



TOWN OF LOOMIS
PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION MINUTES
LOOMIS DEPOT
5775 HORSESHOE BAR ROAD
LOOMIS, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY

March 28, 2017

7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Chairman Hogan
 Commissioner Duncan
 Commissioner Kelly
 Commissioner Wilson
 Commissioner Obranovich

CEREMONIAL MATTERS

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO INCOMING PLANNING COMMISSIONER: **GREG OBRANOVICH & LINDA KELLY**

AT THIS TIME THE COMMISSION WILL ELECT A CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

Motion was made to select Mike Hogan Planning Commission Chairman. 1st. Kelly 2nd. Duncan passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5
Noes: 0
Abstained: None
Absent: None

Motion was made to select Jeff Duncan Planning Commission Vice-Chairman. 1st. Kelly 2nd. Obranovich passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5
Noes: 0
Abstained: None
Absent: None

COMMISSION COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA : none

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA : None

This time is reserved for those in the audience who wish to address the Planning Commission on subjects that are not on the Agenda. The audience should be aware that the Commission may not discuss details or vote on non-agenda items. Your concerns may be referred to staff or placed on the next available agenda. Please **note that comments from the public will also be taken on any item on the agenda. The time allotted to each speaker is three minutes but can be changed by the Chairman.**

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

If items on the Agenda will be rescheduled for a different day and time, it will be announced at this time. Speakers are requested to restrict comments to the item as it appears on the agenda and stay within a three minute time limit. The Chairman has the discretion of limiting the total discussion time for an item.

Motion was made to adopt the Agenda. 1. Duncan 2. Kelly

passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5
Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA : none

CONSENT AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION

1. PROJECT STATUS REPORT
2. DECEMBER 20, 2016 MINUTES
3. JANUARY 5, 2016 MINUTES

RECEIVE AND FILE
APPROVE
APPROVE

Motion was made to approve the consent Agenda. 1. Kelly 2. Duncan
passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5

Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

BUSINESS ITEMS

4. **#17-04 2ND #17-04 SECOND BLESSINGS THRIFT STORE - MINOR MODIFICATION
6440 KING ROAD
APN: 043-093-049
APPLICANT: LOOMIS BASIN CONGREGATIONAL UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST**

Carole Larsen, the applicant, on behalf of the Loomis Basin Congregational United Church of Christ, requests a Minor Modification to replace the existing a 480 sq.ft. single-wide modular building (12'x40') approved for use as a Thrift Store and replace it with a double wide modular building (24'x36') of 864 sf.

The Thrift Store would be subject to the previous conditions of approval, including limited operating hours of no more than 3-4 days per week (Tue/Wed/Fri/Sat), for approximately 4 hours per each of those days.

The approval of a thrift store is subject to Minor Use Permit that may be approved by the Planning Director. The original application though was appealed to the Planning Commission who approved the project on August 2, 2011. This approval was subsequently appealed to the Town Council who approved it on October 11, 2011 subject to the 15 conditions of approval. (attached)

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission approve Resolution #17-04 to replace the existing single wide modular building with a double wide modular subject to the previous conditions of approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carol Larson spoke on behalf of the applicant, explained need and purpose of request.

COMMISSIONERS DELIBERTATON: None

Motion was made for the Planning Commission approve Resolution #17-04 to replace the existing single wide modular building with a double wide modular subject to the previous conditions of approval. 1st. Duncan 2nd. Kelly

passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5

Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

5. **#17-02 FEATHERED NEST - MAJOR USE PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION
3264 TAYLOR ROAD
APN 043-014-011
APPLICANT: RICHARD MASSIE**

The applicant proposes to construct an 11,000 square foot (sf) building, along with 34 parking spaces, delivery and loading areas and roadways. The latter will create approximately 20,000 sf of coverage for an approximate total of 30,000 sf of lot coverage.

The site and surrounding parcels are zoned General Commercial (CG) applies to areas appropriate for a range of retail and service land uses. Furniture Stores are a Permitted Use normally subject to only a staff level zoning clearance. However, as this is new construction Section 13.26.040 Table 2-6 requires a Major Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission adopt Resolution #17-02 to allow construction and operation of a 11,000 square foot retail furniture store “The Feathered Nest” at 3264 Taylor Road, subject to the findings in Exhibit A and the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit B, and find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as per *Section 15183 Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning*.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rick Massie (The applicant) spoke on behalf of the project. Explained path to septic –not the first or primary plan. Prior to purchasing the property, the applicant researched possible sewer hook-up, spoke with South Placer Municipal Utility District (SPMUD) and engineered a plan – to discover after the purchase, SPMUD changed regulations, as a result, the proposed plan was no longer viable. Applicant offered to front the cost of putting together the Assessment District for sewer along Taylor Road in this area, if the Town of Loomis would be the lead agency. In respect to septic / repair area location, Placer County Environmental Health (PCEH) suggested the location because neighboring property has an open well, and there is a requirement about distance from an open well.

Mike Boberg - Jetton Lane business owner: Spoke on the difficulty of working with SPMUD and is in favor of the project.

Victor Markey: Taylor Road – spoke in opposition of the project. Stated previous owner of the property killed all the trees on the lot over a weekend at night. Voiced concerned about traffic on Taylor Road. He also stated that he did not think perk tests have been completed.

Rick Massie (applicant): Responded that in fact perk tests were completed in several areas and the best location selected. He also stated that PCEH has preliminarily approved the proposed septic system and will sign off on the permit once the Town Issues a building permit.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENT:

Commissioner Kelly: Appreciates the architecture of the building

Commissioner Obranovich: What is the timeframe to begin building

Joan Phillipe (Town Manager) explained the spirit of the general plan and how it applies to the dual roles she filled as Town Manager and Planning Director in conjunction with economic development.

Jeff Mitchell (Town Attorney): Explained ambiguity of the general plan in regards to the sewer hook up requirement, allowing for hook up to septic until sewer is available

Commissioner Wilson: Restated her position that regardless of the unforeseen difficulty in obtaining sewer hook-up, the general plan requires sewer hook up for non-residential development

Commissioner Duncan: Asked about the timeline for potential neighboring properties to be developed

Commissioner Wilson: Led a discussion suggesting caution in making decisions based on future speculative use of neighboring properties

Commissioner Kelly: Opened a discussion about traffic impact on Taylor Road and whether a left turn lane will be added.

Commissioner Wilson: Brought up that the site map has been flipped, and asked if the arborist report will be changed or modified to reflect the change. She also asked about the large Oak tree at the edge of property and the potential effect of the leach field in the area. She also asked questions about the size and location of the repair area.

Bob King (Town Planner) explained the arborist update will be completed and turned in with the required tree permit.

Chairman Hogan: Restated that Curb / sidewalk/ gutter improvements will be required per Town of Loomis standards

Commissioner Duncan: Opened a discussion on how to put together an Assessment district

Joan Phillipe: Stated that there are some ways that the Town can help with financing the identifying financing options..

Commissioner Wilson: opened a discussion about SPMUD availability in the area – and brought up a previous project approved on Taylor Road that was approved but sits vacant because of SPMUD costs and availability.

Brit Snipes (Town Engineer) spoke in the discussion about various ways the town has reached out to SPMUD to resolve these issues

Chairman Hogan: Spoke specifically on the Lugo Property and the requirement placed on this project to hook into sewer, and the

costs involved. Stated that we need to be consistent in our decisions, even if we are consistently wrong
Commissioner Kelly: Opened discussion in learning from past mistakes and suggested proactive action in aiding economic development in the Town.

Joan Phillipe: Spoke on the possibility of revisiting the Lugo property project and re-evaluating the COA imposed on the project cautioning that since no project is the same, and property issues differ at different location sites, the solution to the issues may differ, but the determining processes are consistent.

Commissioner Wilson: Asked if there are other options to septic or sewer such as holding tanks.

Joan Phillipe: Mentioned that it is possible to continue this item to the next meeting to allow the applicant and staff time to research other viable options.

Jeff Mitchell: Explained Assessment district start up procedures, the voting process and the follow up procedures. Spoke on the Lugo project and the need to research the Conditions of Approval in regards sewer/septic and to determine if the site was viable for septic or if it was considered at the time of approval.

Motion was made for the Planning Commission to continue this item to the next Planning Commission Meeting 1st. Obranovich 2nd Duncan. Passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Duncan, Obranovich, Kelly, Wilson, Hogan

Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

**6. #16-19 MINOR SUBDIVISION “LANDS OF PETKUS
NORTH SIDE OF BRACE ROAD, WEST OF I-80 N THE TOWN OF LOOMIS
APN’S 044-123-013, 044-150-001 & 008
APPLICANT: DAN PETKUS**

The applicant submitted a Minor Subdivision Application #16-19 to create a Parcel Map “Lands of Petkus” to divide the site into only four parcels replacing the previously approved Tentative Tract Map of 16 lots. The project site is zoned RS-7 Single Family Residential 7,000 square foot minimum and shown as Residential Medium Density in the General Plan

The “Del Oro Vista” Tentative Tract Map was approved by the Loomis Planning Commission with a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) as per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) on April 21, 2009. The Town of Loomis proposes to use the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) as per Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines for this project

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission approve *Resolution #17-05* rescinding approval of Major Subdivision “08-12 “Del Oro Estates,” and simultaneously approve Minor Subdivision #16-19 “Lands of Petkus” into 4 residential lots, subject to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for “Del Oro Estates” as per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as per Section 15164 of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and the recommended findings and conditions of approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The applicant, Dan Petkus spoke on behalf of the project. He stated that the request was made was to simplify the project. He went on to explain that the subdivision didn’t pencil out the way they had thought it would, and a four lot split was an easier and less expensive process

Mike Boberg- Hunters Oaks: Open a discussion on potential 2nd units on property sites and potential drainage and easements issues that cross his property.

Sandra Granada – Brace Road: Voiced concern over drainage and easements. Also, the change in view, future development and fencing, and roads in and of the lots.

The applicant responded that the easement is 16 feet, approved by fire department. Also, that future development of the lots should not be considered in this approval process..

Brit Snipes responded that drainage plans for each lot will be evaluated when the owners pull their building permits; therefore does not expect any changes in drainage issues.

Bob King responded that the state has enacted new requirements regarding 2nd dwellings and cities are not allowed to deny 2nd dwelling permits as long as that follow setbacks and other zoning requirements.. Also stated that one of the conditions of approval restricts further sub-dividing of the 4 lots. Roads are not required in this lot split, driveways only and street lights are not required. Our zoning requirements restrict and control the brightness and height of lights installed at the sites.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENT:

Chairman Hogan Inquired on the impetus of the request, asking if there is a condition of approval the applicant want to avoid. Joan Phillipe noted that Item 25 of the conditions of approval should be changed to eliminate the phrase “acceptable to the Town Attorney, for those conditions not completed”.

Motion was made for The Planning Commission approve Resolution #17-05 (Attachment 1) rescinding approval of Major Subdivision “08-12 “Del Oro Estates,” and simultaneously approve Minor Subdivision #16-19 “Lands of Petkus” into 4 residential lots, subject to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for “Del Oro Estates” as per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as per Section 15164 of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and the recommended findings and conditions of approval; with the Suggested change to COA item # 25, eliminating the phrase “acceptable to the Town Attorney, for those conditions not completed”. 1st Kelly 2nd: Obranovich. Passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Hogan, Wilson, Kelly, Duncan, Obranovich

Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

**7. #16-09 “THE GROVE” MAJOR SUBDIVISION\DESIGN REVIEW
SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF HUMPHREY ROAD AND NO NAME LANE WITHIN THE
TOWN OF LOOMIS.
APN: 044-021-008
APPLICANT: MANDARICH DEVELOPMENT**

The applicant is proposing to subdivide a 9.98 acre parcel into 26 lots southwest of the intersection of Humphrey Road and No Name Lane in the Town of Loomis. The land is designated Residential Medium Density in the Loomis General Plan and zoned RS-10a Single-Family Residential 10,000 average minimum. As shown on *The Grove Tentative Subdivision Map Sheet 1 of 4*, the site will consist of 26 lots accessed from Humphrey Road via a circular interior road “Grove Circle.” Six of the lots, including the park will be clustered in the center, with the remaining lots around Grove Circle backing to the sides of the project site. The proposed 26 lots will be as follows:

- 22 single family residential lots with a minimum lot of size of 11,871 sf, a maximum lot size of 15,066 sf, an average lot size of 12,444 sf, and an average gross density of 2.2 dwelling units per acre;
- Two landscaping lots (Lots A and B), 5,720 sf and 6,896 sf, respectively;
- A 12,171 sf park lot located within the central portion of the site (Lot C); and
- A 22,206 sf storm water detention basin lot (Lot D).

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission approve *Resolution #17-03* approving Major Subdivision #16-10 “The Grove” into 22 residential lots, along four additional lots reserved for a park, entryway landscaping, and a required storm drainage retention basin, subject to the approved Design Review and adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration as per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the recommended findings and conditions of approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The applicant Gary Mandarich explained the development and spoke on behalf of the project.

Mike Carroll- Myrtle Drive: Voiced concern about the seasonal pond, the effect on the Salmon Habitat, the proposed fences and is unhappy about the poisoned plants. Appreciates the lower density, does not want lights.

At this time, a motion was made to extend the meeting to 11:00pm : a 1st Kelly 2nd Duncan - Passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Hogan, Wilson, Kelly, Duncan, Obranovich

Noes: 0
Abstained: None
Absent: None

Bell Wenzell- No Name Lane: Voiced concern over the drainage, does not think the drainage plan is complete, would like the project continued to a later date until the drainage plan is in place.

Jim Martin- No Name Lane: Stated that drainage is an issue, voiced concern over the fencing, and the detention pond. Thinks the effects on the individual persons is understated and not addressed.

Steve Harris- Myrtle Drive: Thinks drainage is an issue, concerned that wildlife is negatively affected by the plan. Does not like the "gated property" feel of the project. Is concerned due diligence has not been completed.

Bob Martin – No Name Lane: Agrees with drainage issues stated previously. Concerned about the potential effect on No Name Lane. Voiced also concerned about maintenance plan for the detention pond. He asked about appeal and lawsuit procedures.

Debbie Clark- No Name Lane: Voiced concerns about the detention pond plan.

Jacob Harris – No Name Lane: Agrees with everything stated above, also does not like the proposed entrance sign, that it is out of place in our community. Is concerned about potential falling price values, the impact on the schools and asked about recourse if the pond fails, and No Name Lane floods.

Rochelle Byers – Myrtle Drive: Agrees with everything stated above, also wants a stop sign installed at the entrance to the development. Concerned elevated homes encroaching on the privacy of the neighbors. Concerned about fences, maintenance of space between old fencing and new fencing.

Jim Gilbert – Myrtle Drive: Asked about possible spillway alternative to address some of the drainage issues so that a portion of the water is retained in the nature area, eliminating the loss of wildlife due to stream drying up.

Becky Lunders – No Name Lane: Likes the open space the site presently offers. Was not happy that pesticides were applied. Thinks the project has a "gated" community feel, not like Loomis at all. Would like to see the maintenance plan clearly defined - maintenance responsibilities clearly stated, such as Who addresses potential graffiti on the fences? Voiced concern about dust on No Name Lane. She wants to make sure the developer does not use their properties as staging during the construction process.

Tim Jones – No Name Lane: Voiced concern over the detention pond and drainage issues – Wildlife demise is also a concern.

Applicant responses to comments:

- 1 Pre-Emergent weed control was applied to the area at recommended state levels.
- 2 The detention Ponds and drainage plans have been engineered, and the final pond plan, water lines etc will finalized and addressed as building and grading plans are evaluated and approved.
- 3 Detention Pond maintenance will be addressed as the maintenance plan agreement is drawn up and approved.
- 4 The project falls within the Town's Municipals codes and ordinances and zoning regulations.
- 5 The homes are designed and situated so they do not look into the yards and windows of the neighboring homes.
- 6 Wood Fences are preferable in this market and are what the buyers are looking for.
- 7 If the neighbors want the developer to remove the existing fences and replace, the developer is willing to do so.

Commissioner Duncan asked if it was possible to do wrought iron fencing in the corner where the cement retaining wall, also opened a discussion about the entrance signage.

Commissioner Wilson: Opened and led a discussion regarding entrance sign to the subdivision and the fencing issues and possible solutions to appease the residents.

Chairman Hogan asked for clarification regarding the impacts to the schools

Bob King stated the schools did not respond to the ISMND or any of the agency mailings that this project would have a negative impact on the schools.

Commissioner Duncan restated a comment the Loomis Elementary Superintendent Gordon Medd made to the Council regarding the school population and the need to maintain a high number of Loomis students to retain funding..

COMMISSIONERS COMMENT:

Commissioner Wilson clarified that there are no gates at the project, reminding them that gated communities are not allowed in Loomis. She also stated that the project has no access to No Name Lane, therefore, there will be no additional traffic on or use of No Name Lane as a result of the project.

Brit Snipes explained that the project has an easement on No Name Lane that is being deeded over to the Town, and this additional width will be necessary if the residents on No Name Lane ever decide to widen to Town standards and have the town accept it as a public road. The maintenance of the easement be done through the road maintenance plan agreement being drawn up as required in the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Wilson asked if school commute hours will be considered during construction. She also asked about street light height in the project.

Commissioner Duncan asked for clarification on the placement of homes in relation to their neighbors.

Chairman Hogan: Mentioned item 15 in the conditions of approval – believes the road width is referenced incorrectly, specifically the final sentence that reads

“The developer shall record an I.O.D. for future Humphrey Road expansion for that portion of the subdivision within 75-feet of the centerline of the existing Humphrey Road.” -

Town attorney suggested it to read

“The developer shall record an I.O.D. for future Humphrey Road expansion consistent with the general plan.

Chairman Hogan opened and led a discussion drainage plan and retention pond in the subdivision; responsibilities, guarantees and recourse if system fails.

Brit Snipes discussed overall plan to prevent failure.

Jeff Mitchell brought up questions regarding condition of approval item 11 regarding the CC&R’s maintenance agreement. The Town attorney suggested the item that originally read

“Prior to Final Map Approval, the owner shall submit the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’S) for review and approval (in accordance with these conditions insuring that those parts of the CC&R’s that involve these conditions cannot be amended without the consent of the Town) by the Planning Director, Town Engineer and Town Attorney”,
be changed to read:

“Prior to Final Map Approval, the owner shall submit the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’S) implementing these conditions of Project approval for review and approval by the Planning Director, Town Engineer and Town Attorney. The CC&R’S will a) name the Town of Loomis as a third-party beneficiary with the right, but not the obligation, to enforce those provisions of the CC&Rs, and b) provide that those provisions cannot be amended, modified or rescinded without the prior written consent of the Town.”

Motion was made for The Planning Commission approve Resolution #17-03 approving Major Subdivision #16-10 “The Grove” into 22 residential lots, along four additional lots reserved for a park, entryway landscaping, and a required storm drainage retention basin, subject to the approved Design Review and adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration as per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the recommended findings and conditions of approval; including the suggested changes in verbage for Condition of Approval #11 and Condition of approval # 15 . 1st Obranovich 2nd Kelly passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Hogan, Wilson, Duncan, Kelly, Obranovich

Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

8. #17-07 ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT ESTABLISHMENT OF PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONE

The Town of Loomis is proposing to add a new zoning district entitled Planned Development (PD) consistent with the Loomis General Plan.

Purpose:

The proposed ordinance clearly states from the very beginning the use and expectations of it. Specifically, it states,

“The Town expects each project within a Planned Development District to be of obvious and significantly higher quality than would be achieved through conventional design practices and standards.”

The PD Zone creates a tool to implement the objectives and policies of the General Plan, especially for larger parcels of land that allow for a mix of residential uses, and some commercial, while preserving large areas of environmentally sensitive areas for public enjoyment. Importantly it ensures an orderly and quality small town design consistent with the Town goals, and surrounding neighborhoods and uses. The PD zone is a tailored district designating the zoning regulations for a project and setting specific development standards.

A PD zone offers the ability to facilitate innovation and specific site conditions, not found in traditional zone districts that often are criticized for reinforcing standardized subdivisions that do not adapt to a rural and small

town atmosphere. The PD zone also offers a vehicle for negotiation not found in the yes/no options of a traditional zone. Rather it allows the town to negotiate to accommodate the needs and demands of the town that are enforceable by an ordinance. While a PD zone allows for flexibility, it is not an excuse for reduction of standards, but a mechanism to require higher standards for the town in exchange.

Motion was made for the Planning Commission to continue this item to the next Planning Commission Meeting 1st. Obranovich 2nd Kelly. Passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Duncan, Obranovich, Kelly, Wilson, Hogan

Noes: 0

Abstained: None

Absent: None

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Commission approve *Resolution #17-07* and adopt the resolution recommending approval to the Town Council of adding the Planned Development Zone to the Loomis Zoning Ordinance

PUBLIC COMMENT

COMMISSIONERS COMMENT:

ADJOURNMENT: 11:08 PM

INFORMATION SUBMITTED AT HEARING OR AFTER PREPARATION OF PACKETS

The Planning Commission may not have time to read written information submitted at the hearing or after 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the scheduled hearing date. We encourage you to present your comments, during the scheduled time period, at the public hearing.

ACCOMMODATING THOSE INDIVIDUALS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Town of Loomis encourages those with disabilities to participate fully in the public hearing process. If you have special needs or requirements in order for you to attend or participate in the Town's public hearing process or programs, please contact Town Hall at 652-1840 prior to the public hearing or program you wish to attend, so that we can accommodate you. Materials relating to an item on this agenda can be obtained at Town Hall (3665 Taylor Road) or on the Town's website at www.loomis.ca.gov.

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES MUST BE EXHAUSTED PRIOR TO ACTION BEING INITIATED IN A COURT OF LAW

If you challenge the proposed project described above in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Town at, or prior to the public hearing.

APPEAL PERIOD

** There is a 10-day appeal period for most Planning Commission decisions. However, a Planning Commission approval of a tentative parcel map has a 15-day appeal period. Appeals can be made by any interested party by submittal of a written appeal request to the Loomis Town Clerk, 3665 Taylor Road, Loomis, California, 95650. **

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURE:

1. Town staff makes its presentation on the Project and outlines all recommended actions
2. Commission/Council asks questions of staff
3. Chair/Mayor opens the public hearing
4. Applicant makes its presentation – 15 minutes (At the discretion of the mayor or chair, time may be extended depending on the size/scope of the proposed project. The applicant must make the request for a time extension prior to the beginning of the meeting.)
5. Commission/Council asks questions of the applicant (and staff)
6. Public comment – maximum 3 minutes per speaker, one opportunity to speak each
7. Applicant opportunity to respond to public comments – 5 minutes (At the discretion of the mayor or chair, time may be extended depending on the number of comments made during public comment.)
8. Chair/Mayor closes the public hearing is closed
9. Staff responds to all public comments; Commission/Council asks any additional questions of staff
10. Council deliberates and acts on requested entitlements

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

I, Carol Parker, Administrative Clerk/Planning Assistant for the Town of Loomis, declare that the foregoing agenda for Tuesday March 28, 2017, meeting of the Town of Loomis Planning Commission was posted March 22, 2017 at Town Hall of the Town of Loomis, 3665 Taylor Road, Loomis, California, 95650. The agenda is also available on the Town website at www.loomis.ca.gov .

Signed, April 18, 2017 at Loomis, California.

Carol Parker, Administrative Clerk/Planning Assistant