



**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

---

**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**March 25, 2003 – 7:00 PM**

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

\* Chair

Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director  
          George White, Assistant Director, Community Development  
          Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

---

**ROLL CALL:**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of March 11, 2003 were approved as amended.  
M/S Dargie/Asselmeier, 4-0.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** None

**COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** Chair Barrett and Commissioner McAllister attended  
the 2003 Planners Institute Conference.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was read.

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

---

Public hearing began: @ 7:00

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

- I. **DRAFT CENTRAL PETALUMA SPECIFIC PLAN AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR).**
  - A. **Review, comment and recommendation to City Council on DEIR.**

**B. Review, comment and recommendation to City Council on Draft Central Petaluma Specific Plan.**

1  
2  
3  
4 Mike Moore, Community Development Director: Asked the Commission to review,  
5 comment and make recommendations on the DEIR and the Central Petaluma Specific  
6 Plan.

7  
8 John Wagstaff, Wagstaff & Associates: Presented the DEIR for the Central Petaluma  
9 Specific Plan.

10  
11 Chair Barrett: Have specific mitigations highlighted for Cultural Historical resources and  
12 for Transportation impacts which are considered significant and unavoidable, do not have  
13 for air quality.

14  
15 John Wagstaff: Highlighted the above because they are a specific concern. For air  
16 quality we do identify significant local and regional impacts related mostly to traffic –  
17 traffic mitigations would reduce air quality locally, however, regionally it will trigger  
18 threshold of significance.

19  
20 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked for explanation of development scenario related to the  
21 proposed 25% cap and how it relates and why there is an additional column for  
22 development potential.

23  
24  
25 John Wagstaff: Mixed use designations provides for maximum future flexibility to  
26 encourage mixed use, smart growth applications. If the entire envelope is built out, it  
27 would exceed your objectives. So, as a result, a cap is formulated – 25% on residential  
28 and 25% on commercial. The EIR addresses the implications of those caps.

29  
30 Commissioner Asselmeier: Did the 25% cap come from the Advisory committee?

31  
32 Mike Moore: Yes.

33  
34 Commissioner Asselmeier: If a historic building is proposed to be demolished, would  
35 additional EIR be done?

36  
37 John Wagstaff: Any demolition of a historic resource, is a significant impact and  
38 requires preparation of an EIR. The EIR may not prevent demolition, it will identify why  
39 it is historic, what the value is and will suggest alternatives to demolition.

40  
41 Commissioner Asselmeier: That would then apply to the 66 potential resources and  
42 anything that is already deemed historically significant? What is the body of other  
43 resources that remain and do not fit the definition of potentially historical.

44  
45 John Wagstaff: It used to be quite substantial in downtown Petaluma. When the EIR  
46 was done for the redevelopment plan, it was obvious that there were buildings that had  
47 not been listed officially. As a result, the study was done by Carey & Co. and now you

1 have a thorough listing and a recommended extension of the historic district. That is the  
2 principal basis.

3  
4 Commissioner Dargie: If an EIR is tiered on this one regarding a historic building, why  
5 would this EIR not suffice.

6  
7 John Wagstaff: If a building is being demolished, this will not suffice because that  
8 particular action is a significant impact under CEQA. If we knew now all of the specific  
9 sites that might be demolished and identify them in this EIR and address the  
10 environmental implications of that then this EIR would cover it. Described in Mitigation  
11 7.2.

12  
13 Commissioner Asselmeier: Can you address how the role of SPARC might be changing  
14 based on the adoption of the Specific Plan and the SMART code, and how it may or  
15 won't change based on the new process we will be embarking on.

16  
17 Mike Moore: Would like the Commission to focus on the EIR first and then come back  
18 to the plan.

19  
20 Chair Barrett: Appreciate the thoroughness and the alternatives section. Concerns are  
21 traffic, historical resources and air quality which seem to be unmitigatable areas. Role  
22 of SPARC will be relied on to make sure mitigations are put in place. If SMART code  
23 will limit SPARC's purview, need to look at this associated with the EIR.

24  
25 Mike Moore: Section 7 of SMART code has a process for identifying historic properties  
26 and also provisions for addressing modifications or demolition. The plan is intended to  
27 update current zoning regulations. To that extent, SPARC's role will not change,  
28 particularly historic SPARC compared to current regulations. If someone came forward  
29 to establish a new district or expand an existing district that covered a portion of the  
30 specific plan area, that would be reviewed by historic SPARC. If there was a proposal to  
31 alter or demolish a historic building, that would be also be reviewed by SPARC.

32  
33 Chair Barrett: When we talk about potentially historic resources - who determines what is  
34 historic?

35  
36 Mike Moore: There are criteria. Part of our normal process now if we have an  
37 application that affects a structure that is potentially historic, we do a historic analysis or  
38 use a consultant to do the analysis.. If the application is processed administratively, staff  
39 would make the determination or it requires review by historic SPARC then historic  
40 SPARC would make that determination.

41  
42 Chair Barrett: The procedures are already in place and will remain in place even with the  
43 SMART code in place.

44  
45 Mike Moore: Yes

46  
47 Public hearing opened:

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

Katherine Rinehart: Have concerns regarding historic resources, particularly about resources that were not considered historic. Presented inconsistencies in writing.

Jane Hamilton: Co-chair of CPSP Committee. Plan represents many hours of work and thinking – was a very inclusive process. Concerned about how the Commission’s discussion takes place. Can the CPSP committee contribute to the discussion?

Chair Barrett: If the Commission cannot come to conclusion, will look to the Committee for assistance.

Diane Reilly Torres, Rainier Avenue: Public utilities was not adequately covered, pg. 3-21, 3.6.6. No cable services in portions of the CPSP – think this is important. Presented a document re: PUC.

John Wagstaff: Regarding demolition and looking at mitigation language, a demolition will reside in a statement of overriding consideration – could occur without an EIR.

Chair Barrett: Asked if a historic building could be demolished if there were statements of overriding considerations.

John Wagstaff: Need to look into this.

Mike Healy, 304 Kentucky: Referred to Table 2-1, is traffic analysis enforced for the total specific plan area or each individual sub area?

Matthew Ridgeway: Assumed that mix of uses is consistent with downtown Petaluma and spread them evenly. The totals are ok for the Specific Plan area, however, how it is allocated within the specific plan and if the assumptions do not agree with what comes forward in terms of development proposals, you may need to revisit on a site by site basis.

Mike Healy: How would the city know if they need to be revisited?

Matthew Ridgeway: The assumptions are laid out clearly and are in the new traffic model so when a proposal comes forward, we would check it against the assumption that was made for that site and then make a determination if the impact would be greater or lesser.

Chair Barrett: Variations could be within the specific plan, but the implications for traffic outside the specific plan would be same, and the variations would happen at different spots within the plan.

Matthew Ridgeway: Yes

Mike Healy: Is a 25% cap proposed to be enforced within each sub area, or is it a 25% cap overall.

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

Mike Moore: Came up with something for the entire area, could be fluctuations in each sub area.

Public comment closed:

Commission discussion:

Commissioner Imm: General question on mitigations, when and how they get triggered? Who makes determination?

John Wagstaff: EIR does not specify thresholds of development increments when certain mitigations should be in place. Have taken a cross section at 2020 and indicated what the impact scenario would be then and the EIR describes what mitigations need to be in place by 2020 – do not specify the phasing. Regarding traffic, to implement mitigations, there will be traffic fees that addresses development as it occurs.

Commissioner Imm: If in 19 years we are built out within 1% of the plan and still do not have mitigations in place, is that ok?

John Wagstaff: For traffic there is a fair share mechanism in place.

Commissioner Imm: The plan would not be halted if the mitigations were not put in?

John Wagstaff: Have to prepare a mitigation implementation program that will be included in the final EIR.

Commissioner Imm: So there will be a schedule?

John Wagstaff: Yes, however, not in the EIR. The schedule is inherent in capital improvements programs.

Chair Barrett: Are road diets put in as a capital improvement program?

Mike Moore: Road diet proposal is part of the recommendations of the specific Plan and the EIR traffic analysis looked at one of the scenarios that included the road diet so if plan is adopted with the road diets included, it will be done through a capital improvement program.

Commissioner Asselmeier: If demolition is not approved and you have lost an important resource, can fines and penalties be enforced as a mitigation measure?

John Wagstaff: If the Planning Commission wanted to adopt an ordinance regarding prohibiting demolishing historic resources, can be included as a question in the Final EIR.

1 Commissioner Asselmeier: Regarding the Zoning map, section 2-10 – maximum height  
2 on Petaluma Boulevard South would be 3 stories – is this the only maximum heights.  
3 Shouldn't we have some maximum heights on the western side of the Petaluma river  
4 knowing that it is a goal to protect the view shed. Looking for reassurance – do we really  
5 want four stories on the river and does that encourage public access.

6  
7 John Wagstaff: EIR assumed potential for maximum build out under existing zoning  
8 heights or the SMART code. Did not get into mitigation of building heights – defer to  
9 design guidelines in SMART code and SPARC review.

10  
11 Chair Barrett: If sentiment of the Commission to restrict height on the west side of the  
12 river, can do after the Final EIR, with the zoning map as it stands.

13  
14 John Wagstaff: Yes

15  
16 David Keller: Clarified height on Water Street and Poultry Streets.

17  
18 Commissioner Asselmeier: Does not seem to be access easements on the western side of  
19 the Petaluma river between D Street and McNear. Have small green areas designated as  
20 civic space. Some mitigation for new building construction will be to allow public  
21 access. Can we ask applicants for public access along the fronts of these buildings.

22  
23 Mike Moore: Yes, the Specific Plan and River Enhancement plan specifically asks for  
24 this.

25  
26 Chair Barrett: When discussing architectural guidelines, are these from Wayne Miller.

27  
28 Mike Moore: The reference is to provisions in the SMART code, however, as a comment  
29 to the EIR we can made reference to the architectural guidelines in Chapter 4 which will  
30 be included in the final Plan.

31  
32 Commissioner Asselmeier: What happens when we have the new General Plan. Will  
33 there be an opportunity to revisit the specific plan, will that come back for this body?

34  
35 Mike Moore: You will have that opportunity when you have the draft General Plan. If  
36 the specific plan is adopted, the general plan land use map will reflect the land uses  
37 adopted by the Specific Plan and will incorporate policies that need to be in that  
38 document that are already in the specific plan and if something comes to light, you will  
39 have the opportunity to look at that.

40  
41 Commissioner Asselmeier: Pg. 11-13, Mitigation 11-2, some mitigations use shall, back  
42 and forth between shall and should. Should they all be using “shall” in all cases unless  
43 except unreasonable and infeasible language.

44  
45 John Wagstaff: If it is changed to shall, under CEQA you are required to do these things  
46 and some will have significant financial impacts. Even if you use shall will still have  
47 unavoidable air quality. Is intended to be discretionary.

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: Mitigation 13-4, concerns about 6 stories where there have been no buildings previously. This is different soil in this area, suggest the language could include, “but are not limited to”.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Pg. 12-9, why would there be no increased threat of flooding with significant development on the river?

John Wagstaff: Does not supercede ordinances in place regarding flooding. CPSP does not permit development that is not compliant with these ordinances.

John Fitzgerald: Has been covered in great detail.

David Keller: No flooding impact downstream of the CPSP.

Commissioner Barrett: Historic preservation – have concerns particularly regarding the Northwest Information Center.

John Wagstaff: Want to assure you that they are in the loop.

Commissioner Barrett: Think there are more than 66 historic properties, would like to point out to SPARC concerns regarding overriding considerations.

Mike Moore: Can bring this issue to SPARC.

Commissioner Barrett: Want SPARC to be aware of the discrepancies in the number of historic properties.

Mike Moore: Will investigate the discrepancy of the numbers. There may be more historic resources identified at some future time.

Commissioner Asselmeier, Pg. 8-19: Noting last paragraph – 25 acres of park land that can be developed – is on the eastern side of the river – can smaller areas be created on the west side.

M/S. Asselmeier/Dargie to recommend final EIR be prepared and recommend that it be certified by the City Council.

All in favor:

- |                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Dargie:     | Yes |
| Chair Barrett:           | Yes |
| Commissioner Asselmeier: | Yes |
| Commissioner Imm:        | Yes |

1 Break @ 8:50 p.m.

2

3 Resumed @ 9:00 p.m.

4

5 Mike Moore: Presented the staff report.

6

7 Commissioner Dargie: Seems as though land use is mostly predetermined. Will most  
8 projects be approved administratively? As I read this I did not anticipate a lot of projects  
9 coming to the Planning Commission.

10

11 Mike Moore: That is probably true. Will probably see the same proportion of projects  
12 that go through administration and what will go in front of either Planning Commission  
13 or SPARC. That is the overall intent of the plan to streamline the process. Will probably  
14 not see as many projects as in the past.

15

16 Commissioner Dargie: On the caps that have been discussed – can you discuss the intent.

17

18 Mike Moore: Main reason for the analysis was for the EIR – to look at traffic impacts.  
19 Looked at primarily vacant and underutilized land and looked at development potential.  
20 Twenty-five percent seemed to be more intense without going full-blown. Need to give  
21 the plan some time to work and then relook at the cap.

22

23 Commissioner Dargie: If we want to revise, would it trigger another EIR or a revision of  
24 the existing one.

25

26 Mike Moore: We can use the traffic model to reevaluate.

27

28 Chair Barrett: How will different developments in the CPSP be triggered?

29

30 Mike Moore: Typically a person comes in and identifies a piece of property and will ask  
31 what can be done with it? We look at all the regulations and provide the information and  
32 they come back with an application.

33

34 Chair Barrett: SMART code does not trump zoning regulations?

35

36 Mike Moore: It provides a specific level of land use regulation for the specific plan area  
37 and in areas where SMART code or specific plan is silent there may be other policies or  
38 regulations that will provide direction. This is the same process that exists now.

39

40 Commissioner Asselmeier: Is there discussion of what as a City would want to happen  
41 first?

42

43 Moore: Implied in the plan the City wants to see new development in this area.  
44 Incentive programs not specifically identified in the plan. City needs to implement the  
45 plan by identifying areas. Capital Improvement projects to be priorities such as parking  
46 garage and redevelopment assistance. Council will ultimately decide.

47

1 Commissioner Barrett: Were civic buildings an oversight?

2

3 Mike Moore: Building standards table does not address standards for civic buildings and  
4 that will be changed.

5

6 Commissioner Imm: Asked about the article where ABAG came out with  
7 recommendations for housing in the north and the 7% growth for Petaluma was the exact  
8 number that came out of this.

9

10 Mike Moore: Gave background on the article regarding the ABAG projections.

11

12 Chair Barrett: Asked about Jerico's letter.

13

14 Mike Moore: Want the road that is on their property to be moved. Will address the issue  
15 in the final plan.

16

17 Public comment opened:

18

19 John Fitzgerald, CPSP Committee: Spoke about the CPSP committee – emphasized the  
20 history of the committee. Represented Petaluma and its diversity. Asked the  
21 Commission to trust what the Committee has done.

22

23 Chris Stevik, Liberty Street: Presented a trolley economic and history study. Asked the  
24 Commission to take the study into account.

25

26 Public comment closed:

27

28 Chair Barrett: Section 2.10, Zoning Map - asked for explanation of 50% section on 1<sup>st</sup>  
29 Street between F and G.

30

31 Mike Moore: To address development proposals for two existing warehouse buildings  
32 north of the foundry wharf. Will accommodate a break in the existing buildings. It's an  
33 exception to the regulations that apply to the rest of the T5 area to accommodate what he  
34 is doing on those sites.

35

36 Chair Barrett: Does this apply to whole block or just that frontage?

37

38 Mike Moore: Just the frontage.

39

40 Chair Barrett: Otherwise it remains at a T5 urban center footprint with a 50% minimum  
41 required building frontage between arrows.

42

43 Mike Moore: Yes.

44

45 Chair Barrett: Why could this not be rezoned T4 for this block?

46

1 Mike Moore: Goes back to the issue of the type of development proposed in this area.  
2 Recommendations are an attempt to address development of the site, except for the  
3 frontage requirement. Committee wanted to support what Mr. Haake was doing.

4

5 Chair Barrett: Explain parking location – in riverfront warehouse where will people be  
6 parking their cars?

7

8 Mike Moore: Referred to glossary on pg. 68, explaining how layered parking will work.  
9 Also referred to pg. 43. This is an area where the committee felt strongly that structured  
10 parking should not just go anywhere. In order to deal with parking in this area, there was  
11 a discussion of interim parking lots which makes exceptions to the layered parking lot.

12

13 Chair Barrett: T4 section in riverfront warehouse, homes that back to Petaluma  
14 Boulevard South could only have 3 stories – parcels facing on 1<sup>st</sup> St. can go to 6 stories?

15

16 Mike Moore: True.

17

18 Chair Barrett: Three stories maximums are in place in the lower reach area that faces the  
19 green belt, however, same protection is not provided on the western side of the river.  
20 Will be a barrier to the river in the riverfront warehouse district and the lower reach.

21

22 Commissioner Asselmeier: Can we make a recommendation suggesting additional height  
23 limitations. Did the committee decide that some of these areas could take 4 stories.

24

25 Jane Hamilton: Committee did decide that if up to 5-6 stories were allowed due to the  
26 economic feasibility we would not see a wall of buildings.

27

28 Commissioner Asselmeier: Did you not feel a limitation of 2-3 stories along the river  
29 was appropriate? Will feel imposing if there are 5-6 stories – what is the thinking?

30

31 David Keller: Already have 2 and 3 stories. A trade off to developers is allowing more  
32 density. Will not see six stories in a wall on the river in Petaluma. River Enhancement  
33 Plan discusses view sheds.

34

35 Commissioner Asselmeier: Even with 4 stories along the river – will a person be able to  
36 see Sonoma Mountain from 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.

37

38 David Keller: Yes.

39

40 John Fitzgerald: As a committee, we walked the area to test the scenarios.

41

42 Chair Barrett: Concerned about a wall of shadow. Why would T4 not work there?

43

44 Jane Hamilton: T5 allows for the density that the Committee wanted.

45

46 Commissioner Asselmeier: On East side of river, closest to 101, how did that triangular  
47 space come about, can it be connected to the other civic space adjacent to the river?

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

David Keller: Is arbitrary but conceptual. To develop neighborhoods with commons.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Access to the walkway on east side, will it be constructed?

David Keller: Yes.

Chair Barrett: Is zoning map conceptual or are we approving as drawn?

Mike Moore: Yes, however, if someone wants to divert from the zoning map, it would come before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Provided written comments from PBAC.

Chair Barrett: Asked about comments from Diane Reilly Torres,

Mike Moore: Is addressed on Pg. 78.

Chair Barrett: Asked Mr. Stevick if there was specific language to be added.

Chair Stevick; Seems as though there is continual effort to leave out tracks in certain plans .Lines on 1<sup>st</sup> Street are an integral part – want a way to turn the trolley around. Say that the tracks are given every possible advantage to be maintained and used. Tracks contribute to a historic resource.

Chair Barrett: Three areas of tracks in the specific plan: riverfront warehouse, turning basin and upper reach.

Commissioner Asselmeier: On civic spaces – do we have ideas about where new civic buildings will go?

Mike Moore: Was not a discussion about specific civic buildings. SMART code has a broad definition. Did not look at parcel by parcel locations – does not preclude their inclusion. Section 3 of land use table is an example.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Libraries, churches can be built in the civic spaces.

Mike Moore: No just those designated as civic space.

Commissioner Asselmeier: What is the intention of the depot site?

Mike Moore: A civic center or city hall was not discussed, it is not precluded by not appearing as civic space on the zoning map. Based on the use tables, it could go in any of the locations if it were a priority of the city and the site would be built according to the standards for that zone.

1 Chair Barrett: Specific changes chapter 4, page 8 conflicts with pg. 106 of the CPSP.  
2 Pg. 11, word century is left out. Look at the provisions, examples are not clear –  
3 comfortable leaving that to SPARC. Want to see 1H deleted limiting SPARC’s purview.  
4 Will only help Petaluma if SPARC’s purview is not limited. Want their role clarified.  
5 Number of discrepancies in the Historic preservation section - need to be addressed.

6  
7 Commissioner Asselmeir: Thanked the Advisory Committee.

8  
9 Commissioner Dargie: Fully support the plan.

10  
11 Commissioner Imm: Respect the Committee’s discussions and their work.

12  
13 Mike Moore: Bike committee was involved in the Committee’s discussion. Intent is  
14 already in the plan. Details are already code requirements for development applications.

15  
16 Commissioner Asselmeier: Will leave it to Planning staff

17  
18 M/S Asselmeier/ Dargie recommend approval of CPSP with PBAC comments included,  
19 the issue related to Jerico Product’s road is resolved, issues rated to the trolley are  
20 resolved, Pg. 8 of new chapter 4 conflicts with pg. 106 in the plan, corrections to Chapter  
21 7.

22  
23 All in favor:

24  
25 Commissioner Dargie: Yes  
26 Chair Barrett: Yes  
27 Commissioner Asselmeier: Yes  
28 Commissioner Imm: Yes

29  
30  
31 **II. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.**

- 32 • Look at an ordinance regarding abolishing historic resources.  
33 • Determine when election of officers will take place.  
34

35  
36 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 37  
38 a. **City Council:** None  
39 b. **SPARC:** Approved lighting and trees on Downtown Master Plan and  
40 conceptual plan for Water Street with details to return to SPARC.  
41 c. **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Considered the CPSP and  
42 made comments.  
43 d. **Tree Advisory Committee:** Reviewed oak sapling planting plan for  
44 Baker Ranch.  
45

46 Adjournment: 10:35  
47