



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 **Planning Commission Minutes**
3 **January 14, 2003 – 7:00 PM**

4
5 Commissioners: *Present:* Asselmeier, Barrett*, Dargie, McAllister, Healy, von
6 Raesfeld

7 * Chair

8
9 Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director
10 George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
11 Betsi Lewiter, Project Planner
12 Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary
13

14
15 **ROLL CALL:**

16 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of November 26, 2002 and December 10, 2002
17 were approved as amended, M/S vonRaesfeld/Dargie; 5-0; Healy abstained.

18 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

19 **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

20 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** Commissioner Barrett noted that Whole Foods would
21 be donating 5% of their sales to COTS on Thursday, January 16, 2003.

22 **CORRESPONDENCE:** Three letters in opposition to the Factory Outlet expansion,
23 Planning Commission Handbook, letter regarding the Gatti Property.

24 **APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was read.

25 **LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.
26

27
28 Public hearing began: 7:00
29
30
31

32 **NEW BUSINESS:**

33 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

34
35 **I. PETALUMA VILLAGE MARKETPLACE, 2200 Petaluma Blvd. North**
36 **AP No: 007-391-009, 048-080-038**

1 **File: REZ02001**
2 **Planner: Betsi Lewitter**

3
4 Proposed modification of River Oaks/Petaluma Factory Outlet Village Master
5 Plan Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report.

6
7 Continued from December 10, 2002.

8
9 Betsi Lewitter presented the project.

10
11 Brad Stipe, Chelsea Proeprty Group: Presented an overview of the project.

12
13 Dan Tocchini, North American Cinemas: Gave a history and background of North
14 American Cinemas.

15
16 Darrell Evanstreet, Architects Orange: Presented the architecture.

17
18 Phil Vandertulen, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape architecture for the
19 project.

20
21 John Courtney, Lamphier & Gregory: Introduced the team who worked on the EIR.
22 Gave a history of the original EIR and the draft subsequent EIR and identified issues
23 having significant impacts.

24
25 Public comment opened:

26
27 Vince Landoff, 12 Cordelia Drive: Questioned items protecting endangered species
28 during construction, increased flooding downstream, is a cross town connector being
29 considered and if so who will pay the costs? Existing mall doing poorly – many stores
30 closed. Employees of the factory outlet cannot afford homes here. Retail here will kill
31 out downtown business. Signage – will this become a Las Vegas strip? Concern
32 regarding the traffic impact at Petaluma Boulevard North and Payran Street intersection.
33 Offset detention ponding – not a parking lot. Issues: traffic impacts, water consumption,
34 increase in demand on sewer plant prior to construction of new plant.

35
36 Janice Cader Thomson: Identified a proposal for a project @ North McDowell – Deer
37 Creek project proposal for 215,000 square feet of commercial space plus 300 residential
38 units – competing interests. Suggested reading the Petaluma Master Plan Watershed
39 documents – it identifies 13 tributaries that converge at Denman Flat and Corona Reach.
40 The current proposal is in the Corona Reach area. Upstream development will degrade
41 the flood fix. Discussed a letter from the Anderson brothers regarding species of birds on
42 the proposed site that the DSEIR should consider. Regarding traffic – how will
43 improvements be paid for and how will it be implemented? Denman Flat used to hold
44 water, but has been filled in over time. Why build a 12-plex in the flood plain –
45 downtown, or Kenilworth is a more appropriate site. Seems fraudulent to ask the federal
46 government for money for flood control, then to build more development which would
47 increase flooding. River walk looks different in person than what is presented here.

1 Concern regarding destruction of old oak trees. Should wait until General Plan and
2 Central Petaluma Specific Plan are done.

3
4 David Moore, 19 Bernice Court: Believe EIR finding that it does not have significant
5 flooding impact is incorrect. Huge oversight that document doesn't address USACOE
6 flooding project not being done. Read an article from the December Press Democrat –
7 regarding development and impervious surfaces increasing flooding - unwise to approve
8 EIR – more information and discussion on flooding needed.

9
10 Supurb 7 – Sarah Marcia, Ashley Ditmer, Elizabeth Comstock, Madison Webb, Noelle
11 Bisson, Liza Idall: Interested in a movie theater, however, think a movie theatre in the
12 downtown is a more appropriate place. Have two requests: a public meeting to discuss
13 possible site and finding a spot downtown.

14
15 John Cheney, 55 Rocca Drive: Information regarding flooding postdated and inadequate.
16 No remapping of river from FEMA since 1989. Referred to a report - does not make any
17 sense to build in the floodplain. Need a movie theater, need money for the City, do not
18 need to develop in the floodplain. Chelsea needs to wait until the hydrology report from
19 the General Plan is produced. Finish flood project, remapping by FEMA, and an
20 independent hydrological study from the new general plan.

21
22 Bob Martin, 171 Payran Street: Most important mitigation for the project is zero net fill.
23 Letter of map revision should be filed with FEMA. The site is one of the most flood
24 prone areas in Petaluma.

25
26 Maxine Durney, 198 Ely Road North: Speaking in behalf of valley oak trees. These
27 trees are disappearing in California. Valley oaks need to be left alone.

28
29 Elaine Woodruff, 717 North McDowell: Object to the expansion of Outlet Mall. Outlets
30 were built in a wetland and wildlife corridor – mitigations don't work. Only nature can
31 create a wetland – 81% of mitigations are failures. Do not compound a mistake.

32
33 John Kinsella, 532 Howard Street: Against the project because it diverts business from
34 downtown, expands a retail mall that is below average, will create major traffic, interfere
35 with delicate wetlands, asphalt will cause flooding downstream.

36
37 Marty Bennett, 1967A Sonoma, Living Wage Coalition of Sonoma County: Presented
38 document “A Living Wage for Santa Rosa and Petaluma.” Wanted to speak to economic
39 impact, referred to page 3-3 and 3-4 of the EIR. Challenged those assumptions. EIR
40 exaggerates the jobs to be created – economic impact is misleading. Project violates the
41 general plan mandate for city-centered growth. Hidden subsidies and trade offs for low
42 paying jobs – MediCal, increased emergency room use, Section 8 housing vouchers.
43 Provided a questionnaire. 270-290, 34% fulltime, 66% part time, entry wage is \$8.13/hr.
44 Aggregate wage of \$9.59 is high. Turnover rate is 50-75%/year. Workers are not
45 teenagers as the EIR states. Workers at Outlet are locked out of the housing market in
46 Sonoma County.

1 Stan Gold, 615 King Road: Two topics. EIR and the issue of mitigation. Mitigations
2 reduce or eliminate impacts. Funds must come from known source, funds must be
3 sufficient and received in a timely manner. Planning Commission has no obligation to
4 give a green light when there is community degradation. Community can grow as a
5 freeway corridor or a revitalized downtown where all monies and concern should go.
6 San Jose is a good example of cannibalizing the downtown area. Urge the Planning
7 Commission to focus on downtown.

8
9 Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Want to reintroduce all comments, questions,
10 concerns I made on the previous EIR. Redwood Business Park had not been built when
11 this project was initially built. Chelsea is exceeding constitutional rights – building in a
12 floodplain and rent, lease or sell the property to others. Identified the California
13 Floodplain Management Report which came out December 12, 2002 – urged it be read.
14 Get on to more important things, like the Central Petaluma Specific Plan.

15
16 David Keller, 1327 I Street: Addressed claim in the EIR regarding the consistency with
17 General Plan central goals. Asked that the comment period be extended. Wanted to
18 know what kind of tenants were being pursued? Need to know in order to assess traffic
19 impacts and economic impacts on existing businesses. Mapping in EIR is very unclear
20 regarding what is in the City limits and what is in the county. Need story poles – was
21 requested last spring. Need specifics on sales tax versus property tax on projections of
22 the applicant. New neighborhood at Deer Creek proposed. Other projects being
23 proposed need to be considered in the cumulative impact. Central Petaluma Specific
24 Plan was omitted in the EIR. Quoted Policy 3.1 in CPSP.

25
26 Break at 9:10

27
28 Resumed at 9:20

29
30 David Keller (continued): Most concerned about compliance with the General Plan –
31 referred to page 26 of the EIR. Facades being proposed – could be anywhere. Hinders
32 Petaluma's character and identity. Will displace the auction and slaughterhouse –
33 agriculture, creamery – do not want to lose agriculture – project is threatening those
34 businesses due to the increase in property values. Does not conform to River Access and
35 Enhancement Plan. Why is roadway in protected area? Parking lots intrude into
36 setbacks. Quoted Program 14A. Opined roadway not being constructed at narrowest
37 point. No analysis done of using existing roadway rather than building another. Use the
38 land for the natural wetlands. Violates goals of River Plan and General Plan. New
39 mapping floor elevations are 23 ft – if in the floodplain don't build. Need to look at what
40 will happen when rest of basin is developed. Area needs to be remapped. Wealth will be
41 created in Petaluma and transferred somewhere else. Acknowledged in EIR project will
42 increase traffic impacts downtown. Will require adoption of overriding considerations.
43 EIR has major conflicts with the general plan. Preserve the site as open space for the
44 City of Petaluma – river walk can be built without project by using redevelopment
45 monies. Area should be purchased as central park for the City.

1 M/S vonRaesfeld/McAllister to continue to January 28, 2003.

2
3 All in favor:

4
5 Council Member Healy: Yes
6 Commissioner Dargie: Yes
7 Commissioner McAllister: Yes
8 Chair Barrett: Yes
9 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes
10 Commissioner Asselmeier: Yes

11
12 Commissioners asked the following questions be answered for the next meeting:

- 13 • Clarity on where the proposed road will go
14 • Owner of parcel that is Capri Creek
15 • Is Village Drive part of the project
16 • What mitigations would be required by the DFG and Army Corps of Engineers
17

18 Commissioner requested the following information prior to the next meeting:

- 19 • Minutes from the SPARC preliminary review
20 • Maps from the 1990 EIR
21 • California Flood plain Management Report
22 • Story poles prior to final EIR
23

24
25 **II. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

26 Commissioner Asselmeier reported issues from the Bike Advisory Committee to
27 be discussed by the Planning Commission: trophy homes; private parks; impact
28 fees and use of landscape assessment districts; gated communities.
29

30
31 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 32
33 a. **City Council:** New council had first meeting.
34 b. **SPARC:** Discussion of Downtown Streetscape, Staples, Cerf SFD;
35 General Plan Opportunities and Constraints, Incubator Lofts on a
36 preliminary basis; Plaza south façade remodel; preliminary review of the
37 Gatti subdivision.
38 c. **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Items mentioned above.
39 Davidon homes proposed at Windsor and D Street; city and county
40 working together on funding trails.
41 d. **Tree Advisory Committee:** Meets Wednesday, January 15, 2003
42

43 Adjournment: 10:05
44

Planning Commission Minutes - January 14, 2002

1
2