



**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](mailto: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**  
**January 28, 2003 – 7:00 PM**

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

\* Chair

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

---

**ROLL CALL:**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of January 14, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S Asselmeier/McAllister – 6-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Janice Cader Thomas, 732 C: presented a flyer on the river clean up scheduled for Sunday, April 27, 2003. Read a letter regarding new junior high school and the Kennilworth property.

Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Spoke about flooding in Petaluma.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT:** None

**COMMISSIONER’S REPORT:** None.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Numerous pieces of correspondence regarding the outlet expansion will be read into the record by Betsi Lewitter.

**APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was read.

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

---

Public hearing began: 7:00

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

1 **I. PETALUMA VILLAGE MARKETPLACE, 2200 Petaluma Blvd. North**  
2 **AP No: 007-391-009, 048-080-038**  
3 **File: REZ02001**  
4 **Planner: Betsi Lewitter**

5  
6 Proposed modification of River Oaks/Petaluma Factory Outlet Village Master  
7 Plan Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report.  
8

9 Continued from January 14, 2003.  
10

11 Betsi Lewitter: Presented materials requested by the Planning Commission at the last  
12 hearing. Read numerous pieces of correspondence into the record in favor of the project  
13 and one piece of correspondence opposed to the project.  
14

15 Public hearing continued:  
16

17 Stan Gold, 615 King Road: Presented photos showing standing water and the site and  
18 nearby properties. Spoke regarding mitigations, specifically traffic. Discusses cross  
19 town connectors, etc. – no money for this mitigation. Mitigation is not adequate unless it  
20 includes funding and timing. Need to make a decision about developing downtown or  
21 along the freeway. Referred to bad decisions on the Peninsula regarding where  
22 businesses are placed. Asked Commission to reject on the basis of shortcomings in the  
23 EIR.  
24

25 Vince Landoff, 12 Cordelia Drive: Referred to a new submission for preliminary SPARC  
26 review of a project at Deer Creek. Think this means a cross town connector is planned  
27 for Rainier – money will come from citizens. Freeway development will weaken the  
28 downtown. Want to maintain roots of Petaluma and its agricultural history. Reinforce  
29 character of downtown, preserve concentration, and attract shopping downtown. No  
30 funding established. Employees of outlet mall are paid minimum wages and cannot  
31 afford housing. Need a theatre downtown. Don't building in floodway.  
32

33 Mark Ferguson, 112 Rancho Benito Circle: Want to show support for the proposal.  
34 Petaluma needs to attract more retail to increase sales tax revenue. Think it is a perfect  
35 location for the theater and do think the Rainier overpass needs to go in. Want to  
36 eliminate congestion on the freeway. In the CPSP we will bring in more retail and mixed  
37 use development – think downtown will be served well with a theatre at the Outlet Mall.  
38 Think it is a win-win situation. As far as flooding – need to look at the watershed – it is  
39 47 square miles, only 8 within the city limits. This development seems like a drop in the  
40 bucket if you look at the total picture. Hope you will vote favorably.  
41

42 Lauren Williams, 12 North Napa Drive: President of Petaluma Trolley. Want to restore  
43 the trolley from the riverfront warehouse district to the factory outlet and beyond.  
44 Chelsea has been cooperative with the trolley. If expansion does not proceed, trolley  
45 could be the savior of the current outlet mall. Feel the trolley from the riverfront  
46 warehouse district to the outlet mall should be reflected in the EIR. Passed out pamphlets  
47 for the commissioners to read about the history of the trolley and Petaluma's history.

1  
2 Connie Heizer, 160 Petaluma Blvd. North: Have witnessed flooding in the Payran area.  
3 Regarding a flyer that was distributed by public relations for Chelsea – this is not about a  
4 theatre. The point is about the EIR.

5  
6 Jerry Price, 411 D Street: Appeal to the commission – look at the long term and the big  
7 picture. What is the benefit for the citizens? River enhancement plan needs to be  
8 implemented. CPSP needs to be implemented. Need to development well when it  
9 happens – need more housing, public transportation, etc. Would like a theatre downtown  
10 with adequate parking and close to public transportation. Consider redevelopment funds  
11 for just what they are – redevelopment and hopefully in the city center. Think Rainer  
12 would be costly. Consider a crossing at Corona.

13  
14 Murray Rockowitz, 418-8<sup>th</sup> Street: Have a business downtown. Have concerns regarding  
15 the EIR. Referred to the theatre in the north end of town, which is now empty. Have  
16 concerns regarding building in the floodplain and whether downtown can survive  
17 physically and financially.

18  
19 Geoff Cartwright, 56 Rocca Drive: Spoke about both EIRs for the project. A great deal  
20 of comments and data were submitted for the original EIR, which was not favorable. The  
21 result was a new project and a new EIR. Referred to a letter from the Sonoma County  
22 Water Agency, dated December, 2002. Do not want to subjugate the legal process.  
23 Think all comments need to be resubmitted.

24  
25 Connie Madden, 215 Water Street: Approval of this is putting the cart before the horse.  
26 In the General Plan discussions people want to preserve the downtown. If redevelopment  
27 money is put into the outlet expansion – flooding problems – all this is endangered. OK  
28 if it is environmentally sound. See Petaluma more like Sonoma and Healdsburg – do not  
29 want to be a cookie cutter. Other possible location for a movie theater would be at the  
30 Kennilworth site. Need to investigate other locations for a theatre.

31  
32 Matti Christiansen, 109 Rocca Drive: Board member of Payran-McKinley  
33 Neighborhood. Want to speak to the mitigations of the EIR. Need to mitigate absorption  
34 of water into the aquifer – is complicated. Want to put a human face on flood victims.

35  
36 William Turley, 37 Twin Creek Circle: Reflected living in San Diego where  
37 development caused flooding. Traffic and flooding are my main concerns.

38  
39 Elaine Woodruff, 717 North McDowell Blvd.: Mall is in Corona Reach floodplain which  
40 is a valuable wildlife and riparian corridor. Do not want to lose wetlands to development.  
41 Too many local wetlands have already died. Asked Commission to reject the expansion  
42 of the outlet mall.

43  
44 John Mills, 1315 D Street: Represent a typical family – biggest positive impact  
45 environmentally – thousands of miles driven to shop elsewhere. Can't find everyday  
46 things in the downtown area. Listed stores frequented in the last two months by his  
47 family. Spent money for his business outside of the City of Petaluma.

1  
2 Sherri Fabre Marcial, 164 Oxford Court: Against the outlet. Enjoy the wetlands and do  
3 not want downstream neighbors to flood. Will try to shop downtown first. Only see  
4 negative environmental impacts. Prefer that Chelsea take the mall elsewhere. Want a  
5 theatre downtown.

6  
7 David Keller, 1327 I Street: There is not sufficient information to make a decision on the  
8 he EIR. No info regarding the CPSP; no mention of modeling done by Fehr & Peers  
9 regarding traffic; no inclusion of cumulative impacts from projects “on the table”; no  
10 recognition of the central plan goals. Does not address growth impacts for Petaluma  
11 Blvd. North or current financial impacts and its relevance. Do not talk about the losses  
12 such as businesses, jobs, etc. Need fiscal analysis and impacts - done in 1991 – needs to  
13 be updated. Do not know the prospective tenants. Fails to address economic and  
14 environmental impacts from redevelopment funds going toward traffic improvements.  
15 Does not address commute patterns, housing, and minimum wage jobs. Put new retail  
16 downtown or on the boulevard instead of in the floodplain. Project definition is unclear.  
17 No way to coordinate services for new projects in the northwest portion of the City.  
18 Wetland losses on railroad right of way are not identified – inadequate treatment of storm  
19 runoff; no alternate sites for theatre. Planning Commission rejected prior EIR last spring  
20 – asked that it does not go forward. Public and the commission are ill informed.

21  
22 Lisa Thornton, 1733 Wynoochee Way: Is teenage delinquency discussed? Happens  
23 because there is nothing available for teenagers – there is no theatre and kids can’t get to  
24 one on bikes. Seems like a good place to expand shopping – next to the freeway. There  
25 is a point where this City needs to say yes so we do not have to leave the city to shop.  
26 Need a cross-town connector or on and off ramps to mitigate traffic. Would love to have  
27 a theatre downtown – do not know where it is possible – types of businesses downtown  
28 are limited. Support this EIR – mitigation for flooding has been addressed.

29  
30 Jane Hamilton, 110 G Street: DSEIR offers only a few answers – we need in depth  
31 answers. Do not need Petaluma to become “any town USA.” Can afford to hold out and  
32 for better development. Does not address CPSP. Have downtown impacts,  
33 redevelopment funds, traffic, and the Army Corps project been discussed? Cumulative  
34 projects must be revealed and looked at. Violates the General Plan in many ways.  
35 Petaluma is a tourist spot and big box development is not attractive to tourists. Need a  
36 theatre downtown or near one of our commercial centers. Need to incorporate data from  
37 new traffic model. Is in the wrong place – was originally and two wrongs do not make a  
38 right. Need to preserve the basin and the open space. DSEIR takes more than it gives –  
39 is inadequate.

40  
41 John Cheney, 55 Rocca Drive: Referred to movies that were filmed here because of our  
42 downtown character – will not happen at the outlet mall. Spoke about employment and a  
43 living wage so that people who work at the outlets can afford to live here. Leave as a hay  
44 field. Do not build here.

45  
46 Peter Dunlop, 12 Queens Lane: Referred to flooding a few years ago in the Payran area.  
47 Want any project to take into consideration the flooding impact. Want the EIR to take a

1 broader look at the impact of the citizens. Need more places for citizens to recreate in  
2 our town. Will have growth, however, we need to consider the type of development.  
3 This development does not have a broad enough vision of where we want Petaluma to be  
4 in 20 years. Where is our town center going to be? Theater in the Kennilworth area  
5 seems to make more sense.

6  
7 Patricia Tuttle Brown, 513 Petaluma Blvd. South: Important issue is not about  
8 squelching retail but whether issues can be mitigated. Need to put energy into  
9 downtown. Do not want to fall for this development being the only way it can happen.  
10 Two basics: Habitat and traffic. The watershed helps protect the downstream area from  
11 flooding, is a beautiful place – do we want this to be buildings? This is the only  
12 unchannelized portion of the river. Chelsea wants to rape this area. This cannot be  
13 mitigated.. Traffic – is mitigated by putting nails in the coffin of downtown. PBAC has  
14 a vision for Petaluma Blvd. North and South narrowing so there is room for pedestrians  
15 and the street. Who pays for the mitigations – redevelopment. Want our redevelopment  
16 funds to go to downtown. There are other, more appropriate places – depot area,  
17 Kennilworth, D Street and Petaluma Boulevard South. This is not a cross-town  
18 connector – money needs to go to downtown. Is in direct conflict with the General Plan.  
19 The developer made a mistake in this development. EIR glosses over the effect of  
20 downtown. Need improvements to downtown to draw people there.

21  
22 Bruce Hagen, 145 Grevilla Drive: Three comments – want the EIR to address tidal  
23 influence; project alternatives need to be addressed – a third alternative needs to be  
24 addressed – the Kennilworth area toward downtown. Acquire this parcel for urban open  
25 space and hiking trails. Inadequate EIR. Thanked all citizens for coming either in  
26 support or opposition. Let's do it downtown and not to downtown.

27  
28 Diane Reilly Torres, Rainier Avenue: What is feasible? There is not one feasible traffic  
29 mitigation. If the mitigation has significant impacts, these must be discussed in the EIR.  
30 Rainier would have no significant impacts? What about funding? Chelsea would put up  
31 \$1,200,000 for Rainier, but the City can use funds for the same affect elsewhere. If not  
32 spent by December 31, 2003 these funds can be used for something else. Trip reduction  
33 ordinances can be applied for those employing more than 100 employees, but the state  
34 says you can not force compliance, so it is not a mitigation. On page 5-2, the USGS  
35 gauges the City's environmental review guidelines – it talks about the use of consultants,  
36 and the City violates this (see DSEIR pages 5-1, 51-8 and 5-19) by using PWA (same as  
37 WESCO) – these hydrologists were involved in the prior EIR. On page 7-16k, the 2015  
38 traffic volumes used came from the 1993 Rainier EIR, but his is not true – is it a mistake?  
39 The Council meeting letter was about repealing the resolution on Rainier. You need to  
40 have the General Plan update consultants peer review these documents.

41  
42 Ronnie Mungle, 623 F Street: I love Petaluma – like the outlet mall and would like to see  
43 a theatre there so we do not have to leave Petaluma to go to the movies. Think Chelsea  
44 is trying to mitigate flooding problems. Think the benefits outweigh the risks.

45  
46 Larry King, 6 C Street: Urge the commission to reject this upon the inadequacy of the  
47 EIR. There are 31 significant impacts identified. Four of these impacts require acts

1 beyond the control of this City. The EIR with these deficiencies will attract litigation.  
2 Send it back to be done right.

3  
4 Clayton Engstrom, 125 Jesse Lane: Live directly across from the project. Own a home  
5 on Jesse Avenue in the floodplain. The first EIR was challenged and survived. The site is  
6 within the Urban Growth Boundary. Let's do this and do it right.

7  
8 Superb 7: 832 – 5<sup>th</sup> Street: Want theatre to be centrally located. Think what we do now  
9 affects our environment and will affect our families later.

10  
11 Matt Connolly: Have worked on the project since 1985. It is a good project. Listened to  
12 the city and focused on a specific project – all buildings are designed to be above the  
13 flood plain. When this site was vacant, the Payran area flooded. Will not create new  
14 impacts. Have done very conservative traffic estimates – looking at existing impacts on  
15 certain intersections. The project is in the redevelopment area. Asked that this be moved  
16 along. The EIR addresses impacts conservatively.

17  
18 Dan Tocchini: Operator of the proposed theatre. Biggest concern is exposure and  
19 parking – needs 600 parking places – do not know if downtown can handle this. People  
20 want a first class theatre and the outlet mall is the only location.

21  
22 Break at 9:15

23  
24 Resumed at 9:27 p.m.

25  
26 Scott Hess, 100 Union Street: Think it would be unwise to build in the floodplain.

27  
28 Scott Egide, 315 Walnut Street: Am a downtown merchant and I remember the first  
29 Chelsea phase. Do not want the jewel of downtown to be tarnished. Do not understand  
30 how a project can be contingent on a movie theatre. Would be nice to have several  
31 locations for theatres. Stop building to mitigate traffic. Additional cars on our streets  
32 will cause more problems. Would like to see the Planning Commission and City Council  
33 say no.

34  
35 Chair Barrett indicated that oral public comment was closed for the evening, however  
36 written public comment remains open until February 3, 2003.

37  
38 Brad Stipe, Chelsea Property Group: Comment regarding previous EIR being denied was  
39 incorrect. Decided to redraft the EIR to a more defined project. Think the document is  
40 very well written. Public comment will close on February 3, 2003. EIR is drafted with a  
41 consultant to the city of Petaluma and not to Chelsea.

42  
43 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked why the CPSP was not addressed in the EIR?

44  
45 Mike Moore: Addressed the Commission regarding the drafts of the Central Petaluma  
46 Specific Plan.

1 Chair Barrett: Asked if the traffic model used in the General Plan is available.

2  
3 Zack Matley, W-Trans: Land use has not been developed yet – so the traffic model is not  
4 available yet for cumulative impacts.

5  
6 Council Member Healy: General Plan presentation at Council on January 27, 2003.  
7 Thought it was closer to completion.

8  
9 Mike Moore: Addressed the issue – model may be available for the CPSP EIR.

10  
11 Commissioner McAllister: Asked about the landscape and hydrolic district that was  
12 mentioned.

13  
14 Mike Moore: There was an original condition to monitor mitigation areas – if continued  
15 beyond 5 years, the applicant was asked to form the district and fund it to pay for  
16 mitigation. Landscape assessment district not formed. Monitoring has been formed and  
17 is ongoing.

18  
19 Commissioner Asselmeier: There is a lot of information out there just beyond our reach  
20 – can we use this information now?

21  
22 Courtney: EIR was started when the NOP went out last year. EIR's would never be  
23 completed if they considered new information after the Notice of Preparation.

24  
25 Chair Barrett: Why was no mention of the CPSP made in the EIR?

26  
27 Commissioner Asselmeier: Have concerns that this was not considered in benefiting this  
28 project.

29  
30 Mike Moore: Asked the commission to be more specific about what is missing from the  
31 EIR. Comments have been made regarding the CPSP and the EIR, however, these  
32 comments will be responded to in the final EIR.

33  
34 **Commission comments:**

35  
36 **Chapter 1: Project Description**

37  
38 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Graphic exhibits have no graphic scales – need to be  
39 added. Omits discussion of three key parcels: the railroad parcel, water agency parcel,  
40 and Village Drive which is part of this project and there is no environmental review of  
41 this.

42  
43 Commissioner Asselmeier: Want language to address the applicant having an agreement  
44 to cross the water agency parcel.

45  
46 Commissioner McAllister: Table 1-3, pg. 1-15 re: parking – would like to see something  
47 that reflects the zoning ordinance requirements. Is in traffic and circulation portion –

1 would also be helpful here. Under future and cumulative development – future projects  
2 such as Deer Creek and the Johnson property need to be considered.

3  
4 Chair Barrett: No environmental review for Village Drive was done for the project or  
5 alternatives. No traffic impacts for access to Johnson property were considered. This  
6 needs to be factored in.

7  
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 112 has an incorrect statement re: Parcel B – “ would  
9 continue existing parking of outlet” – site plan clearly shows this is not true. Remainder  
10 on Parcel B – whnt is the intent – is a large parcel.

## 11 12 **Chapter 2: Land Use and Planning Policy**

13  
14 Commissioner McAllister: Pg. 2-3 – want elaboration on ownership, zoning to the north  
15 of parcel C. Pg. 2.7 - am surprised at the evaluation of the General Plan goals. Goal is  
16 enhancing Petaluma’s identify as separate and distinct. Development does not satisfy  
17 these criteria. Concerned about how the river walk is being dealt with at the roadway  
18 crossing. Think it is questionable about mitigation of the 100-year flood. Needs to be  
19 discussion as to how this enhances downtown.

20  
21 Commissioner Asselmeier: These goals addressed on pg. 2-7 – need additional facts as  
22 to how these goals are being met. CPSP should be discussed. Similarly, regarding the  
23 jobs being provided – want good paying jobs and not minimum wage jobs.

24  
25 Chair Barrett: These General Plan goals stated are not consistent with the General Plan –  
26 the project is not specific to Petaluma. Attracting jobs is in direct completion with  
27 downtown and does not enhance downtown. Would like to see evidence that this project  
28 would pay for itself.

29  
30 Commissioner Dargie: On pg. 2-7, the second last bullet point is misleading regarding  
31 mitigation of flooding impacts.

32  
33 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked if the summary applies to each bullet point – too  
34 general and not remotely adequate. Using “may be” too frequently.

35  
36 Commissioner McAllister: One last point under General Plan goals regarding traffic –  
37 discussion oversimplifies the issues and does not represent a more balanced reading of  
38 the General Plan.

39  
40 Chair Barrett: Regarding open space – these parcels are zoned for a PCD, but also in  
41 floodway. The question is how you develop to minimize destruction and impact of flood  
42 waters?

43  
44 Commissioner von Raesfld: Refers to parcels appearing open – do not appear open are  
45 open.

## 46 47 **General Plan Heading: Community Character – Open Feeling and Rural Backdrop**

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

**Policy 3:**

Chair Barrett: Refers to low profile buildings – is inconsistent with General Plan. Think this stretches the definition of one story.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 2-11: Summary says consistent, however, language is inconclusive.

**Policy 6:**

Commissioner McAllister: Do not see this as consistent with the existing development.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Agree with the above.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Does not seem to be a way to move from Parcel to parcel except in front – is not harmonious.

Chair Barrett: There is an error regarding access and circulation on Parcel A.

**Policy 7:**

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Re: setbacks – be straightforward with what the setbacks are instead of subtle differences.

Commissioner McAllister: Setback does not equal openness – buildings form a mass against the freeway instead of openness. Do not agree with summary statement – agreement from Barrett and von Raesfeld.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 2-12 – Street is 101 and not Petaluma Boulevard North.

Chair Barrett: Concur with above – front of project is Highway 101 and not Petaluma Boulevard North.

**General Plan Heading: Community Character – Nature and Character of Development**

**Policy 20:**

Chair Barrett: Violates the scenic corridor of 101 in General Plan – needs to be discussed. Policy 17 – barely consistent with setbacks.

**General Plan Heading: Parks, Recreation, Schools and Child Care – Child Care:**

Chair Barrett, Pg. 2-14, Policy 30: Needs to be addressed more clearly and realistically. Could be a condition of approval.

1 **General Plan Heading: Transportation – Traffic Flow, Convenience and Access:**

2  
3 Chair Barrett: Pg. 2-15, Policy 2: Mitigation measures just need to be feasible.

4  
5 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Summary statement reads significant and unavoidable – is  
6 not consistent.

7  
8 Commissioner McAllister: Same comments apply to Policy 31 under *Transportation –*  
9 *Land Use*.

10  
11 **General Plan Heading: Housing**

12  
13 Commissioner McAllister: Pg. 2-15 regarding housing – Policy 15. Balance of housing  
14 costs and salaries anticipated for these jobs.

15  
16 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 2-16, Policy 7 – have problems with “however” if  
17 consistent.

18  
19 **General Plan Heading: Community Health and Safety – Flood Hazards**

20  
21 Chair Barrett: Pg. 2-17, Policy 10: Needs more discussion – nothing after “consistent”.

22  
23 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Not complying with mitigations in the original EIR – one  
24 sentence is inadequate.

25  
26 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Bullet #2 under River Enhancement Plan – state specifics  
27 or delete statement.

28  
29 Commissioner McAllister: Pg. 2-20, point 14 – now have a road proposed through that  
30 zone – needs to be identified.

31  
32 Commissioner von Raesfeld: #14 is not delineated on any plans, how consistent?

33  
34 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asking for discussion of each policy?

35  
36 Commissioner von Raesfeld: There is a divergence.

37  
38 Chair Barrett: #20 – the bridge may be going into this.

39  
40 Commissioner von Raesfeld: #24 as well.

41  
42 Commissioner Dargie: Pg. 2-23, parking design policies.

43  
44 Commissioner McAllister: Parking is not screened – does not meet goal #8.

45  
46 Chair Barrett: Also noted 7 and 8 on pg. 2-23. Visual corridor – does not seem  
47 consistent.

1  
2 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Pg. 2-24 – referred to the last paragraph – cannot agree  
3 with statement re: greenway. Pg. 2-25 re: existing railroad – does not have a zoning  
4 designation.

5  
6 Commissioner Asselmeier: Want more explanation regarding the consistency with PCD.

7  
8 Commissioner McAllister: General comment on Chapter 2 in land use and zoning policy  
9 – would like to see some conceptual goals incorporated because they have been available  
10 since the NOP.

11  
12 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Support that statement. This section is missing discussions  
13 regarding the CPSP.

14  
15 Chair Barrett: Including public comment re: islands of county land.

16  
17 Council Member Healy: Want the opportunity to offer comments/concerns:

- 18     ▪ Competition with downtown – looking for more guidance in that area.  
19         What kinds of retailers would locate here – would they really be  
20         competing with downtown? Would like a list of the type of tenants and if  
21         they are in competition.
- 22     ▪ Transportation and circulation – does the project accommodate the  
23         trolley?
- 24     ▪ Pg. 7-10 – want to know view of likely impacts as opposed to worse case  
25         impacts. What traffic isn't going to other places because it's going here  
26         instead? Need for analysis for CEQA perspective – projects not at top of  
27         CIP list – how to evaluate for EIR? Includes traffic improvements needed.  
28         If not funded, how do we deal with it?
- 29     ▪ Flooding issues – require 0 net runoff, includes Traditions, Old Elm, page  
30         5-19 – discussion about increase in storm water runoff. Is not significant  
31         with this project, but how about cumulative? Want zero net fill in a real  
32         sense.
- 33     ▪ Pg. 14-5 discussion of alternatives – addresses only the movie theater site  
34         and not the retail. Needs more discussion – reduction in theatre size?

35  
36 M/S Dargie/von Raesfeld.to continue to February 11, 2003.  
37

---

38  
39 **II. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:** None

---

40  
41  
42 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 43     **a. City Council: None.**
- 44     **b. SPARC:** Concept for Water Street; Preliminary review of King office  
45         building on east Washington; preliminary on Boulevard Apartments;  
46

1 preliminary review; Deer Creek continued to Feb. 13; preliminary review  
2 for Haystack landing.

3 c. **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Discussed this project and  
4 providing input and the Southgate project.

5 d. **Tree Advisory Committee:** Discussed celebration of Arbor Day,  
6 discussion of Community Gardens.

7

8

9 Adjournment: 11:10

10

11

12

13 S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\012803.doc

14

15

16