



City of Petaluma, California
City Council Chambers
City Hall, 11 English Street
Petaluma, CA 94952

Telephone 707/778-4301 / Fax 707/778-4498
E-Mail planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us
Web Page <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

Planning Commission Minutes
April 23, 2002 – 7:00 PM

Commissioners: *Present:* Barrett, Dargie, Glass, Monteschio, von Raesfeld, Vouri
Absent: O'Brien

* Chair

Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Laura Lafler, Project Planner
Joan Lamphier, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Secretary

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of March 26, 2002 were approved as amended.
M/S Vouri/Dargie. Glass abstained. Minutes of April 9, 2002 were approved as amended
M/S von Raesfeld/Vouri. Dargie abstained.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Vince Landof, 12 Cordelia Drive. Petaluma has a great need to
have infrastructure repaired before future development. Try to fix what is here now.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Conditional Use Permit approval for the RESA Project has
been appealed and will go to the City Council on May 20, 2002.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: Commissioner Vouri thanked Commissioner
Monteschio for her years of service to the Planning Commission. Chair Glass amended
Agenda Item IV – Discussion of Planning Commission Rules. Chair Glass read Rule 512
regarding the vote. If a Commissioner sits on the dias then he or she must vote according
to the rules.

CORRESPONDENCE:

APPEAL STATEMENT: Was read.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

1 **OLD BUSINESS;**
2 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

3
4 **I. ROCKRIDGE POINT, Western Avenue and Windsor Drive.**
5 **AP Nos: 020-030-037, 039, 013 & 015**
6 **FILE Nos: ANX00004; PRZ00001; PUD00004; TSM00003**
7 **Project Planner: Laura Lafler**
8

9 The City Council has directed the Planning Commission to review and make a
10 recommendation on the revised Rockridge Point development plan. The previous
11 development plan was denied by the Planning Commission.
12

13 Commissioner Vouri recused himself.
14

15 Laura Lafler presented the staff report.
16

17 Vin Smith: Presented the project history and described the January 8, 2002 Planning
18 Commission meeting. Felt there was support for: the density, the public park, plan for
19 the pedestrian and bike access and zero net runoff. The developer worked with the
20 neighbors and felt that the proposed architecture was consistent and rural in nature.
21 Concerns predominantly were the grading plan.
22

23 The City Council directed the developer to go back to the Planning Commission with the
24 revised grading plan.
25

26 Vin Smith: Addressed the grading issue only. Additional issues from the Council's
27 minutes were to be addressed at the May 6th council meeting.
28

29 Commissioner Barrett: Asked about lot sizes.
30

31 Milani & Associates: Lot size: 17,600 average; majority are 11,000 to 15,000 square foot
32 lots.
33

34 Public comment opened:
35

36 Paul McGavin, 297 Cambridge Lane: Agree the remaining issue is grading. Read
37 conditions of approval. Thought Condition #95 was too general. Developer agreed to
38 two traffic-calming measures paid for by the developer. 1-round about at the intersection
39 of Edinburg, Cambridge and Windsor Drive which would be landscaped and maintained
40 by Victoria Homeowner's Association which we agreed to do; and 2- traffic island
41 further to the west/south. Want to make sure the agreements do not get lost and that they
42 are adhered to as we go forward.

43 My second comment has to do with the detention basin. There has been discussion about
44 what that could become – it could be a major nuisance to home looking directly onto the
45 detention basin. Home in Victoria are much closer than the Rockridge Pointe homes.
46 Will it be restricted to public access; will it be landscaped and maintained – if so would it
47 be the Rockridge Pointe Homeowner's Association and not Victoria Homeowners

1 Association. Discussion about making it a larger wetland area as a way to help further –
2 possibly on both sides of Windsor Drive. This is a feasibility study that the Victoria
3 Residential Association agreed to enter into with the developer. Want to make sure that
4 is still a possibility. If all of the agreements are stated and they have addressed the
5 grading issues, the Victoria Residential Association, would supports the project based on
6 the developer coming up with the traffic mitigation measures.

7
8 Pete Gang, 381 Cleveland: Have a number of concerns, which I addressed in my letter to
9 the Commission. Wanted to address three points this evening. 1) the reason for concern
10 about the property is the unique site. It's very visible, it's one of the last large
11 developable properties on the west side and even though it is within the UGB it needs to
12 be annexed in order to be developed. The General Plan and the Hillside and Residential
13 guidelines are very specific and clear on giving direction of how to approach sites such as
14 these. Specifically preserving the rural backdrop and maintaining views of important
15 natural features including western hills and to preserve ridgelines and hilltops and view
16 corridors in their open state. Requires preserving the natural topographic feature, quality
17 and aesthetic character of the City. This is a clear point of guidance. Must approach the
18 whole site this way rather than only parts of it.

19 2) in my opinion as a designer, I fee that decisions early on were fundamentally flawed –
20 cannot tweak a bad design into a good one. Cannot recreate D Street on a sloping hillside
21 outside of town, build as many houses as possible and as large as possible and then
22 ignore the guidance of the General Plan and alter the topography to suite a preconceived
23 drainage strategy. This is a strong arm, 1960s approach. Design today needs to be done
24 with much more intelligence. 3) It seem that any public body – the Planning Commission
25 especially, has the responsibility to weigh private and public concerns – accessible open
26 space, safe streets, a vibrant downtown and affordable housing. Only 12% of homes in
27 Sonoma County are affordable to a median income family – probably our police, fire
28 fighters, small business owners. Want to see more of a balance between private and
29 public concerns.

30
31 Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Believe project will go forward. Am looking at the
32 detention pond and am concerned.

33
34 Scott Braun, 1161 Western Avenue: Live adjacent to this property. Thanked the
35 developer for the open space. Look forward to legally walking from my property to
36 Helen Putnam Park. Have big problems with the grading as it stands. There is a letter in
37 the file that states property has not been used for agricultural use for several years. There
38 is definitely grazing on the property. Plan takes away 65% of the drainage that goes into
39 a seasonal creek, which runs through my property. Trees on Western Avenue near the
40 Junior High are fed by this creek. Would be putting the creek into a drought situation.
41 No one has been talking about taking water out of this creek. It will cause more problems
42 downstream. There is a well near our property line that is adjacent to the wetlands on the
43 map. If you are taking away 65% of the drainage, I concerned about what this is going to
44 do to our well. Why so much grading in the first place? Will have people up 30 feet
45 looking down on me – will add value to the lots. Think there are other ways to do that
46 without the grading and filling. When the developer is gone with their profit what will

1 the City of Petaluma have, the residents, the neighbors? People on Marin Creek not
2 convinced the detention pond will withstand the 100-year flood event.

3
4 Jamie Bridges, 1177 Western Avenue: Will see and feel the construction of this
5 development throughout construction. The developer will be our neighbor. Water level
6 now sometimes goes down to less than 5 lbs. The homes will have large lawns and the
7 need for water. Is Petaluma ready for this? Was not contacted by the developer – work
8 out of my home and am there all the time. Also, I see cattle there every day yet they say
9 it is not use for agricultural purposes.

10
11 Steve Edmondson, 250 Cambridge Lane: Prepared Victoria Residential Association
12 response and comments, however, tonight I am speaking as a private citizen. Had a
13 botanist from Chico State look at the wetland and she identified several obligate species.
14 Detention basin would adversely affect the wetland and the stream. It would affect the
15 hydrology that provides water to the wetland and sustains the stream. This is a rare and
16 valuable resource. Will potentially dry up the stream. Detention basin will require high
17 maintenance, will possibly create an attractive public nuisance and possible liability to
18 the city. Suggested enhancing existing wetland – greater and cheaper in the long term;
19 provides a natural flood control detention basin, it will absorb high flows and release
20 back to the stream; it will provide habitat for plants and animal species; and lastly it has
21 been used by municipalities as a wastewater treatment. Public benefits are that is an
22 educational and aesthetic resource. We were told that the applicant would consider
23 enhancing the wetland in lieu of building the detention basin, however, there was no
24 commitment. Were told the applicant would work with us to create a plan. Have not
25 seen a plan or been contacted regarding a plan. Received e-mails from the Residential
26 Association asking for funding sources. Was told the applicant would consider if it could
27 be paid for with public monies. I have provided references and examples to the applicant
28 on creating wetlands.

29
30 Tom Hergenrother, 234 Edinburgh Lane: Opposed to project as currently planned.
31 Grading will create drainage problems. There is grazing currently, which keeps the
32 weeds down so it does not present a fire hazard. Site line will be changed. Think the
33 detention basin would be a nuisance. Who will maintain landscaping on roundabout –
34 needs to be a clear site line.

35
36 Pat McShane, 34 Myrtle Court: Upstream affects downstream. Living in the Payran
37 area, am aware that as streets are paved, cement laid, everything flows from the hills to
38 my area. Flooding in streams leads to the river and the flood area.

39
40 Doug McCanne, 1845 Western Avenue: In opposition to the project. I am in the county
41 and will be downstream of the traffic. Have watched traffic grow since 1986. Is now
42 difficult to get out of my driveway in the morning. Roads are not being maintained now.
43 How will we maintain the same roads with more traffic.

44
45 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Thanked the planner for the conditions and the developer for the
46 future park. One condition that was not included was regarding compliance with City
47 plans. We felt there should be no homes visible on the ridgeline. This was in our

1 recommended Conditions of Approval. This is a pedestrian issue and smaller houses, 1
2 car garages would help with visibility problems and traffic problems.

3
4 Public comment closed:

5
6 Doyle Heaton: Clarified average on house sizes.

7
8 Vin Smith: Addressed concerns from public comment.

9
10 Commissioner Dargie: Asked for clarification on the scope of cut and fill that is now
11 proposed.

12
13 Mike Milani, Milani Associates: Presented the changes in the grading of the project
14 presented tonight.

15
16 Commissioner Monteschio: Too much cut and fill – did not even reduce by 10%.
17 Disappointed that this is back as the same project.

18
19 Commissioner Barrett: The grading stopped the project in its tracks. Think there are a
20 variety of other issues: wetlands as an attractive nuisance; water usage affecting the
21 neighbors; do not agree that the Commission was generally in favor the architecture.
22 Traffic implications are critical. Think if the project goes forward that story poles should
23 be put up. Nine percent reduction is nothing – is not enough. Not the best way to deal
24 with this property. Disappointed things were not included in the packet that was
25 requested by the Planning Commission.

26
27 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Agree that grading is still the primary issue. Project still
28 has 20 ft. cuts and the fill has been reduced, however, its still a flat pad issue for a hillside
29 location. It is not the revision I had hoped for. There are 17 to 20 lots that are on the
30 perimeter that are problematic. Do not see a lot of progress here.

31
32 Commissioner Dargie: Grading is the primary issue – revised plan is essentially the
33 same. Quoted the staff report regarding reducing the grading by designing a site plan that
34 works with the topography.

35
36 Commissioner Glass: Think it is important to have a second opinion on hydrology and
37 soils if the project goes forward. Developer has agreed to solve some of the traffic
38 problems. Think the developer has done a lot of good.

39
40 Vin Smith: Understand the commission will reaffirm the motion made previously. Will
41 then request to continue our discussion with the council to change the grading

42
43 M/S Barrett/Monteschio to uphold the Planning Commission's previous denial without
44 prejudice.

1 All in favor:

2 Commissioner O'Brien: Absent
3 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
4 Commissioner Monteschio: Yes
5 Commissioner Glass: Yes
6 Commissioner Barrett: Yes
7 Commissioner Vouri: Recused.
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes
9

10
11 **III. PETALUMA VILLAGE MARKETPLACE EXPANSION (Factory Outlet**
12 **Center), 2200 Petaluma Boulevard North.**
13 **AP Nos: 007-391-009; 048-080-038**
14 **FILE No: PRE02001**
15 **Project Planner: Joan Lamphier**
16

17 The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission hold a Public Hearing
18 on the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) for the proposed
19 expansion of the Petaluma Village Marketplace (Factory Outlet Center).
20

21 Note: This item was continued from the March 26, 2002 meeting.
22

23 Joan Lamphier: Object of this meeting tonight is to continue to take public comment.
24

25 Public comment opened:
26

27 Vince Landof: Document refers to an east west overpass. Public does not want to spend
28 money on an overpass. Need to look to fixing the streets and water treatment plant.
29

30 Richard Braun, 141 Grevillia: Lack of standards in the report. Role of the report is to
31 present how the development will not exceed these standards. Gave an example for street
32 noise decibels – number is not in the report. Need to stay away from the subjective.
33 Permeable surface? What is acceptable? We do not have standards. Each of General
34 Plan policies should be analyzed. Address integration of project into Petaluma – the
35 more mitigation you have, the more fighting there will be. Who will pay the cost of
36 enforcement?
37

38 Hank Flum: In 1998 homes in Payran flooded and the stores in the factory outlet
39 flooded. That storm was a 40-year event. Did a topographical map and showed the flood
40 plain – Parcel C of the Factory Outlet was flooded. Have been increasing runoff in the
41 river with development since 1998.
42

43 Pat McShane, 34 Myrtle Court: Payran Neighborhood Action Committee. Think about
44 downtown business, traffic and CEQA.
45

46 John Cheney, 55 Rocca Drive: Referred to 1998 flood being a 40-year event. Ridiculous
47 to build the project in the first place and is ridiculous now. Need to be able to run the

1 traffic model before project would go forward. What about affordable housing for people
2 who will work at the outlet?

3
4 Elaine Woodruff, 717 North McDowell: National landscapes dying with new shopping
5 centers and hotel. Need to save undeveloped area and turn into a park.

6
7 Jerry Price, 775 Baywood: East west overpass discussed. Fails to include a freeway
8 frontage road – mandated by original conditions of approval. Saw flooded stores in 1998
9 – proposal is to build in an obvious flood zone.

10
11 David Keller, I Street: Reiterated information from last time. EIR is vague. Stated
12 criteria and the document does not meet that criteria. No maps included in the document.
13 Project is not clearly defined. Does not meet CEQA requirements. Planning
14 Commission needs to have the original documents in order to make an informed decision.
15 Too much critical information is missing. No analysis of LOS on roadways. Ranier
16 overpass will make traffic worse on Petaluma Blvd. No and McDowell. It is freeway
17 dependent development – does not support CPSP, River Enhancement Plan,
18 Redevelopment of downtown. Acreage needs to be blocked out now. Does not provide
19 new City services. Revenue for services required is not being provided by present outlet
20 mall. Planning Commission and City Council need to say stop. Suggested putting up
21 story poles so residents can see what is proposed. Joan Lamphier as City staff and author
22 of document is in direct conflict. Acreage should be a city park. Strongly recommend
23 denial.

24
25 David Yearsley, 521 Walnut Street: Want to speak on behalf of the river and the citizens
26 of Petaluma. Asking to deny the project. River provides diverse wild life and acts as a
27 filter. Building here would have a negative affect on the river. This would be a park that
28 everyone could enjoy.

29
30 Stan Gold, 615 King Road: Do not want to see the area change like Silicon Valley did.
31 EIR does not speak about the downtown merchants at all. Traffic and building in the
32 floodplain are issues that have been discussed. There would be destruction of riparian
33 habitat. Hope the Planning Commission can concentrate on in fill.

34
35 Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: No money to pay for Rainer – where is the traffic
36 going to go – it will be gridlock. This is not an appropriate project for approval. Showed
37 photos of the Corona Road bridge in 1993. Flood events of 1998 were not identified in
38 the current document. Don't identify existing conditions of the flood plain. Quoted
39 flooding mitigation. EIR is inadequate. Risk to downtown flooding is not mentioned in
40 the report. Does not identify the floodplain as it exists now.

41
42 Paul Johnson, 141 Upham: Area is quite beautiful – should encourage development
43 downtown. Making an emotional appeal. Do not encourage development in this area.

44
45 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Thanked Mat Connolly for taking the time to meet with the Bike
46 Committee. This land is not suitable for development, particularly Parcel B. Will have
47 adverse affect on air quality. Suggested increasing density downtown. Encourage non-

1 automobile use. Can benefit Petaluma and all of Sonoma County. Quoted River Plan –
2 too important to give up to development.

3
4 Public comment closed (for this evening):

5
6 Commissioner Monteschio: Thanked the public for coming out this evening.
7 Groundwater was left out of the report and it needs to be addressed. Need coordination
8 between the other EIR's. Rainer cannot be considered mitigation. Concerned that Joan
9 Lamphier is writing the report and is staff planner. Would also like to see story poles.

10
11 Commissioner Vouri: Would like the Commission to address whether this qualifies as a
12 DSEIR.

13
14 Commissioner Barrett: Is best to direct staff to put the brakes on the Final EIR and go
15 back to redrafting the DSEIR.

16
17 Commissioner Glass: Need initial EIR to review since this is a DSEIR and the conditions
18 of approval from the original project; would like the latest information that the council
19 has regarding the Traffic Study (even the presentation that was made on March 18,
20 2002); the most recent CPSP; story poles so people can see what is being contemplated.
21 In light of the absence of the above do not feel we can adequately discuss the document
22 before us. Feels Joan Lamphier as author of the EIR and staff planner is a conflict of
23 interest.

24
25 Mike Moore, Community Development Director: Addressed Mr. Glass's concerns
26 regarding Ms. Lamphier's services. Stated that prior to hiring Ms. Lamphier, the City
27 Council was informed that her role would be to prepare the EIR and serve as an extension
28 of staff for the project. Mr. Keller was on the City Council at the time and was aware of
29 role Ms. Lamphier would be playing in this project. Further stated that Ms. Lamphier's
30 role was not unlike that of other City contract planners or in-house staff who are
31 responsible for preparing environmental documents and presenting that information to the
32 Commission along with a recommendation. CEQA requires the Planning Commission to
33 exercise its independent judgment regarding the adequacy of the EIR.

34
35 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Have an underlying problem with this EIR – what is the
36 project? Description of the project is inadequate – defined adequately in graphic terms
37 and in text. No finite definition of what this is. Would like original EIR. Due to
38 sensitivity of this report, hire a CEQA attorney to get a legal opinion regarding the
39 project planner and consultant being one and the same.

40
41 Commissioner Vouri: Recommend that we direct staff to create a revised DEIR. This
42 document does not provide enough information to comment on as a draft. There is
43 information missing and we need to have that information in the DEIR to be able to
44 provide comments. Specific areas where it is lacking: Is this a legal project in a CEQA
45 sense since there are three projects proposed and maybe a combination of each. What if
46 the cumulative impacts of the combinations produce different environmental impacts than
47 what is described here? Quoted the Initial Study regarding significant "seismic" impacts

1 and yet there is no Geology and Soils chapter in the DEIR. Similarly in the Initial Study it
2 states this project may induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly. The
3 growth is dismissed in Chapter 10, Section 5. There is no Housing and Population
4 Chapter in the SDEIR. Page 14 of Initial Study states that the project may substantially
5 deplete groundwater supply or interfere with groundwater recharge. That is not
6 addressed anywhere in the report. The Initial Study states that this project may impair
7 implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted Emergency Response Plan or
8 Emergency Evacuation Plan, yet there is no Hazards or Hazardous Materials element in
9 the document. The Initial Study discusses possible recreation or expansion of recreational
10 facilities. There is no recreation element in the draft. Initial Study discusses a possible
11 significant adverse change in Archeological resource – issues not addressed in the
12 document and there is not a cultural resources element. There are no maps of detention
13 ponds, no description of the technology, no modeling of how detention ponds will work,
14 no map of option 3, no maps of alternatives 1 or 2 and no maps of wetlands. Disturbed
15 that a Biological element is non-existent. Would recommend to staff to create a revised
16 draft.

17
18 Commissioner Glass: Suggested one more meeting to discuss the inadequacies in the
19 document to give good direction as to what this Commission wants to see.

20
21 Commissioner Dargie: Would like Conditions of approval from original project and a
22 copy of Final EIR for the original project as well as new maps that are larger and easier to
23 read.

24
25 MS von Raesfeld/Barrett to continue public hearing to June 11, 2002.

26
27 All in favor:

28 Commissioner O'Brien: Absent
29 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
30 Commissioner Monteschio: Yes
31 Commissioner Glass: Yes
32 Commissioner Barrett: Yes
33 Commissioner Vouri: Yes
34 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes

35
36
37 **PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS:**

38
39 **III. DISCUSSION OF NEW CITY OF PETALUMA TRAFFIC MODEL**
40 **AND THE AVAILABILITY FOR USE ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

41
42 No discussion due to the lateness of the hour.

43
44
45 **IV. DISCUSSION OF PLANNING COMMISSION RULES**

- 46
47
 - **Planning Commission Rules attached**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Discussed earlier in the meeting.

V. LIAISON REPORTS:

- **City Council:**
- **SPARC:**
- **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee**
- **Tree Advisory Committee**

Adjournment: 11:35

S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\042302.doc