



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 **Draft Planning Commission Minutes**
3 **March 12, 2002 – 7:00 PM**

4
5 Commissioners: *Present:* Barrett, Dargie, Glass*, O'Brien, von Raesfeld, Vouri
6 *Absent:* Monteschio

7 * Chair

8
9 Staff: George White, Planning Manager
10 Jayni Allsep, Project Planner
11 Phil Boyle, Assistant Planner
12 Anne Windsor, Secretary
13

14
15 **ROLL CALL**

16 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

17 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of February 26, 2002 were approved as amended.
18 M/S von Raesfeld/Dargie; abstain Monteschio.

19 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

20 **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

21 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:**

22 **CORRESPONDENCE:**

23 **APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was read.

24 **LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.
25

26
27 **OLD BUSINESS:**

28 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

29
30 I. SOUTHGATE BUSINESS AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT,
31 LAKEVILLE HIGHWAY AND FRATES ROAD. REQUEST FOR A
32 GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING APPROVAL.

33 APN: 017-030-017 & 017-150-019

34 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**
35

1 **Note: This project is continued from the February 26, 2002 Planning**
2 **Commission meeting.**

3
4 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report and the changes to the project since it was initially
5 heard at the Planning Commission Meeting on October 9, 2001.

6
7 Vin Smith, Basin Street Properties: Addressed some issues regarding the air quality
8 study and traffic studies.

9
10 Vin Smith, Basin Street Properties: Introduced the team of consultants involved in the
11 project. Presented five main points:

- 12 • Traffic
- 13 • Urban Separator
- 14 • Gateway Design
- 15 • Internal consistency with neighborhood plan
- 16 • Stronger regulatory commitment
- 17 •

18 Peter Swift, Civil Engineer: Gave a presentation on roundabouts.

19
20 **Public Comment:**

21
22 Rick Savel, 499 Adobe Road: Mitigations are not a reality until 101 is widened.
23 Question for the record: change the baseline methodology – need to look at adopted
24 plans, consider funding, history. Relying on improvements that will not be in place until
25 2013. Referred to Council member Healy’s memo. Does not consider cumulative traffic
26 on Adobe Road.

27
28 Paul LaSage, 10 Raffles Court: Discussed growth limitations, water, traffic, and the
29 natural or riparian area.

30
31 Mark Albertson, 1676 Calle Ranchero: Continue to oppose project. Reiterated traffic
32 issues regarding traffic studies. Discussed General Plan policies not referenced in the
33 Staff Report – referred to Policy 10 – City is allowing too many exceptions to occur.
34 Policy #2 – General Plan states avoiding T intersections. Project ignores Del Oro
35 Subdivision.

36
37 Arthur Kerbel, 1882 Adobe Creek Drive, President, Adobe Creek Homeowners
38 Association: Referred to the stretch of road from Casa Grande to Frates and safety of
39 school children – presently there are no stop signs or crosswalks. Confused about the
40 timing of the project. Question how much the roundabouts will help traffic. Mitigated
41 Negative Declaration is not the way to figure out the project – need an EIR. Will create a
42 lot more problems than the benefits for the City of Petaluma.

43
44 John Sedlander, 1629 Cerro Sonoma Circle: Supports the project – thinks it’s an
45 attractive project, would much prefer this type of project to another East Side subdivision

1 or a big box retail. Like the idea of a mixed used project, like the landscaping, that the
2 project will attract public transit, and will probably slow down traffic.

3
4
5
6 Carmen Herrera, 1870 Adobe Creek Drive: Think this development is too large and out
7 of place – it is more appropriate for an urban area instead of a rural area.

8
9 Helen Aronis, 2072 Falcon Ridge Drive: Have issues with pm peak traffic. Frates is a
10 connection to Novato, Napa. If attempted to design like downtown “put it downtown”.

11
12 John McGinnis, 15 Sapporo Court: Wishful thinking that people will live and work in
13 the same community – look at the Hamilton development in Novato. Petaluma cannot
14 keep up with road repairs presently – how can we take care of additional traffic?

15
16 Merrill Louks, 1808 Falcon Ridge Drive: Opposed to the project – areas of concern are
17 traffic, air quality and water runoff. Feel EIR is required as opposed to a Mitigated
18 Negative Declaration.

19
20 Neil Picha, 1643 Calle Ranchero: Do not see how project will improve mass transit.
21 Wanted data on air pollution.

22
23 Ronald Nadeau, 1964 Falcon Ridge Drive: Think corner of Lakeville and Washington is
24 a more appropriate spot for this type of development. Concerned about the parking ratio
25 for the rental units. Traffic on Frates is very heavy – have difficulty believing the
26 roundabouts will not create traffic jams.

27
28 Ken Roman, 1884 Adobe Creek: Want protection from new construction this is
29 approved. Problems that will need correcting: 1) traffic congestion – do not think
30 roundabouts will work; 3) dangerous intersections which will get worse with additional
31 development; 4) costs for additional sewage. Need progress, however, it creates
32 problems – do not want to see the community suffer.

33
34 Mark Albertson: Revisions to right away required?

35
36 Allan Tilton: At a roundabout a right away is required.

37
38 Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: The issues addressed tonight – water, traffic, sewage,
39 etc. is enough to require an EIR for this project.

40
41 **Public comment closed:**

42
43 Vin Smith: Addressed some of the issues. Originally Basin Street was directed by the
44 Planning Commission to use the Park Central Model for the traffic study. There is not an
45 Issue regarding water supply. If there were a water supply issue it would have been
46 brought up in the Initial Study. Discussed the building heights on Frates Road. The

1 larger buildings would be on the interior of the project. Development would build
2 apartments and office buildings simultaneously.

3
4 Commissioner Barrett: Was under the impression that the Traffic study done for the
5 General Plan was the study that was recommended.

6
7 Commissioner O'Brien: Consultants did not have all the information for land use –
8 model has not been tested.

9
10 **Commission Comments:**

11
12 Commissioner Glass: Identified the issues: traffic, air quality, and urban separator.

13
14 Commissioner Barrett: Is there adequate water supply? Is that addressed in the Initial
15 Study?

16
17 Jayni Allsep: The adequacy of water supply is addressed in Section 13 of the Initial
18 Study checklist. Did not receive any comments from the Sonoma County Water Agency.
19 Response from the City of Petaluma's Water Resources Department did not suggest any
20 water supply issues.

21
22 Commissioner Vouri: Is Sonoma County PRMD on the referral list?

23
24 Jayni Allsep: They did comment, however, they did not raise issues regarding water
25 supply.

26
27 Commissioner Vouri: Regarding traffic – I had asked to use the Park Central model,
28 Commissioner Glass said no because that model had assumptions that were not correct.
29 Referred to November 13 minutes, pgs. 8 and 9. Discussion about a dynamic or static
30 model – there was no agreement. Dynamic model with new traffic model from General
31 Plan plus add Adobe and Frates Roads. Asked Allan Tilton to clarify model used.

32
33 Alan Tilton, Whitlock & Weinberger: Was asked to review the Traffic Study done for
34 the project. Serious questions on Petaluma's model because it was focused on just
35 Petaluma. New model was not available. 1995 Transportation Authority model was
36 used. Process used is not dynamic. Chose static model because it provided the worse
37 case scenario.

38
39 Commissioner Glass: What is our obligation to mitigate the traffic regionally?

40
41 Alan Tilton: Project is bounded by two Counties – this proximity to regional corridors,
42 makes it an ideal location for this type of project.

43
44 Commissioner Vouri: I have issue with why the project is before us now – think new
45 traffic model should be used.

46
47 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Traffic is the most significant issue.

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
47

Commissioner Barrett: Agree traffic concerns are key – don’t see good solutions. Think the applicant has nothing to loose by waiting for the new model.

George White: There is no certainty about when the new model will be ready.

Commissioner O’Brien: Need to go with the information we have presently.

Commissioner Dargie: Think we should make a decision with what is in front of us.

Commissioner Vouri: If we want a consistent model that is what we need to require. This development is a very large and intense and we need to be confident in what we are doing.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Am not sure an EIR will give additional information.

Commissioner Glass: Regarding an EIR – do not think it is required. Do not have the confidence of the Commission to go forward without a current traffic model.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Need to have square footages and usages of the buildings in the Initial Study – pg. 1. There are inconsistencies between the check boxes and the discussion in the Initial Study in the air quality section. Also pg. 21-visual quality and aesthetics – 8a – think that less than significant impact with mitigations would be more appropriate box to check; 8c – less than significant with mitigations more appropriate. Pg. 24 transportation and traffic – significant with mitigations (10b) per traffic study.

Consensus: Revise check boxes in Initial Study to reflect that impact is less than significant with mitigations.

Commissioner Vouri: Support request to illustrate perceived 25% improvement in air quality. Population, employment and housing – significant and adding 340 homes and 3500 jobs – making a significant impact.

Commissioner Barrett: Regarding Air quality – don’t think mitigation is addressed in the Initial Study. If numbers used in Attachment 9 – think these should be Conditions of Approval.

Jayni Allsep: Clarified air quality analysis in the Initial Study. Purpose of mitigation measure 4.2 is to expand on TSM program proposed.

von Raesfeld: Air quality is very open – how will it be mitigated? No guarantees.

George White: Can modify mitigation measure.

Vin Smith: Want definitive language to move forward.

Urban Separator:

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
47

Commissioner O'Brien: OK.

Commissioner Dargie: Comfortable with layout.

Commissioner Barrett: Uncomfortable with the Ely section where housing is next to the rural area – do not think it is compliance with General Plan. Will be willing to give some – do not think we should give the whole area – is not feathering into the rural area.

Commissioner Vouri: Speaks to a larger issue. Public brought out the real issues – is this the right place for this development? Would like to see a separation along Ely or a feathering approach to the development.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Project has been revised for the better – do not have an issue with the separator – would rather put the 75' setback on the south side of the project. Do not have an issue with the Ely side – take the first tier on Ely and limit it to two stories. Add a graphic along Ely that is 2-story residential. First tier on Ely 2 story. Try to move some of the 75 feet back.

Bill White: Hear a lot of uncertainty – have been working on this project for three years – want some certainty with conditions of approval.

Commissioner Barrett: Would consider Commissioner von Raesfeld's suggestions to address the Urban Separator issues.

Commissioner Glass: Urban Separator issue was dealt with by the City Council in 1999.

Proposed intensity and development:

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Need urban framework diagram amended.

Commissioner Glass: Asked why height was increased on the residential and office?

Vin Smith: It allows more flexibility with the design.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Do not have issue with building heights.

Commissioner Vouri: Do not have an issue.

Commissioner Barrett: As long as they are designed well – it's not a problem.

Commissioner O'Brien: Defer to Commissioner von Raesfeld.

Commissioner Glass: Like that higher buildings are on the interior of project.

von Raesfeld: Amend to text and graphics.

1 Commissioner Barrett: Asked if the Day Care was a condition of approval. Would like
2 to see it as a condition of approval.

3
4 Bill White: Have put a Day Care center at Redwood Business Park – has been very
5 successful. Will start with 7,200 square feet. Have no problem with being locked into a
6 Day Care Center, however, probably in two phases. 6-8,000 square feet in each phase.

7
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Plan, Table of Contents: Chapter 7 – Conditions of
9 Approval, PCD resolutions. Pg. 1 –include bullet describing document’s relationship
10 with regulatory process described in new Chapter 7. Pg. 10 first sentence. Pg. 11 –
11 Modify Urban Framework Diagram graphic to show: two story limit and where it occurs.
12 Identify building at corner of Lakeville and the Laguna Mateo as a Signature building.
13 Regarding minimum number of buildings, in commercial Gateway area – if you count it
14 is 5 buildings you have, but diagram identifies four Central area of office buildings –
15 leave minimum number of buildings at 6. Multiplex residential area next to ball fields –
16 how can you do that in three buildings? Five would be a good compromise. Area east of
17 A Street, should differentiate between 2 mixed use and 4 residential buildings. Pg. 13 –
18 maps don’t match. Pg. 14 – Lakeville frontage paragraph – should be revised to reflect 4
19 signature buildings. Pg. 14 – Summary of Design Guidelines should be revised to
20 include number of stories in addition to building heights Pg. 15 -text that indicates that
21 ground floor retail/service commercial is permitted but not required – suggest to put same
22 language in the office district discussion (pg 22). Pg 17 – indicate max. number of
23 stories. Pg. 20 – include maximum height in both feet and stories. Pg. 21 modify Ely
24 Road cross-section to show 2 stories on first tier of buildings closest to Ely Rd. – Should
25 include graphic to show how project relates to Frates and to the Urban Separator going
26 south. Pg. 22 – office area, 2nd line, 2nd paragraph – make the text match the urban
27 framework and insert same language as on page 15 that ground floor retail commercial
28 uses permitted but not required. Pg. 23 – include four story limit to Office Area
29 guidelines, Pg. 24 – Show two story step back on Frates Road section. Pg. 26, indicate
30 two story building limit in Gateway Commercial Guidelines in addition to 35-foot
31 building height limit. Pg. 30 – indicate that trees will be provided along linear path on
32 southern greenbelt to trees that will break up view of project. Pg. 37, state that the
33 project will go to SPARC. Pg. 39 – parking ratios – indicate that residents will be
34 allowed to use non-residential parking on weekends. Pg. 43 – sign program to go
35 through design review – forego sign program until first commercial building. Appendix
36 A – not all uses apply to all land use areas – would be better to identify uses according to
37 “area” -Gateway, residential, commercial, etc. Illustrative Site Plan (11 x 17) should also
38 show/describe land uses immediately adjacent to project site to be consistent with other
39 graphics. Office/R&D buildings east of A Street should be identified as Mixed use
40 instead of office/R&D.

41
42 Bill White: Addressed traffic issues.

43
44 Commissioner Vouri: Would like you to apply mitigations to bring Lakeville &
45 Baywood and Calle Ranchero to Level of Service C.

1 Alan Tilton: Referred to pg.16 of the Traffic Study – bringing the intersection of
2 Lakeville & Baywood to Level D. Calle Ranchero level of service overall for the
3 intersection it is much better than presented.

4
5 Vin Smith: Would prefer to have the mitigation reflect that project would not exceed
6 Bay Area Quality Management Standards.

7
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Regarding Draft findings – tied to Neighborhood Plan on
9 Attachments 2, 3 and 4.

10
11 M/S O'Brien/von Raesfeld to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration as amended
12 including the Neighborhood Plan.

13
14 All in favor:

15 Commissioner O'Brien: Yes
16 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
17 Commissioner Monteschio: Absent
18 Commissioner Glass: Yes
19 Commissioner Barrett: No
20 Commissioner Vouri: No
21 Commissioner Von Raesfeld: Yes

22
23 M/S O'Brien/Dargie to adopt findings for General Plan Amendment referencing the
24 amended Neighborhood Plan.

25
26 All in favor:

27
28 Commissioner O'Brien: Yes
29 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
30 Commissioner Monteschio: Absent
31 Commissioner Glass: Yes
32 Commissioner Barrett: No
33 Commissioner Vouri: No
34 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes

35
36 M/S O'Brien/von Raesfeld to adopt findings for PCD as referenced in the amended
37 Neighborhood Plan.

38
39 All in favor:

40
41 Commissioner O'Brien: Yes
42 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
43 Commissioner Monteschio: Absent
44 Commissioner Glass: Yes
45 Commissioner Barrett: No
46 Commissioner Vouri: No
47 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes

1
2
3 M/S O'Brien/von Raesfeld to adopt the Neighborhood Plan as amended.
4

5 All in favor:

6
7 O'Brien: Yes
8 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
9 Commissioner Monteschio: Absent
10 Commissioner Glass: Yes
11 Commissioner Barrett: No
12 Commissioner Vouri: No
13 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes
14
15

16 **DRAFT FINDINGS FOR ADOPTION OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE**
17 **DECLARATION**
18

19 **Mitigated Negative Declaration:**
20

- 21 1. That based upon the Revised Initial Study, potential impacts resulting from the
22 project have been identified. Mitigation measures have been proposed and agreed
23 to by the applicant as a condition of project approval that will reduce potential
24 impacts to less than significant. In addition, there is no substantial evidence that
25 supports a fair argument that the project, as conditioned and mitigated, would
26 have a significant effect on the environment.
27
- 28 2. That the project does not have the potential to affect wildlife resources as defined
29 in the State Fish and Game Code, either individually or cumulatively, and is
30 exempt from Fish and Game filing fees because it is proposed on existing
31 undeveloped site surrounded by urban development.
32
- 33 3. That the project is not located on a site listed on any Hazardous Waste Site List
34 compiled by the State pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government
35 Code.
36
- 37 4. That the Planning Commission and City Council reviewed the Revised Initial
38 Study and considered public comments before making a recommendation on the
39 project.
40
- 41 5. That a Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared to ensure compliance
42 with the adopted mitigation measures.
43
- 44 6. That the record of proceedings of the decision on the project is available for
45 public review at the City of Petaluma Planning Division, City Hall, 11 English
46 Street, Petaluma, California.
47

1 **Mitigation Measures**

2
3 All mitigation measures, as identified in the Initial Study for the Southgate Business and
4 Residential Development, revised February 6, 2002, are herein incorporated.
5

6
7 **DRAFT FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

8
9 1. That the proposed amendment is deemed to be in the public interest to provide for
10 orderly development of appropriate commercial, office, and residential uses. The
11 Mixed-Use designation allows a broad range of uses to be developed at this site.
12 The Mixed-Use designation at this location will not create a nuisance to existing
13 surrounding uses.
14

15 2. That the proposed General Plan Amendment is consistent and compatible with the
16 rest of the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected.
17

18 The Mixed-Use designation at this site incorporates the policies to develop
19 underutilized properties of the General Plan. The Southgate proposal, subject to
20 modifications recommended by Staff, will help the City further the objectives,
21 policies and programs of the General Plan.
22

23 3. That the potential impacts of the proposed amendment have been assessed and
24 have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare.
25 An Initial Study was prepared which analyzed the potential environmental
26 impacts of the General Plan Amendment. Based upon the Initial Study, a
27 determination was made that no significant environmental effects would result.
28

29 4. That the proposed amendment has been processed in accordance with the
30 applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California
31 Environmental Quality Act.
32

33 The requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have been
34 satisfied through the preparation of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative
35 Declaration, which identifies changes to the project and/or mitigation measures
36 that would avoid or reduce to a level of insignificance, potential impacts
37 generated by the proposed amendment to the General Plan land use designations.
38 A copy of notice of intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was published in the
39 Argus Courier and provided to residents and occupants within 300 feet of the site,
40 in compliance with City of Petaluma CEQA requirements.
41
42
43
44
45
46

**DRAFT FINDINGS FOR REZONING FROM S - STUDY DISTRICT TO
PCD-PLANNED COMMUNITY DISTRICT**

- 1
2
3
4
5 1. The proposed Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 1072 N.C.S., to classify and
6 rezone the subject parcel from S- Study District to PCD - Planned Community
7 District will result in a more desirable use of land and a better physical
8 environment than would be possible under any single zoning district or
9 combination of zoning districts.

10
11 The proposed uses comply with the Mixed Use General Plan designation, which
12 allows for a combination of residential, commercial or retail uses on one parcel.
13 Additionally, this proposal incorporates the policies and guidelines of the PCD-
14 Planned Community District of Article 19 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- 15
16 2. The public necessity, convenience and welfare clearly permit and will be
17 furthered by the proposed Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, reclassifying and
18 rezoning the subject property to Planned Community District.

19
20 The Southgate Neighborhood Plan – Appendix A describes permitted and
21 conditional uses as well as those that would not otherwise be allowed to be
22 established at this location. This specific list of uses prevents the creation of any
23 nuisance to the existing surrounding uses.

- 24
25 3. The requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have been
26 satisfied through the preparation of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative
27 Declaration, which identifies changes to the project and/or mitigation measures
28 that would avoid or reduce to a level of insignificance, potential impacts
29 generated by the proposed amendment to the General Plan land use designations.
30 A copy of notice of intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was published in the
31 Argus Courier and provided to residents and occupants within 300 feet of the site,
32 in compliance with City of Petaluma CEQA requirements.

33
34
35 **DRAFT FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF THE**
36 **SOUTHGATE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN - PLANNED COMMUNITY DISTRICT**
37 **DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND DESIGN GUIDELINES**
38

- 39
40 1. That the PCD Development Standards will result in appropriate and compatible
41 uses in the district.

42
43 The proposed PCD will allow for a mix of uses commercial, office and residential
44 that is compatible with the existing surroundings uses. Design
45 guidelines/development standards have been prepared to ensure that the proposed
46 uses and structures are compatible with the surrounding uses. The proposal
47 results in a more desirable use of the land than would be possible under any single

1 zoning district or combination of zoning districts. The PCD would provide a
2 group of commercial, office and residential uses to supply the day-to-day needs of
3 the surrounding area.

4
5 2. That the plan for the proposed development presents a unified and organized
6 arrangement of buildings and service facilities which are appropriate in relation to
7 adjacent or nearby properties, and that provisions for adequate landscaping and/or
8 screening are included to ensure compatibility. Conditions have been
9 incorporated requiring design and development standards that are compatible with
10 neighboring developments.

11
12 3. The requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have been
13 satisfied through the preparation of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative
14 Declaration, which identifies changes to the project and/or mitigation measures
15 that would avoid or reduce to a level of insignificance, potential impacts related to
16 the rezoning of the site from S- study to PCD - Planned Community District.
17 Based upon the Initial Study, a determination was made that no significant
18 environmental effects would result.

19
20 4. *Adequate available public and private spaces are designated on the Planned
21 Community District Development Plan. Through mitigation measures and
22 project conditions, adequate building setbacks and other project amenities are
23 provided.*

24
25 *The Planned Community District provides for specific design criteria and
26 development standards, which regulate the proposed development of the site.*

27
28 5. The development of the subject property project in the manner proposed by the
29 applicant, and as conditioned, will not be detrimental to the public welfare, will be
30 in the best interests of the City, and will be in keeping with the general intent and
31 spirit of the zoning regulations of the City of Petaluma, and with the Petaluma
32 General Plan.

33
34 The project, as conditioned, complies with the applicable provisions of the
35 Municipal Code and the General Plan. The recommendations and conditions of
36 City Departments have been incorporated into conditions of approval to the extent
37 that they apply to Development Plan.

38
39 6. The Southgate Development Plan will help the City further the objectives,
40 policies and programs of the Petaluma General Plan.

41
42 The project as proposed supports a number of Policies of the Petaluma General
43 Plan such as:

44 **Community Character Element Policy 27** - *The City shall require the provisions
45 of privately owned open space in residential developments of more than 15 units
46 were made necessary by project density or design, or lack or proximity to public
47 parks and open space.*

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
47

The Southgate Development Plan proposes two recreational centers that include swimming pools and other facilities, as well as recreational fields that can be used for organized sports, including Little League baseball.

Land Use and Growth Management Element Policy 12 – *The Urban Separator shall continue to serve its function as a continuous chain of open space on the East Side, while being intermittent on the West side.*

Land Use and Growth Management Element Policy 14 – *The City shall extend the length of the Urban Separator where feasible, at a maximum width of 300 feet.*

Land Use and Growth Management Element Policy 18 – *Details of public access pathways along the entire length of the Urban Separator shall be established during the development review process, in concert with project design.*

Along the east boundary [to be determined by Planning Commission/City Council] Along the south boundary that borders existing agricultural lands with the County, a 100-foot wide greenbelt is proposed. In addition to serving as a recreational area, this greenbelt, or linear park, is intended to function as a collector of storm water from the entire site, which slowly feeds into a retention basin (“Laguna Mateo”) at the southwest corner of the site.

Land Use and Growth Management Element Policy 23 - *Convenience shopping in proximity to residential shall be encouraged.*

The project proposes up to 25,000 square feet of retail space, which will serve both the Southgate residents and the adjacent residential area northwest of Frates Road.

Land Use and Growth Management Element Policy 28 - *The City shall support residential development only in those areas where adequate City facilities are available or will be provided with development.*

Conditions to ensure that adequate City services will be imposed at the appropriate stages of the project entitlement and building permit review process.

Open Space, Conservation, and Energy Element Policy 25 - *Developers shall provide adequate drainage and erosion control during construction.*

In addition to providing the on-site detention facility that would reduce the amount of drainage entering the City’s stormwater system, the developer will be required to conform to City and State regulations by providing an erosion control and storm water pollution prevention plan, which shall be adhered to throughout project construction.

Park and Recreation Element Policy 5 - *The city should provide park sites to respond to the needs of a diverse population. The needs include creek side*

1 *systems; trail ways for pedestrians, joggers, and bicyclists, and non-traditional*
2 *types of recreation such as habitat restoration projects, community gardens, and*
3 *skateboarding.*

4
5 A variety of open space and recreation areas are proposed as part of the Southgate
6 Development. These spaces would provide opportunities for organized sports,
7 walking, jogging and bicycling in areas with views of the surrounding landscape.
8 In addition to the proposed recreational field and two recreational centers, the
9 project includes a 100-foot wide linear park proposed along the east edge of the
10 site will include a riparian area that would provide habitat for birds and other
11 wildlife, and the Laguna Mateo retention basin at the southwest corner of the site
12 may provide bird watching opportunities, as well as function as a collector of
13 storm water from the entire site. Proposed “Neighborhood Green” and outdoor
14 plazas would also respond to the recreational needs of a diverse population.

15

16

17

DRAFT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

18

19

From the Planning Division:

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

1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit or building permit, final site plans, architecture, landscape plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee. Plans submitted for final SPARC approval shall include a photometric plan for all exterior lighting, including the building, parking lot, landscape and pedestrian lighting. Said plan shall include a detail of the types of fixtures to be installed for review and approval by the planning staff. The lighting plan shall be reviewed with regard to the Site Plan and Architectural Review standards for lighting as well as the lighting standards outlined in the Bike Plan (Objective O; Policy 39, 40 and 41).
2. The Southgate Design Guidelines shall be revised to indicate that bicycle facilities and amenities shall be provided in accordance with the adopted City of Petaluma Bicycle Plan.
3. The applicant shall be required to utilize Best Management Practices regarding pesticide/herbicide use and fully commit to Integrated Pest Management techniques for the protection of pedestrian/bicyclists. The applicant shall be required when pesticide/herbicide use occurs that appropriate signed be installed warning pedestrians.
4. The owner shall clearly sign all Class II lanes. Said signs shall be installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Planning Department review.
5. Any work or traffic control proposed within State right-of-way, including proposed right-in, right-out only access on Lakeville Highway, will require review and approval by the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans).

- 1 The applicant shall be required prior to issuance of building permits to obtain any
2 necessary permit from Caltrans.
3
- 4 6. All mitigation measures adopted in conjunction with the of the Mitigated
5 Negative Declaration revised February 6, 2002 (Resolution _____ N.C.S.) for
6 the Southgate Business and Residential Development are herein incorporated by
7 reference as conditions of project approval.
8
- 9 7. Upon approval by the City Council, the applicant shall pay the \$35.00 Notice of
10 Determination fee to the Planning Division. The check shall be made payable to
11 the County Clerks. Planning staff will file the Notice of Determination with the
12 County Clerks office within five (5) days after receiving Council approval.
13
- 14 8. Plans submitted for building permit shall include a plan sheet, which shall contain
15 all conditions of approval/mitigation measures for review by the Planning
16 Division.
- 17 9. In the event that archaeological remains are encountered during grading, work
18 shall be halted temporarily and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted for
19 evaluation of the artifacts and to recommend future action. The local Indian
20 community shall also be notified and consulted in the event any archaeological
21 remains are uncovered.
- 22 10. All above-ground meters and transformers shall be shown on plans and screened
23 with landscaping materials subject to approval of the Community Development
24 Department. Any combination of earth berms, retaining walls and landscaping
25 may be used to accomplish said screening.
- 26 11. A reproducible copy of the finalize PCD Development Plan and written Standards
27 incorporating all project conditions of approval, shall be submitted to the Planning
28 Department prior to issuance of development permits/Final Map recordation.
- 29 12. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or any of its
30 boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or
31 proceeding against the City, its boards, commission, agents, officers, or
32 employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, the approval of the project when
33 such claim or action is brought within the time period provided for in applicable
34 State and/or local statutes. The City shall promptly notify the applicants of any
35 such claim, action, or proceeding. The City shall coordinate in the defense.
36 Nothing contained in this condition shall prohibit the City from participating in a
37 defense of any claim, action, or proceeding if the City bears its own attorney's
38 fees and costs, and the City defends the action in good faith.

39
40 **From the Fire Marshal:**

41
42 Listed below are fire protection requirements for the above-mentioned project:
43

- 1 13. The building/s shall be protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system as required
2 by the Uniform Fire Code and shall be provided with central station alarm
3 monitoring, which will notify the fire department in the event of water flow. In
4 addition, a local alarm shall be provided on the exterior and interior of the
5 building.
6
 - 7 14. A permit is required for fire alarm system and sprinkler installations and
8 alterations. A minimum of two sets of plans with calculations shall be submitted
9 to Fire Marshal for approval prior to commencing work.
10
 - 11 15. Fire sprinkler systems installed in buildings of undetermined occupancy/use shall
12 be designed and installed to provide .33 gallons per minute per square foot, over a
13 minimum area of 3,000 square feet.
14
 - 15 16. No combustible construction above the foundation is allowed unless an approved
16 asphalt surfaced road is provided to with 150 feet of the furthest point of a
17 structure and the fire hydrants have been tested, flushed and serviced.
18
 - 19 17. Roundabouts shall meet city standards for turn radius of fire apparatus
20
 - 21 18. A minimum of 8 feet stub-out for water line shall be provided for each parcel.
22
 - 23 19. Required access roads, which are dead-ended, shall terminate in an approved
24 emergency vehicle turnaround. A cul-de-sac designed to City standards is
25 required.
26
-

27
28
29 **NEW BUSINESS:**
30 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
31

32
33 **III. TRADITIONS ROUNDABOUT (Traditions Subdivision) – Request for**
34 **General Plan Amendment to realign the intersection of Sonoma Mountain**
35 **Parkway and Corona Road per Resolution No. 2001-185 N.C.S. which**
36 **determined that the preferred means of redesigning the intersection of**
37 **Sonoma Mountain Parkway and Corona Road shall be a “roundabout”**
38 **APN 137-061-014 & portion of APN 137-061-018**
39 **Project File No. GPA00004**
40 **Project Planner: Phil Boyle**
41

42 Due to the late hour it was agreed that there would be no formal staff or applicant
43 presentations.
44

45 Alan Tilton, Project Traffic Engineer, answered questions from the Commission
46 regarding his experience with roundabouts in Petaluma and about appropriate
47 landscaping for safety and sight distance purposes.

1
2 Commissioner Dargie: Asked Alan Tilton about traffic volume.

3
4 M/S Vouri/Barrett to forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve the
5 proposed General Plan and Corona/Ely Specific Plan Amendments.
6

7
8
9 All in favor:

10
11 O'Brien: Yes
12 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
13 Commissioner Monteschio: Absent
14 Commissioner Glass: Yes
15 Commissioner Barrett: Yes
16 Commissioner Vouri: Yes
17 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes
18
19
20
21

22 **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**
23 ***DRAFT***
24 **FINDINGS**
25

- 26
27 **1. *The traffic analysis for the proposed project concluded that the level of service***
28 ***at the intersection of Sonoma Mountain Parkway and Corona Road with the***
29 ***configuration of a modern roundabout would be LOS C, or better, during both***
30 ***the morning and evening commute periods.***
31
32 **2. That the potential impacts of the proposed amendment have been assessed and**
33 **have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare.**
34
35 **3. In compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act,**
36 **an Initial Study was prepared, which included a roundabout configuration. Based**
37 **upon the Initial Study, a determination was made that no significant**
38 **environmental effects would result. A copy of this notice was published in the**
39 **Argus Courier and provided to residents and occupants within 300 feet of the site,**
40 **in compliance with CEQA requirements.**
41
42 **4. That the proposed General Plan Amendment is consistent, compatible and**
43 **supports a number of policies of the General Plan and the Corona/Ely Specific**
44 **Plan.**
45

- 1 5. That the proposed amendment is deemed to be in the public interest to provide for
2 orderly development of infrastructure. The development of the proposed
3 roundabout will not create a nuisance to existing surrounding uses.
4
5
6
7

8 **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**
9 ***DRAFT***
10 **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**
11
12
13

14 From the Planning Division:
15

- 16 1. Plans submitted for building permit shall include a plan sheet, which shall contain
17 all conditions of approval/mitigation measures for review by the Planning
18 Division. Plans submitted for building permit shall also be in substantial
19 compliance with the approved plans date stamped:
20 a. Proposed Roundabout Plan- Date Stamped
21 December 28 2001;
22 b. Preliminary Landscape Plan- Date Stamped
23 December 28 2001;
24
25 2. Plans submitted for final SPARC approval shall include cross sections of Sonoma
26 Mountain Parkway, which are consistent with Chapter 4-Land Use and Design
27 page 49 of the *Corona/Ely Specific Plan* and the *Sonoma Mountain Parkway and*
28 *Ely Road Streetscape Design Guidelines*, November 27, 1990.
29
30 3. All mitigation measures adopted in conjunction with the Mitigated Negative
31 Declaration for the Traditions project are herein incorporated by reference as
32 conditions of project approval.
33

34 **From the Engineering Section:**
35

- 36 4. ***Construction plans submitted to the City for building permit shall meet the***
37 ***established industry design criteria.***
38
39 5. ***The developer shall show dedication of the necessary right-of way for the***
40 ***roundabout construction on plans submitted to the City for building permit.***
41

42 **From the Fire Marshal:**
43

- 44 6. ***The traffic circle is conditionally approved and appears to meet drawing***
45 ***specification for fire apparatus use. Final approval of the roundabout is***
46 ***subject to an actual driving test on a prototype setup with traffic cones approved***
47 ***by the Fire Marshal.***
48

1 **Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC):**

2
3 Prior to the Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review and approval the
4 following conditions shall be incorporated into the project plans.
5

- 6 7. Lighting: Plans submitted for building permit shall include lighting type and
7 location that do not cast direct glare into cyclist/pedestrian eyes.
- 8 8. Pedestrian Improvements: Plans submitted for building permit shall include safe
9 pedestrian passage across all three approaches of the roundabout.
- 10 9. Signs: Plans submitted for building permit shall include “Share the Road” signs
11 and “Pedestrian Crossing” signs alerting motorists to bicycle and pedestrian
12 traffic.
- 13 10. Through-Travel: This roundabout shall include safe pedestrian and bicycle access
14 around the entire circumference, plans submitted for building permit shall
15 including the following:
- 16 a) Greater separation of bikes/pedestrians and cars including widening Corona
17 toward Sonoma Mountain Parkway,
- 18 b) Create separate dedicated Class II bike lanes up to the periphery of this project for
19 any bicycle entering or exiting the circle.
- 20 c) Include raised colored crosswalks, which have a distinctive treatment to slow
21 traffic at point where cyclists/pedestrians enter from separate facility.
- 22 d) Use various pavement treatments (e.g. barriers, colors, raised surfaces) throughout
23 to provide visual and other effects that lend to traffic calming.
- 24 11. Landscaping: For safety reasons no trees should be allowed in the roundabout, as
25 they reduce 360-degree visibility. Other decorative effects for the roundabout can
26 be created including those that honor the history of the area, but do not so
27 effectively block vision (i.e. public art).

30
31 **IV. LIAISON REPORTS:** None

32
33 Adjournment: 12:40

34
35 S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\031202.doc