



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>

Planning Commission Minutes

January 8, 2002, 7:00 P.M.

Commissioners: *Present:* Barrett, Dargie, Glass*, Monteschio, O'Brien, von Raesfeld, Vouri (Absent for Agenda Item I)

* Chair

Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director
Laura Lafler, Project Planner
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Secretary

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of December 11, 2001 were approved as amended.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Bill Phillips, 824 Blossom Court regarding the Magnolia Place located in the northwest part of Petaluma. Passed out memo form – 17.5 acres proposed as a park from 1987 General Plan. Committee wants to honor General plan to make it a park. Mr. Phillips showed features of Magnolia Park. Committee secured signatures from residents of Petaluma and nearby county neighbors. City has deficit of park acreage.

Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive. Love General Plan – want developers to show love for General Plan. Had flooding in Corona Reach area during recent rains.

Letter submitted by Brian Heim to postpone his appeal to the January 22, 2002 meeting.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: None.

COMMISSIONERS' REPORT:

CORRESPONDENCE: Passed out at places, 2 memoranda from Church Water Consultants, dated December 14 and December 19, 2001; letter from Mr. Cartwright, Bob Martin and John Bertucci regarding Redwood Tech.

DEIR for expansion on Factory Outlets was distributed at places.

APPEAL STATEMENT: Within fourteen (14) calendar days following the date of a decision of the Planning Commission, the decision may be appealed to the City Council by the applicant or by any other interested party. If no appeal is made within that time, the decision shall be final. An appeal shall be addressed to the Council in writing and shall be filed with the City Clerk. Said appeal shall be accompanied by the appeal fee as specified by Resolution 92-251-N.C.S. as adopted by the City Council. The appeal shall state specifically the grounds for the appeal and the relief sought by the appellant.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Persons commenting orally or in writing are advised to raise all pertinent issues at this state of review so that possible solutions may be implemented or adopted at the earliest opportunity. If you challenge the action taken by the City of Petaluma in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised during the public review process, or in written correspondence delivered to the City at or prior to the conclusion of the public review process.

OLD BUSINESS;
PUBLIC HEARING:

- I. **ROCKRIDGE POINT, Western Avenue and Windsor Drive.**
AP NO.: 020-030-037, 039, 013 & 015; FILE NOS: ANX00004; PRZ00001;
PUD00004; TSM00003
Planner: Laura Lafler**

The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve a proposal to prezone a property to Planned Unit Development (PUD), to annex to the City of Petaluma, and to subdivide a 123-acre parcel into 62 residential lots.

(Continued from November 27, 2001)

Laura Lafler presented the staff report. Issues were identified at November 27, 2001 Planning Commission meeting which warrant further discussion.

Vin Smith, Consultant: Responded to items identified by Laura Lafler.

- Details of proposed drainage plan and detention basin responded to by Memorandum 3 and 4 of Church Water Consultants.
- Adequacy of traffic evaluation – proposed a third splitter island. Also a roundabout is proposed if it would be more effective.
- Adequacy of soils analysis. Grading on hillside is safe and appropriate – will be conservative as to how hillside is graded.
- Grading – minimized as much as possible.
- Long-term ownership of open space, role of homeowners associations, maintenance of detention basin. Homeowner’s Association will maintain and secure.
- General Plan consistency – regarding density.
- Adequacy of environmental document – focused on traffic and hydrology issues which have been addressed.

- Downstream flooding – addressed earlier in hydrology memorandums from Church Water Consultants.
- Detail on CC&Rs.

Commissioner Glass: Asked about house sizes as related to Victoria Subdivision. Houses are 3100 to 4100 square feet and 3100 to 3700 square feet in Victoria.

Vin Smith: Stated that he met with Mr. Marne, Homeowner's Association – have come to an agreement.

Commissioner Barrett: Asked about 2-acre park.

Vin Smith: Still to be dedicated to the City.

Doyle Heaton: Have downsized homes from original plans, average house is 3600 square feet.

Public hearing opened:

Bruce Hagen, 145 Grevillia Drive: Speaking on behalf of Bicycle Advisory Committee. Want to make formal recommendations from Bike Committee as well as Parks & Recreation Commission. Biggest concern is public accessible open space in the same fashion as Helen Putnam Park. Cited Bike Plan, Chapter 6, Objective I and Objective J. Would like a rim trail around the City of Petaluma. Access should be pedestrian and bike rather than EVA as requested by Mr. Evans. Do not want retention pond gated and fenced.

Darren McGavin: Would like to see traffic circle as a calming measure. With regard to large agricultural truck traffic – ask developer to improve Western Avenue between Windsor and Chileano Valley Road.

Pete Gang: Site is awesome, gently rolling hills and serves as a boundary and backdrop. Difficult site because it is rolling – requires careful and intelligent development. Best site design does least amount of damage to land – site plan does not account for this. Site houses on and within the existing landscape. Developer makes claims to not be visible.

Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca: In regard to headwaters of Marin Creek – any increment added adds to danger of flooding.

Public hearing closed:

Commission Questions:

Mike Milani, Milani Engineering: Discussed geotechnical reports and soils on hillside site.

Commissioner Glass: Asked if developer would consider a 3rd party soils engineer to analyze soil.

Doyle Heaton: Applicant agreed to supply the names of three soils engineers and hydrologists for a 3rd party soils evaluation if necessary.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Issue of flat pads and grading – difference of opinion on what can happen. 150 feet of differential – HR District states to preserve agricultural.

Commissioner Monteschio: Agree with Commissioner von Raesfeld – thought SPARC, staff and Planning Commission gave good recommendations – cannot support project as it is. Want to support Bike Committee and Parks and Recreation Commission.

Commissioner Barrett: Would like to see guidelines for hillside developments. Can't think of a good reason to level the property and build on flat pads. Concerned about the downstream neighbors and water from the site – think wetlands and a retention pond are a good idea.

Commissioner Dargie: Two issues that are not resolved: 1) grading and 2) open space. Developer needs to complete process with the City and take recommendations from Park & Recreation and Bike Committee.

Commissioner O'Brien: Subject is a land use issue and grading and site plan should be a SPARC issue.

Commissioner Glass: Grading is a difficult issue and this is a difficult site. It brings neighborhoods together, protects wildlife, and will open up parks. Developer seems to be addressing drainage issues - making the effort to make it zero net runoff. Traffic mitigations by developer go above and beyond.

Vin Smith: Think the developer has met the intent of the General Plan – would like Planning Commission to provide direction to go to City Council.

Commissioner von Raesfeld made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Monteschio to deny the project without prejudice due to the amount of site grading and the lot design, with a Finding that the project as is does not meet the City's Hillside Residential Development Combining District (H-R-D), Article 19.1, Section 19.1-100 in the City of Petaluma Zoning Ordinance and the inconsistency with the "Community Character Element" of the General Plan as referenced on Pgs. 9 and 10 of the November 27, 2001 Staff Report (Policies 2, 4 and 6).

All in favor:

Commissioner O'Brien: No

Commissioner Dargie: Yes

Commissioner Monteschio: Yes
Commissioner Glass: No
Commissioner Barrett: Yes
Commissioner Vouri: Absent (this item only)
Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes

NEW BUSINESS;
PUBLIC HEARING:

**II. REDWOOD TECHNOLOGY CENTER by Basin Street Properties, corner of Old Redwood Highway and North McDowell Boulevard.
AP NOS: 007-411-7, 9, 11, 18 and 19; FILE NOS: GPA00001; REZ00001
Planner: Jayni Allsep**

The applicant requests that the Planning Commission hold a Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Redwood Technology Center, an office and research & development campus that would include 262,500 gross square feet of office/R&D space and a 7,500 square foot restaurant pad, and forward a recommendation to the City Council on its adequacy. The applicant also requests a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the City Council to approve a proposal that includes a request for a General Plan Amendment to re-designate the 14.4-acre subject property from “Special Commercial” to “Special Industrial/Office Park”; and a rezoning request to replace the existing Highway Commercial (CH) District on Parcel A, and the Light Industrial (ML) District on Parcel B, to Planned Unit Development-PUD.

Jayni Allsep presented the staff report.

David Early, Design Community Environment: Gave overview of the Draft EIR. Asked Commission to comment on the DEIR by taking public comment and give Planning Commission comments on the DEIR and take action on the proposed Redwood Technology Center.

Vin Smith: Gave historical background of project site and presented the Redwood Technology Center project as proposed. Two significant issues as identified: traffic and wetlands. LOS with or without the project is E to F. This is a regional traffic issue and should be dealt with in a regional way. Will be improving signal at North McDowell and Old Redwood Highway.

Public comment opened:

Steve Nicholson, Robertson Properties, Owner and Developer of Parcel C: Project is 160,027 square feet of retail with 115,00 square feet of a big box retail and the remainder unidentified.

Rick Parmer, 217 Fair Avenue: Lived in Petaluma since 1986. Mitigations in the EIR are unacceptable. Flood plain management is still a serious issue. Flood storage on parcel would have to be extremely high. Inadequate basin wide flood plain management – created flooding in Thompson Creek since Redwood Business Park. Is also impacting the eco system. Creates traffic issues and burdens the street system. Scale down projects on all three sites A big box retail will have a negative impact on downtown businesses.

Rick Savel, Penngrove: Every increment is significant regarding traffic. Petaluma is moving ahead with projects assuming Highway 101 is 6 lanes and that has not happened. City's model does not look outside the City. Overlap traffic analysis zones and use County zone data. Do not agree with assumptions in the DEIR. Would like a county wide, meaningful analysis for traffic before projects are approved. Overlap jurisdictional maps – doesn't evaluate potential of floodway.

John King, 1055 Adobe Road: Have a serious traffic problem on Adobe Road. Issue with the Redwood Technology project is groundwater recharge. Referred to Section 4.32 of the Penngrove Specific Plan.

John Cheney, 55 Rocca Drive: Do not have faith in EIRs. Would like an explanation of MIKE 11. Don't think this project is feasible until we have a new FEMA map. Presented a letter to Planning Commission. Know there is a plan in place for Parcel C. Need a complete study of what is to be done on all Parcels. Please look at this project and be careful.

Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Don't see anything about cumulative impacts in the DEIR. Referred to his letter submitted on January 8, quoting pages of the DEIR.

John Bertucci: Element of mitigation not being addressed. Reclaim the cinema and turn back to the floodplain.

Public hearing closed.

Vin Smith: Responded to public comments on the project. Analysis concludes that the project does not flood downstream projects. Are storing water on the site.

Continued to January 22, 2002.

III. BRIAN HEIM APREAL
FILE NO: APL01001
Planner: George White

The appellant requests that the Planning Commission overturn a staff determination regarding accessory dwelling units.

The appellant asked to propone his appeal to the January 22, 2002 meeting.

IV. LIAISON REPORTS:

- **City Council:** O'Brien was reappointed to Planning Commission.
 - **SPARC:** None
 - **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** None
 - **Tree Advisory Committee:** New trees on Howard and Liberty
-

V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

Adjournment: 11:05

S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\010802.doc