



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
June 11, 2002 – 7:00 PM

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

* Chair

Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director
Joan Lamphier, Project Planner

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of May 28, 2002 tabled until clarification of language regarding the Nessco Appeal.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: None

CORRESPONDENCE:

APPEAL STATEMENT: Was read.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

COMMISSION BUSINESS:

I. ELECTION OF 2nd VICE CHAIR.

M/S Commissioner Vouri/Commissioner Barrett to nominate Commissioner von Raesfeld as 2nd Vice Chair.

All in favor:

Commissioner O'Brien: Absent

Commissioner Dargie: Yes

Commissioner McAllister: Yes

Commissioner Glass: Yes

1 Commissioner Barrett: Yes
2 Commissioner Vouri: Yes
3 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Abstain
4

5
6 **OLD BUSINESS;**
7 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
8

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

15 Note: This item was continued from the April 23, 2002 meeting.
16

17 Joan Lamphier, Project Planner: Reviewed the memo to the Commission indicating the
18 applicant's intention to revise the project and that a new draft subsequent Environment
19 Impact Report would be prepared.
20

21 Commission Comments:
22

23 Commissioner Dargie: Planning Commission should not play a role in directing project;
24 applicant should be allowed to proceed with new document without Commission
25 guidance at this point.
26

27 Commissioner Barrett: Wants to make sure that there is additional information available
28 before new project is reviewed.
29

30 Commissioner Vouri: Each Commissioner had a list of issues on the previous EIR;
31 would be inefficient not to comment.
32

33 Commissioner Glass: Is a matter of personal preference to contribute; will leave it open
34 to comment.
35

36 Commissioner Vouri: Regarding the Notice of Preparation – scope will not be
37 reopened?
38

39 Joan Lamphier: Public can comment during 30-day NOP circulation and comment
40 period.
41

42 Commissioner Barrett: Requested record of previous approval of the factory outlet
43 center to Planning Commission as soon as possible.
44

45 Commissioner Dargie: Will Commission get list of conditions of approval and status of
46 meeting those conditions?
47

1 Mike Moore: Commission will get copies of previous EIR, approved PCD Master Plan
2 and status of compliance with conditions, as well as other related information as soon as
3 possible.

4
5 Public Hearing opened:

6
7 Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Evaluation of groundwater resources report – site is
8 in water recharge area; quoted from SCWA urban water management plan; concerned
9 about assumptions for water supply; expressed concerns about theatre in floodplain;
10 referred to Corps of Engineers flood study; quoted from City floodplain regulations;
11 referred to recent supreme court decision on Lake Tahoe.

12
13 Elaine Woodruff, 717 N. McDowell: Opposes outlet expansion; concerned about
14 impact to downtown; area should be a park.

15
16 Pat McShane, 37 Myrtle Court: Opposed to project; area will cause flooding; applicants
17 have not complied with previous mitigations; no downtown shuttle; need verifiable
18 project mitigation.

19
20 John Cheney, 55 Rocca Drive: Theatre is smokescreen; cars would flood while people
21 are watching movies; flood control for general plan needs to be in place before project
22 should proceed; cumulative impacts on flooding need to be addressed.

23
24 Patricia Tuttle Brown, 513 Petaluma Blvd So: Comments on NOP – language needs to
25 change – “abandon fields” is prejudiced; new language should be substituted; disagrees
26 with recreation not covered ins SEIR; PBAC requests that “all park” alternative in SEIR;
27 how well have 1990 mitigations been successful – need that information; theatre is
28 smokescreen – news articles need to focus on entire project, not just theatre.

29
30 Bill Phillips, 1804 Blossom Court: Redwood Technology Center, Southgate and this
31 project will create flood of traffic on Petaluma Boulevard; Cobblestone project near
32 Jesse Lane will also add to traffic.

33
34 David Keller, I Street: NOP – review checklist – it is wrong; new checklist has to be
35 sent out with NOP. Issues: visual impacts; conversion of prime farmland to non-
36 agricultural use; Coho and steelhead in this reach of river; river plan; water supplies;
37 drainage – parking lot runoff not mitigated; conflict with habitat plan; no recreation
38 consideration; traffic; water supply. NOP doesn’t meet legal standards for notification;
39 theatre is sop to the community; current theatre shouldn’t be torn down; project will
40 impact downtown. Made reference to legal evidence and written materials presented.

41
42 Stan Gold, 615 King Road: Escaped Silicon Valley; same process is happening here –
43 do we want strong central core or “string” along freeway; City needs strong downtown
44 core.

45
46 Hank Flum: Parcel C was underwater in 1998; how do you mitigate flooding on parcel
47 that was underwater; lacks confidence that these issues can be mitigated.

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
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Maxine Durney, 198 Ely Road: Make sure endangered plants are viewed during spring; couldn't tell if species were there.

Public Comment closed @ 8:10:

Five minute recess.

Reconvened @ 8:15.

Commissioner Barrett: Have problem with NOP; no new initial study; determination of significance based on previous EIR; need to reassess based on new project.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Are we comfortable with de facto scoping session; not sure I want to go line by line on initial study.

Commissioner Glass: Are we falling short on getting word out to public.

Mike Moore: Explained NOP process.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: No action required tonight?

Mike Moore: No action is required; information only.

David Keller: Need to send new checklist; checking "maybe" is dishonest; outside agencies need that information

Fred Etzel, Attorney for the Applicant: NOP was not dishonest; decision was made to prepare EIR; you will get 1991 EIR plus new DSEIR; whole purpose of Initial Study is to determine whether EIR is necessary.

Commissioner Barrett: Wants mitigation monitoring reports from existing project; wants to make sure that new projects are included in cumulative impacts.

Commissioner Vouri: Would recommend that new DSEIR include agriculture resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, population and housing; need to look at population and housing impacts; Sonoma County PRMD recommended housing component; no maps of wetlands and detention ponds – needs to be in DSEIR. Wetlands survey in June or July – should be done earlier in year; pictures contradict conclusions of DSEIR re: wetlands; land use policies tend to be selected that support project, need to be more broadly reviewed; concerned about road through oak woodland; no modeling on feasibility of detention basin; consider water quality concerns. Traffic: Corona/Adobe, Adobe/Frates, Penngrove, Hwy 101 need to be reviewed; incorporate comments from Caltrans; no mass transit considerations – trolley, SMART; need to review frontage road (access to Corona); mitigation measure on air quality needs to be reworked to consider travel to and from project; water supply issue

1 not addressed; traffic mitigations that are economically infeasible (Rainier) should not
2 be listed.

3

4 Commissioner Glass: Previous SEIR is not whole truth; need to build trust by having a
5 document of high quality and full disclosure; use category of “significant until
6 mitigated”; document should not refer to Rainier because it is not viable; mitigation
7 5.1.2 re: cross-town connector – no financing mechanism; DSEIR paints a different
8 picture in pieces than in conclusion; ludicrous that you could bring people into town and
9 not impact recreation; there is a housing impact; need to indicate that previous DSEIR
10 had problems – new NOP does not clearly indicate problems with previous DSEIR, does
11 this project degrade the Corps flood control project; what happens with theater in this
12 location verses downtown – economic analysis not suitable for CEQA.

13

14 Commissioner von Raesfeld: New checklist should be done, however, should attach old
15 checklist; agriculture resources should be looked at; should look at population and
16 housing and recreation; graphics should be better – more context; portion of channel is
17 zoned M-L; need to show property lines; aesthetic analysis needs to be more complete.

18

19 Commissioner McAllister: Cover as many categories as possible in new DSEIR;
20 graphics need to provide more context; need clear mapping of all trees and wetlands; can
21 new proposal be staked on site (e.g. story poles); would like to see more alternatives in
22 DSEIR – no project alternative needs to be considered in current context; wants
23 assessment of monitoring reports and current status of wetlands.

24

25 Commissioner Dargie: No comment

26

27 Commissioner Barrett: A recreation alternative should be looked at; CPSP should be
28 addressed in new DSEIR if germane, also new traffic model.

29

30 Matt Connolly: Thanks the commission for comments – look forward to coming back.

31

32

33 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

34

- 35 • **City Council** – Commissioner Vouri spoke re: council review of
- 36 Redwood Technology Center.
- 37 • **SPARC**
- 38 • **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee**
- 39 • **Tree Advisory Committee**

40

41

42 **VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.** None

43

44 Adjournment: 9:33 p.m.

45

46 S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\061102.doc

47

Planning Commission Minutes - June 11, 2002

1
2
3