoning of the area (1 acre lots). He said he would consider making new plans that reduced the density. There was a general consensus among the public that there would be little opposition to the project if it was built with the current zoning of 1 acre lots. Residents were not opposed to development in general, but they were opposed to the high density of the proposed project.

Respectfully submitted,
Joe Jarboe

THREE LETTERS FROM THE PUBLIC REGARDING SUB2020-00027 SARA STREET PROPERTIES TR3138 received since PRC 4/1/21 meeting

1.From Greg O'Sullivan:

Potential bullet points to justify denial of Conditional Use Permit for the project referral for SUB2019-00077 Tract 1830, being proposed by Sara Street Properties LLC.

- Residential Suburban requires 1 acre lots or 43,560 square feet. Each lot is considerably less than this amount, due to increase density being proposed by developer and the

subtraction for roadway improvements. At the April 1st TAAG Project Review Committee the developer's agent stated most lots would be ½ acre lots. This density damages the character of the adjoining neighborhood and is inconsistent with all other developments within the area.

- It appears that the access to lots 11-15 is a driveway (labeled as Mirabel Avenue)? The rules used to be no more than 2 lots could use a private driveway; otherwise a full developed road is required. Based on the vesting tentative tract map, a 29' dedication, 20' minimum for a road is thought to be required with no parking on either side of roadway. Will this street require curb, gutter and sidewalk, if so this will encroach the 29' dedication and the required 20' wide street?
- The traffic report states an additional 167 new vehicle trips will be generated daily. While the reports states this "will not significantly impact operations on adjacent roadways and intersections", what is not found in the report is the difficulty of making a left turn to head east on Vineyard drive during morning and afternoons, particularly when school is in session. This is one of the reasons Public Works has prepared the intersection of Bennett and Vineyard to be a regulated intersection via a traffic signal.
- This project, and all other current developments in this area, has only one public road for access/egress. Requiring the developer to acquire an easement on the adjacent westerly parcel and extending Mirabel to Ashton would provide two access/egress options for both the neighborhood and emergency vehicles.
- The neighborhood concerns related to the design and shielding of the detention basin was not addressed in the resubmitted information.
- It should be underscored that the August 25, 2020 letter from Cindy Chamber, Project Manager, confirms that "Tract 3138 is subject to **discretionary approval** regardless of the applicant's request for a concession incentive."
- In a subsequent letter to the applicant dated September 30, 2020 Cindy Chambers states "Your application is subject to a **discretionary** review process. A **discretionary permit** requires the review and approval of the Administrative Hearing Officer, the Subdivision Review Board, the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. A **discretionary permit** may be approved, approved with the conditions or denied. Application for a **discretionary permit** does not guarantee approval, whether a project complies with all applicable standards or has been recommended for approval. All decisions on **discretionary permits** can be appealed to the Board of

Supervisors, who will then make the final decision on the project.” (emphasis added)

Clearly, TAAG and all other approving bodies can and should deny the applicants request for the increase in density.

2. from Russell & Jennifer Spotten

TAAG Meeting regarding Bennett Development

As property owners at 890 Casper Ct, directly adjacent to the proposed new 15-lot subdivision on Bennett Way, we wish to convey the following comments for consideration by TAAG and the County. Our comments are for the most part centered on two areas of concern – Density and Access.

Density

We purchased our home in June of 1997, and it was the first of 8 homes which were ultimately built in our new subdivision of approximately ten acres. (A ninth home was later built at the east end of Casper Ct on a single lot, and not a part of the original subdivision.) At the time we purchased our home, we were told that the (approximate) ten-acre parcel to the west of us was zoned for “one-acre, single family parcels” similar to what we were moving to. For the 23 years that we have lived here, we expected that the Bennett lot to the west of us would someday be developed, but have always expected that the development would be of one-acre, rural-style properties similar to the ones in our neighborhood of Casper Ct and Turkey Ranch way. In other words, we had expected that 8 – 10 homes would someday be built on the subject Bennett property.

We are concerned that the proposed 15-lot subdivision, of approximately ½ acres each, is too many homes and is not consistent with the original one-acre zoning for the area. We believe that this would negatively impact the rural environment of our neighborhood, and hope that TAAG agrees with our belief.

Access

Whether the new subject development is approved with 8 – 10 lots, or the proposed 15 lots on the Bennett property, there needs to be better consideration of access in/out of this area. Currently, there are 11 homes and two churches that use Bennett as the only access onto Vineyard Drive. At peak traffic times, (such as when school is letting in or out, or at commute times), it is already next to impossible to exit onto Vineyard via a left turn. Not only does the traffic on Vineyard create long, inconvenient wait times to exit our neighborhood, it could also be considered a safety hazard should there be an emergency. The addition of the proposed 15-lot subdivision, and the extra traffic that this would bring, would exacerbate this already poor access for our neighborhood.

It is our opinion that the proposed new (half) street on the south end of the development, Mirabel Avenue, should be a full street, and connect to Ashton on the southwest corner to create a second exit point for this neighborhood to Vineyard Drive.

Thank you for considering our comments at this meeting.
Sincerely,
Russell and Jennifer Spotten

3. from Ron & Yolanda Whisenand:

TAAG:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the above referenced project (APN 040-311-014). My wife and I own adjacent property which adjoins the subject parcel along its northeastern boundary (lots 1 and 2). We have owned our property at the end of Jordan Lane since 2001 and have enjoyed living in the community of Templeton.

First let me say, that we're not opposed to subdivision of the property. When we purchased our home, we always knew that the vacant parcel would eventually be developed. We only ask that they (the developer and County decision makers) follow the general plan and zoning and that the development and homes be quality. The owners have the right to develop. Neighbors have the expectation that the County will ensure a compatible development in full compliance with standards.

With that in mind, our comments focus on five issues:

1. Density - One of the purposes of the General Plan and Zoning is to ensure neighborhood and community compatibility. The subject property, as all surrounding parcels, is designated for one acre minimums. The surrounding property is currently developed with homes on one acre lots. While we anticipated eventual development of the subject parcel, we did with the belief that homes on one acre lots would be the result. In this case, the tentative map shows the "approximate lot size" at 0.50 acres; or half the size of lots in the neighborhood.

The applicant's August 20, 2019 justification is rather confusing, since it not only cites the County's own ordinances on density bonuses, but also relies on State law citations to come up with a justification that matches their proposal for five extra units. The citizens of Templeton and the neighbors of this development expect that County to apply the density rules as written and not simply rubber stamp what the applicant is proposing.

Our density question is simple - "do County rules allow for 5 additional lots and if so, has the applicant met the standards for approval"? If not, then the project should be sent back for revision."

2. Trail Plan - We note from the Vesting Tentative Map that the applicant is proposing to dedicate a 12' wide trail easement along the entire northern boundary of the development. I don't recall seeing this as part of the Templeton Trails Plan. While we are proponents of accommodating pedestrian access, and not opposed to a trail in that location, it should be noted that:

- the trail will dead end at a fence on private property at its western most terminus
- the trail is separated from Jordan Lane, a private street/driveway by a strip of undeveloped private property (dirt) approximately 5 feet in width and elevated behind a 3 foot wooden retaining wall.
- a photo of the proposed location and its relationship to adjoining private property is included.

Again, we feel a pedestrian path would be a nice neighborhood amenity. We currently maintain an opening at the end of Jordan Lane to accommodate neighborhood walkers and cyclists to pass through. Should the County wish to develop such a trail, then there should be a plan on how it will be developed, where it will go, and how to address existing private property and topography. While I can't speak for my neighbor to the west, we would certainly be interested in a plan where the subdivider would remove the wooden retaining wall and grade back the slope to the trail and backs of lots 1-5. We would then plant and maintain a row of live oak trees in the five foot dirt strip that we own between Jordan Lane and the proposed trail.

3. Non-Vehicular Access Strip - We realize that primary access to lots 1-5 is from the internal culdesac. However, we see numerous examples where property owners choose to gain secondary access to the rear of their lots for storage, RV parking, etc. As stated earlier, Jordan Lane is a private (non-county maintained) street. The fronting property owners on Jordan Lane are responsible for its maintenance. We would therefore be opposed to any secondary access to be shoehorned in at a later date. In order to avoid potential future problems, we request that the County add a condition to require a "non-vehicular access easement" along the entire northern boundary. This requirement is further justified in order to avoid safety conflicts of vehicles with pedestrians using the future trail.

4. Drainage/Retention - As a past member of a Templeton advisory committee on drainage, I certainly understand the importance of stormwater retention. The project should certainly be designed to accomplish this. However, what is being proposed is an old school steep sided retention basin, complete with protective fencing. Most quality conscious communities have moved away from these designs and developed retention basins that more closely fit in with the natural character of the property and avoid ugly fenced weed/trash collection basins. The design engineer, and County staff should certainly do better.

5. Area-wide Circulation - For the subdivision to be approved, the County Planning Commission must find the development complies with the County's General Plan, including the Circulation Element. One of the primary purposes of the Circulation Element is to avoid piecemeal development with no thought of access to adjoining properties and County roads. I don't see any materials in my packet that address how neighborhood circulation will be accommodated. For instance, immediately to the west is a large underdeveloped parcel that will one day have a similar layout of lots and streets. Access will likely be off of Santa Rita Rd. There is a high likelihood that another culdesac will be developed mirroring the one on Lucero Avenue. Does the County feel that accommodating a future access connection between the two properties would be good forward thinking transportation planning?

In addition, Mirable Ave. is proposed to dead end with a proposed metal beam barricade at the end. However, if you pull back and look at the surrounding development, Ashton Way comes down from the south and ends in a dead end within a matter of inches from Mirable. Does this make any circulation sense?

Again, I haven't seen anything in my application packet from planning or public works staff on whether they are comfortable with multiple dead end streets or have a plan to address this important issue. Perhaps the TAAG can request an exhibit from the County that shows areawide circulation and a plan to address it.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback. My wife and I are not opposed to development of the property, but feel some simple improvements can be addressed to make it a better fit in the neighborhood. We certainly rely on the TAAG process to address constructive ways to make the project better.

Thank you

Ron & Yolanda Whisenand
1020 Jordan Lane