



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 cdd@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
February 11, 2003 – 7:00 PM

Commissioners: *Present:* Asselmeier, Barrett*, McAllister, von Raesfeld
Absent: Dargie, Healy

* Chair

Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director
George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Betsi Lewitter, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of January 28, 2003 were approved as amended.
MS Asselmeier/McAllister-4-0

PUBLIC COMMENT: Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Flooding problems in
Petaluma.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: None

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:

CORRESPONDENCE: None

APPEAL STATEMENT: Was read.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

Public hearing began: 7:00

OLD BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

- I. PETALUMA VILLAGE MARKETPLACE, 2200 Petaluma Blvd. North**
AP No: 007-391-009, 048-080-038
File: REZ02001

1 **Planner: Betsi Lewitter**

2

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

5

6 Continued from January 28, 2003.

7

8 Commissioner Dargie could not attend, however, he submitted written comments.

9

10 Commissioner Asselmeier: Introduced PBAC conditions for the project.

11

12 Commission Discussion on the EIR:

13

14 **Chapter 3:**

15

16 Commissioner von Raesfeld: No socioeconomic evaluation in this EIR – if you rely on
17 the original document, information needs to be updated.

18

19 **Chapter 4:**

20

21 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Soils based on old geotechnical report – is there anything
22 more current than 1990? No analysis of new access road – Village Drive.

23

24 **Chapter 5:**

25

26 Commissioner Asselmeier: Additional pollutants not addressed in post project
27 monitoring.

28

29 Commissioner Asselmeier: Referred to a letter dated 1/13/03 from Bruce Abelli-Amen.
30 Issues:

31 Pg. 3 referring to table on page 5-7, Table 5-3 – does not refer to applicable water quality
32 criteria that applies – add information to this table.

33 Pg. 4 regarding increased peak flows and flood elevations based on 100 year flood event.
34 Why not analyze 2, 5 and 10 year events?

35 Pg. 5 referring to water quality (Impact 5.2.) Post project monitoring – no mitigation that
36 requires monitoring – projected pollutants going into river need to be monitored.

37

38 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Refers to Corps of Engineers study from 1995 – is that the
39 most current information?

40

41 Pg. 5-9 – the recharge area is given in acres and square miles – does not relate to project
42 impacts – not enough information to draw conclusions.

43 Floodway/floodplain exhibits should be overlaid. How much of site is impervious?

44 Pg. 5-10- why are we using statistics from 1990 – need more recent information.

45 Pg. 5-17 – Refers to Dept. of Water Resource Study – what is this? Should be included
46 as attachment if short.

47

1 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked consultant to review Floodplain Management Report
2 dated 12/12/02 for mitigation measures.

3
4 Commissioner McAllister: On the on-site water impacts discussion, the grading plans
5 need to be compared with the drainage plans. Discussion should include on-site water
6 information on the depth of water.

7 Pg. 5-12, Table 5-6, refers to PWA2002 modeling for 100-year event. The plans have
8 different elevations referring to 2001 data.

9 Pg. 5-21, Table 5-10 discrepancy between the two tables (5-6 and 5-10).

10
11 Commissioner McAllister: Asked to integrate information to understand impacts. Asked
12 about table 5-10 – why does surface elevation decrease? Does this produce more flow
13 downstream?

14
15 Betty Andrews, Philip Williams & Associates: Many things going on in a 100-year flood
16 event. There is a change in the amount of water flowing in the river in the floodplain –
17 actually is affecting timing of the two. There are changes due to the proposed roadway
18 for the bridge construction in terms of the floodplain. The revised project altered how
19 water moved through the floodplain, particularly due to the roadway approach for the
20 bridge on the floodplain side.

21
22 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 5-23 re: detention basin reducing runoff – substantial
23 portion of project is south of detention basin. Expand explanation.

24
25 Chair Barrett: For Parcel A Hydrologic assessment district was not pursued by City –
26 does this need to be revisited for parcels B & C??

27
28 Commissioner Asselmeier: More discussion on pg. 5-23, how will basin function. Is
29 there a relationship with swales on Parcel C? How will it benefit water quality?

30
31 Commissioner McAllister: What is impact when the storm exceeds a 2-year level – what
32 mitigations are in place?

33
34 **Chapter 6:**

35
36 Commissioner Barrett: Confusion on footnotes – confusion of when original wetlands
37 research was done. Several mitigations on pg. 6-28 to 6-30 – mitigation suggested was
38 fencing to protect nests – do not think this is feasible. Pg. 6-25 loss of riparian habitat –
39 mitigation by obtaining a 404 permit and streambed alteration agreement does not make
40 sense – needs to be clearer – what does it entail? Look at the wetlands and the new
41 bridge – do not know how to evaluate. Want evaluation in final document.

42
43 Commissioner Asselmeier: Pg. 6-25: Can the wetland mitigation occur elsewhere on or
44 off site? (Impact 6.2). Where will it occur if it is off site? Pg. 6-24 under vegetation and
45 wildlife – refers to two detention basins – are there really two – need clarification.

1 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 6-6 – conditions have not changed, however, some
2 special species statuses have changed. Project site has changed, adding the railroad and
3 Village Drive. Why are we relying on the 1997 study? Why not do 2003 study?
4

5 Commissioner McAllister: Does not address permanent changes to wildlife, only
6 temporary construction effects. Vegetation removal would affect wildlife. Do not see
7 discussion and mitigation. Need to document what vegetation needs to be removed to
8 construct Village Drive. Mitigations would affect the project design if they became
9 conditions of approval.
10

11 **Chapter 7:**

12
13 Chair Barrett: Mitigations do not seem feasible: 7.1.1, 7.1.2 and 7.1.3. Cannot
14 comment on 7-2 and 7-3 because we do not have enough information on the bridge.
15

16 Commissioner Asselmeier: Clarify significant impacts in executive summary –
17 mitigations not on drawing board – this should be clarified. Measures identified but no
18 method for making it happen.
19

20 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 7-1-refers to Village Drive – needs to be consistent
21 with project description.
22

23 Commissioner McAllister: Want to see discussion of onsite circulation – specifically the
24 access road to site. Are there other ways to deal with site access? If Village Drive is not
25 part of the project – how is site accessed? How would circulation be handled on site? If
26 capital improvements are done – that also needs environmental review.
27

28 Commissioner Asselmeier: Mitigation 7.1.1 – need some discussion and how does it
29 affect the merchants on the Boulevard?
30

31 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Discussion of connection to Corona Road – what is the
32 basis for dismissing previous condition?
33

34 Commissioner Asselmeier: Pg 7-28 and 7-29 – discussion of bike paths – would be nice
35 to have a dedicated sidewalk along Petaluma Blvd.
36

37 **Chapter 8:** Last page describes this and it is adequate.
38

39 **Chapter 9:**

40
41 Commissioner Asselmeier: Pg. 9-10 Minimize impact on tenants and customers by
42 deleting the word “if” – don’t wait for complaints.
43

44 **Chapter 10:**
45

1 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 10-4 – we already exceed SCWA capacity. It is not
2 clear when improvements will take place – is there enough water? Mitigations do not
3 reflect this.

4
5 Commissioner McAllister: Refers to water demands – possibility we will have
6 availability, however, raises a question of cumulative demand by future projects.

7
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Is there enough water for the future – project must be
9 delayed if there is not enough water.

10
11 Commissioner McAllister: Need to be more specific on mitigations and how to save
12 water.

13
14 Commissioner Asselmeier: Do we need to know who the tenants are to find out about
15 water usage?

16
17 Chair Barrett: Can Final EIR state who the proposed tenants will be?

18
19 Commissioner McAllister: Pg. 10-13 – loop system is described – what is funding for
20 this? How does police and fire protection get addressed? Would like to see recycling
21 required rather than encouraged.

22
23 Commissioner von Raesfeld: If Village Drive is not constructed – would like a
24 discussion from Police and Fire if this is feasible.

25
26 **Chapter 11:**

27
28 Chair Barrett: Asked for Chelsea to discuss differences to the project since the
29 Preliminary Review at SPARC.

30
31 Brad Stipe: Asked the commission to address this question when discussing the project.

32
33 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked the applicant how the project addresses Petaluma's
34 heritage.

35
36 Brad Stipe: Original project is an agrarian design specific to Sonoma County. Project
37 will not be multi-story.

38
39 Commissioner McAllister: Pg. 11-6 and 11-7 – would like to see views from the river in
40 addition to views from 101. What is visual quality from the public amenity? Mitigation
41 11-1, pg. 11-8, - omit apparent – reduce bulk and mass of structures as a mitigation. Pg.
42 11-9– does not get us where we want to go.

43
44 Chair Barrett: There are large trees along 101 between the freeway and the buildings
45 south of the project - this could possibly mitigate the bulk and mass of some of the
46 buildings.

1 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Scenic vista area – missing view from 101 to the river –
2 expand discussion. What is the front of the buildings? Troubled by the use of “sound
3 design principles.” Cannot achieve these mitigations through SPARC. Missing
4 mitigation – leave out buildings to provide views, reduce the mass, treat 101 as important
5 as the front elevation. Mention buildings are in the position they are because of the flood
6 plain. Would like some discussion on how these large boxes are sound design principles.
7 No visual analysis of the bridge.

8
9 Commissioner Barrett: Expected to see mitigations from the prior EIR here to mitigate
10 visual impact. Trees would soften impact from the highway – is not mentioned.

11
12 Commissioner McAllister: 11.3.2 Landscape lighting – add more specific heights – more
13 emphasis on aesthetics.

14
15 **Chapter 12:**

16
17 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Does not discuss Village Drive or railroad parcel. May
18 want to discuss water agency parcel. Refers to calling County Planning Department if
19 discovery of cultural resources – is that correct?

20
21 Chapter 13: No discussion.

22
23 Chapter 14: Commission asked about the alternatives that were considered and not
24 selected.

25
26 John Courtney: Addressed these issues.

27
28 Commissioner McAllister: Not satisfied with the range of alternatives. There are
29 impacts that have not been addressed by the alternatives. Table 14-1, pg. 14-19 would
30 like additional information, footprint and paved area (actual site coverage).

31
32 M/S Asselmeier/von Raesfeld to produce a final SEIR for consideration and
33 recommendation. Prior to final SEIR story poles to be erected on site and staking
34 centerline of the proposed Village Drive.

35
36 Discussion followed regarding how comments will be included in the final SEIR.

37
38 All in favor:

39
40 Council Member Healy: Absent
41 Commissioner Dargie: Absent
42 Commissioner McAllister: Yes
43 Chair Barrett: Yes
44 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Yes
45 Commissioner Asselmeier: Yes

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

II. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

III. COMMISSION BUSINESS. Add to March 11, 2003 agenda: Discussion of when election of officers takes place and policy and procedures for placement of story poles.

III. LIAISON REPORTS:

- a. City Council: None.
- b. SPARC: None.
- c. Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee: Southgate 2 was discussed 1/22/03 – conditions adopted and policy matters and given to the project planner.
- d. Tree Advisory Committee: None

Adjournment: 9:24
