



TOWN OF LOOMIS
LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
LOOMIS, CALIFORNIA
ACTION MINUTES

1st Thursday

May 6, 2021

3:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER: 3:03

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

x Chairman Jan Clark-Crets

x Member Tim Onderko

x Member A J Moyer

x Member Jean Wilson

X Member Beth Cohen

Technical Staff Mark Teague, Placeworks

x Vice Chair Bonnie London

x Member Randy Elder

x Auxiliary Ramona Brockman

AB Auxiliary Greg Obranovich

COMMITTEE COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA none

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA none

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion to adopt agenda: Wilson 2nd: Moyer Vote:

Ayes: London, Moyer, Wilson, Cohen, Elder

Noes: None

Absent: Clark-Crets, Onderko,

Abstain: None

PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CONSENT AGENDA none

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. MINUTES APRIL 1, 2021

Motion to approve consent agenda: Elder 2nd: Wilson Vote:

Ayes: London, Moyer, Wilson, Cohen, Elder

Noes: None

Absent: Clark-Crets, Onderko,

Abstain: None

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE

COMMITTEE MATTERS

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Land Use Element Overview and Requirements**
- 3. Buildout and Population Projections**
- 4. Discussion**

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS OF STAFF

Bonnie London: Commented on the market analysis, the unique nature of Loomis where high percentage of tax revenue is from non-retail sources (Industrial revenue strong).

She commented on the need for housing and noted our deficiencies in Parks and open space.

Jean Wilson – Stated that the setbacks are adequate to satisfy the need to maintain the rural feel of Loomis, especially in the rural areas. She also commented on the differences between Light Industrial and Limited light industrial.

Jan Clark-Crets – Asked how the various committees can access the comments received.

She also asked for an explanation of the process as changes are recommended to be placed in the Housing element, and then land use designations change to accommodate the previous and finish with zoning changes to ensure consistency.

Tim Onderko – Asked question on business setbacks, how do we make it easier to bring businesses into town.

Ramona Brockman – Explained the benefits of a community placing the higher density in the center of town and lower the density as it expands out. Commented on looking forward to the “Density Game”

Asked how we add and encourage ADU’s to help with our housing numbers, how do ADU’s fit in with the RHYN housing requirements. She added that she like flexibility in zoning setbacks

Jean Wilson commented that while the ADU required numbers are low, we can count all that are built – no limit on encouraging more. She also added that ordinances can be changed and updated as needed, does not required a general plan update.

Tim Onderko – commented on his perception of the impact of ADU’s on our low income housing – will not provide a great solution to the housing need requirements. He also voiced concern on the inconsistencies between the General Plan and the Zoning Code. Ask for a list of these so they can be fixed.

Jean Wilson - Explained the need for specificity in the previous GP – New town and they were looking for some control on what they wanted to see.

Anders Hauge and Mark Teague offered explanation in discussing the General Plan inconsistencies and the process to clean up the document and correct these inconsistencies.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jesse Lunsford – commented that ADU’s are an important part of the housing puzzle – but not the end all. He commented on the ease of ADU permits in the county, and he stated that the housing numbers produced in the last year are not representative of reality due to the pandemic. He stated that the process of meeting housing goals is much like playing “Whack a mole”. He also commented on the BP zoning – what is best to build in this location. Asked that we get in touch with the land owner for his input.

Matt Fox – He thinks that the town is not working hard enough to zone for high density affordable housing, Thinks the town needs to make some very serious decisions.

COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

Ramona Brockman- Stated that regulation regarding affordable housing is difficult to maneuver, asking “where are out teeth. What is the reward? How do we move forward?”

Tim Onderko – Concurs with the comment referring to the search for high density housing is much like “whack a mole” Stated the town needs to move to build out status to remove the regulations. Kick the can is frustrating and no productive.

Jan Clark-Crets – commented on the Town Council Meeting next Tuesday – Encouraged all to listen in and comment as the Draft Housing Element will be brought forward.

RECOMMENDATION none at this time.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

➤ Review:

- Review Goals and Policies ...Think about wording changes.
- Review land use definitions...Think about changes, updates, photos.

- Pictures of the Town
- Provide comments on the comment form from the Town’s website
<https://storage.googleapis.com/proudcity/loomisca/uploads/2020/11/Loomis-GP-Comments-Form-11182020.pdf>
- If no comment, indicate “No Comment” and submit
- Submit comment forms through the General Plan Update email address
at: GPUupdate@loomi.ca.gov

NEXT MEETING: June 3, 2021 – 3:00 p.m. (Zoom)

Click on the following link to view the You Tube video recording of this meeting
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RPpBdycNm7I>

ADJOURNMENT: 4:30 PM

Signed, 05/21/2021 at Loomis, California.

Carol Parker

Carol Parker, Planning Assistant