



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 **November 12, 2003 - 7:00 PM**

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

7
8 * Chair

9
10 Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
11 Irene Borba, Senior Planner

12
13 **ROLL CALL:**

14 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

15 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of October 28, 2003 were approved as
16 presented. M/S

17 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

18 **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

19 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** None.

20 **CORRESPONDENCE:**

21 **APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was read.

22 **LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.
23
24

25
26 Public hearing began: @ 7:00

27
28 **NEW BUSINESS:**

29 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

30
31 **I. PAULA LANE SUBDIVISION, 431 Paula Lane (corner of Paula Lane and
32 Sunset Drive)**

33 **AP No.: 019-080-009 and 019-080-010**

34 **File: ANX01002, GPA01002, PRZ01003, SPC01048 and TSM01003**

35 **Planner: Irene T. Borba**
36

1 Applicant is requesting for a recommendation to the City Council of a proposal
2 for 21 residential units on two contiguous parcels outside City limits but within
3 the Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) totaling 11.22-acres. The proposal requires
4 a General Plan Amendment, Pre-zoning, Tentative Subdivision Map, Annexation,
5 and Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

6

7 Irene Borba: Presented the staff report.

8

9 Marti Buxton, Mission Valley Properties: Presented the project and introduced the team.
10 She noted reasons why the General Plan Amendment is warranted and showed slides
11 with General Plan Land Use designations. Mission Valley is asking for R-1/10,000
12 zoning and feel it is compatible with surroundings.

13

14 Allan Tilton, W-Trans: Went through a series of slides of the adjacent and nearby streets
15 and addressed the neighborhood traffic concerns. The proposal meets the City standards.

16

17 Commissioner McAllister: Asked what traffic volumes were based on.

18

19 Allan Tilton: Did a test under the new General Plan Traffic model and the proposal
20 maintained the City's level of service or better.

21

22 Council Member Healy: This seems to be similar to the Sunnyslope annexation.

23

24 Allan Tilton: Yes.

25

26 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Does street meet minimum City Standards?

27

28 Allan Tilton: In general it has a clean track record, however does not meet minimum
29 standards.

30

31 Commissioner von Raesfeld: What is standard width size.

32

33 Allan Tilton/Craig Spaulding: 32'.

34

35 Commissioner Dargie: Is it a City street?

36

37 Allan Tilton: Portions of it.

38

39 Commissioner McAllister: What does project build out include?

40

41 Allan Tilton: Looking at full General Plan build out within the urban growth boundaries.
42 We used the model with the land uses currently envisioned as the General Plan changes,
43 those numbers would change.

44

45 Chair Barrett: Street frontage on Paula Lane is currently culverts?

46

1 Allan Tilton: There are a series of culverts and driveways. Would go to City standard
2 with curb/gutter and sidewalk and a class III bike lane typical for a collector.

3
4 Chair Barrett: Asked for examples of collectors with Class III bike lanes.

5
6 Allan Tilton: Mission Street, McNear and Mountain View.

7
8 Al Cornwell, CSW Stuber-Stroeh: Showed locations of street lights, stated lights will be
9 to minimum City standards and could be shielded if necessary. The sewer system will be
10 a gravity system from houses to lower part of the property to the pump station on Sunset
11 and eventually will end up in the sewer lines on Bodega. It will be a standard pump
12 station. Regarding draining – will collect water on site, collecting street runoff from
13 homes and streets to a culvert into a proposed detention pond which has a rock filter.
14 Peak flows will be slightly reduced from existing conditions.

15
16 Commissioner Dargie: How deep is detention pond and what is diameter?

17
18 Al Cornwell: Eight feet deep, 150 x 190 in diameter.

19
20 Commissioner Dargie: Who is responsible for pump station?

21
22 Marti Buxton: That has not been determined, however, the Home Owner's Association
23 will pay for it.

24
25 Chair Barrett: Will you be paying the City to maintain – is there an emergency back-up
26 generator. Who maintains that?

27
28 Marti Buxton: CC&R's will be refined and will address all of the requirements.

29
30 Commissioner Dargie: Regarding sewer – will a pipe go down to Bodega?

31
32 Al Cornwell: Yes.

33
34 Commissioner McAllister: Drainage goes to the adjacent property even with this project?
35 That surprises me.

36
37 Al Cornwell: Drainage historically flows from one to the next. You are to maintain the
38 character and flow of the drainage. It is not unusual to do it this way – not increasing the
39 flow.

40
41 Commissioner Asselmeier: You mentioned drainage won't increase but decrease.

42
43 Al Cornwell: We have intercepted the flow. We created a detention pond so peak flows
44 can be regulated for flow.

45
46 Commissioner Asselmeier: How much water will be there?

47

1 Al Cornwell: It should be emptied in a matter of hours.

2

3 Commissioner Asselmeier: Typically there is no standing water?

4

5 Al Cornwell: Correct.

6

7 Commissioner Rose: Asked about drainage onto adjacent properties.

8

9 Al Cornwell: Detention basin will function through the pipe. We don't cut off the
10 drainage that goes to the next property. This appears to be a dam. It spreads water out
11 over the swale. Peaks will be less.

12

13 Chair Barrett: Is this a proven technology?

14

15 Al Cornwell: Yes.

16

17 Chair Barrett: If this were to fail, it would go to adjacent property?

18

19 Al Cornwell: The primary overflow is the pipe with rock filter, then it goes through rock
20 swale. Water will only stand for several hours.

21

22 Edie Robbins, CSW Stuber Stroeh: We used the City's fire flow calculation for Zone 2
23 and did a fire flow test to check out the computerized water model. The test was done at
24 the corner of West and Paula and we were able to achieve a decent flow. The
25 calculations for water flow and fire pressure meets the City standards. Showed slides of
26 location of new hydrants. The modeling showed that the project fire flow meets
27 requirements. City standards require air gaps. The City required calculation that if in an
28 emergency the air gaps will fill – it meets the City standard. Regarding water pressure
29 system, a study was prepared using the City water model. We were not able to find an
30 impact with the proposed development. Static pressure was 18 lbs per sq. inch. This is
31 not a perceptible impact to the area with the proposed 21 homes.

32

33 Council Member Healy: Taking into account the existing condition, will the new tank
34 make a difference?

35

36 Edie Robbins: My understanding is if something happened to one tank, an additional
37 tank would be available.

38

39 Commissioner Dargie: Tanks provide residential water; what about water for a fire?

40

41 Commissioner McAllister: Why is existing pressure in the area so low?

42

43 Edie Robbins: I cannot explain fully why the existing homes have low pressure. May
44 not be operating with the air gap system. For the proposed development we will have a
45 500 gallon tank on site. If water service level of Paula Lane tank were higher, it could
46 benefit pressure.

47

1 Craig Shields, Treadwell & Rollo: Outlined the types of soils found. From a
2 geotechnical standpoint, the soil is excellent. Loose soil can simply be taken out and
3 compacted. Houses will be a standard foundation. We found no geotechnical issues with
4 the property.

5
6 Commissioner Rose: Lots 14, 15 & 16 – on the large slopes are you suggesting post
7 tension slabs?

8
9 Craig Shields: Post tension slabs are what we would like to use on the steeper slopes.

10
11 Commissioner Asselmeier: Can you give us an explanation of the proposed grading
12 scheme.

13
14 Al Cornwell: In general lots 17, 18, 19 and 20 are the higher part of the site and will
15 have some cuts, other areas will have fill.

16
17 Chair Barrett: Fill will be put behind lots 1 through 6?

18
19 Al Cornwell: Yes – all lots have some cut and fill.

20
21 Commissioner Dargie: The soil is considered competent – there will be no piers?

22
23 Craig Shields: Yes.

24
25 Chair Barrett: When will the final geotechnical report be done?

26
27 Craig Shields: For final grading plans.

28
29 Chair Barrett: Does this interfere with the badger community?

30
31 Craig Shields: This would be better addressed by an environmentalist.

32
33 Rick Smith, Illingworth/Rodkin: The noise levels are within standards. The noise during
34 construction were outlined in mitigation measures. After build out there would be no
35 noise impacts.

36
37 Meta Bunce, JRP Consultant: Performed a historical evaluation. Explained what merits
38 a historical resource. There are 4 buildings on the site and the evaluation addressed all
39 the buildings. The building do not meet the criteria of a historical resource.

40
41 Jane Valerius, Wetland Specialist: Conducted wetland and biological evaluation of the
42 site. Walked the property with the Army Corps of Engineers and noted the topographical
43 features, the swales and reviewed the data points. Also looked at the soil, water and
44 plants on the site. There were 3 categories of plants that the Corps reviews – did not find
45 any rare plants and it was determined that the site did not meet wetland criteria.

46

1 Anne Flannery, Wildlife biologist: There is a great deal of concern about wildlife from
2 the neighbors. The site does provide habitat for the animals on the site and they will be
3 displaced. Some of the animals are on a special status, however, no regulatory
4 protections apply. Reviewed the regulatory protections which do not extend to habitat.
5 Fish and Game visited the site and found no federally protected animals on the site.

6
7 Commissioner Asselmeier: How did the applicant decide to dedicate the 3 acres of open
8 space?

9
10 Marti Buxton: When we walked the site we outlined where the badgers habitat was and
11 Department of Fish and Game felt that 3 acres would be adequate.

12
13 Commissioner Asselmeier: Did the Department of Fish and Game comment on how
14 much habitat badgers need?

15
16 Anne Flannery: The homes are away from the badgers, however, some of the habitat will
17 be destroyed by development. Fish and Game was satisfied by the 3 acres of open space.

18
19 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked about conservation easement.

20
21 Marti Buxton: It is an agreement which we will come to as part of the approval – it is not
22 a classic conservation easement.

23
24 Commissioner Asselmeier: Are there restrictions placed on the area.

25
26 Marti Buxton: Yes.

27
28 Commissioner Asselmeier: I am pleased by Mr. Robert Floercke's comments that a
29 pedestrian trail through the badger habitat is acceptable.

30
31 Marti Buxton: We show a pedestrian path in this area and anything beyond will have to
32 be reviewed by the Department of Fish and Game.

33
34 Commissioner Asselmeier: Am interested in hearing more about possible additional
35 pedestrian trails that the applicant is agreeing to provide.

36
37 Commissioner McAllister: Asked for clarification of current situation on regulatory
38 environment.

39
40 Anne Flannery: Said there is no precedent to stop a project, but design modification may
41 be necessary.

42
43 James MacNair, McNair Associates: Discussed existing trees on the site. Of the 38
44 trees, 26 are proposed to be removed. We reviewed the impact of the project on sudden
45 oak syndrome. The reality is it is a forest disease. Studies seem to point toward bay
46 trees, which may spread the disease.

1 Chair Barrett: You mentioned 38 trees, however, materials it shows 32.

2

3 James MacNair: 32 is correct.

4

5 Chair Barrett: Seven trees are listed as good to marginal – not keeping many trees. All
6 the good trees you are removing – is that because it interferes with development.

7

8 James McNair: Being removed because of grading.

9

10 Marti Buxton: The live oaks are mitigated at a 4:1 ratio.

11

12 Break at 9:10 p.m.

13

14 Resumed at 9:20 p.m.

15

16 Public comment opened:

17

18 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked about hillside calculations. What is the formula –
19 the source and purpose was not clear.

20

21 George White: Explained that the formula comes from the Zoning Ordinance and that we
22 can have that information clarified.

23

24 Commissioner Asselmeier: Would like an explanation of what it means.

25

26 George White: We can supply the section of the Zoning Ordinance.

27

28 Steven Carl, Penngrove: Spoke on the water resource issues. Wells in Penngrove are
29 going dry – water is coming out of the same aquifer. Showed a map of extensive
30 exchange areas. Rohnert Park is going to cover up its own water supply. The Paula Lane
31 project is right in the wedge of recharge areas which is not a good idea. Expect a water
32 supply through 2020, after that it will not be there. Your decision will affect Petaluma
33 and Penngrove.

34

35 Don Marguardt, 1202 West Street: Am not here to take a position on the development.
36 Most houses built prior to 1971 do not have a pressure system. Lived with a condition
37 which is low pressure. The pressure of water at the mains and houses came up today.
38 Provided copies of maps and existing hydrants. Checked water pressure of existing
39 homes in area. Developer is talking about 500 gallons tanks on properties being installed.
40 Saw city employee checking fire hydrant pressure and it was stated that the pressure was
41 at 18. On page 27 of Initial Study developer shall be required to develop to Fire
42 Marshal's standards. Went to Fire Marshall and it was stated pressure was 20 at 500 psi.
43 Found out tonight it is a different standard for the project. This is conflicting
44 information. Believe this controversy is a red flag. In view of the discrepancies in the
45 environmental document, City should sit down and do a study of existing and future
46 development. Can you guarantee pressure will not be impacted?

47

1 Julian Podbereski, 1100 Schuman Lane: Read a letter from Paul Miller on how the
2 project will destroy the environment such as wildlife and views.

3
4 Paul Selinger, 1411 Sunset Drive: The character of the neighborhood is rural. I am the
5 Chair of P.L.A.N and we have 70 members in our organization. We differ with the
6 developer in many ways. We are dismayed about the annexation.

7
8 Bill Bennett, 2902 Bodega Avenue: Want to speak about drainage – detention ponds
9 don't work. The nature of the water flow has been changed. The water agency has no
10 jurisdiction on the tributaries and Marin Creek. The property owners have to deal with
11 it on their own. We are working with the Water Agency to conduct a study. Zone 2A
12 was set up to relieve some of these conditions. Believe the density should remain at 2
13 acres minimum – the downstream neighbors get the runoff.

14
15 Joanna McClure, San Francisco: The area is country – want the quality to be retained –
16 particularly the birds, deer and the views.

17
18 Susan Kirks, Paula Lane: Member of P.L.A.N. Showed a tour of the neighborhood –
19 presented a handout.

20
21 Ken Miller, 600 West: P.L.A.N. member. An approval would add to the traffic situation
22 on Paula Lane and alter Paula Lane forever. The traffic report based it's study on City
23 data and not county. The study included Bantam Way which is not part of the area.
24 What is the methodology used? It should be evaluated by the County road standards.
25 The neighborhood conducted their own traffic study. Paula Lane is a narrow street and
26 students walk this road every day to school. Because it is county, vehicles tend to drive
27 fast – to add more traffic would be disastrous.

28
29 Caroline McCall, 1302 Sunset Drive. Regarding noise and lighting issues: The
30 magnitude of noise will significantly impact the neighborhood and wildlife – noise
31 generated would be significant. It is a rural area and there is no noise on the site now.
32 There will be an increase in noise during construction and after development it would be
33 a permanent impact. Currently there are no lights or streetlights – the impact of nighttime
34 lighting will impact the area and the wildlife. Noted previous letters submitted. The
35 development would destroy ecosystem that has been in effect for years. The proposal has
36 lots 13, 18, 21 which overlay the badger habitats. The 3-acre proposed open space is the
37 area for fire protection mowing. Need further research for badger habitats. Have both
38 fire safety and water concerns for both the City and the County. Referenced a June 25,
39 2003 letter submitted – fire flow barely meets the minimum. My water pressure is at 17.
40 Our pressure has not been resolved and this will only add to it.

41
42 Rollin Bruce, 1400 Sunset Drive: I have a serious problem with the drainage issue –
43 have watched water flow testing previously. The water is going through a large pipe,
44 which will exit onto my property. There is no water flow in July. I bear 100% of this
45 runoff including the pollutants. You would essentially be putting a leach field into my
46 well. Widening Sunset Drive is an issue – my utilities are there – are you going to pave
47 over my utilities? The sewer pumping station is right at the property line at my driveway.

1 I will have to listen to the pumping station if it breaks down it will come onto my
2 property. The badgers leave holes and when this development happens, the badgers will
3 be on my property. Leave the density the way it is – 5 houses.

4
5 Charles Carle, 250 Paula Lane: Concerned with the footprint of the houses and the
6 runoff. There is a new home right behind my house and I watched the grading of the
7 home. They put in pipe to collect the water and ran it down to the culvert to Bodega
8 Avenue – this exacerbates the flow to the Petaluma River. It is time to deal with some of
9 these measures now, not in 50 years from now. Suggest making the site a park – it
10 belongs in the public domain.

11
12 Lawrence Jordan, 20 Paula Lane: This development will cause serious dissention in or
13 community and is not appropriate.

14
15 Joe Molinoli, 669 Paula Lane: Sold the tank site to the city – I have no pressure. This
16 should stay 2 acres per house. Traffic concerns – street is too narrow – need light at
17 Bodega and Paula Lane

18
19 Steve Rubart: Read letter from Judy Reynolds. This development will destroy our
20 neighborhood. The traffic and alteration of a historical landscape, etc. will be destroyed.
21 If the developer has their way there will be no more country living, deer, birds, etc. You
22 have a chance to save a piece of this community.

23
24 Steve Rubardt: Would like to know about the water pressure – who will be responsible if
25 our pressure drops? Don't feel a lot of assurance from the experts.

26
27 Amanda Kualheim, 680 Paula Lane: My home is located at the crest of a hill. The issues
28 of increased traffic and the narrow street are concerns. There is no sidewalk and no room
29 to widen the road.

30
31 Patrick Schaffer, 594 Paula Lane: Purchased home six months ago – was a dream home
32 for me and my partner. It is a quality of life issue. I am disgusted with this project and
33 that I have to fight for what I have. I love the neighborhood, the neighbors and the
34 animals – a park would be better.

35
36 M/S von Raesfeld/Dargie to continue to January 13, 2004. 7-0.

37
38
39 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 40
41 **a. City Council:**
42 **b. SPARC:**
43 **c. Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:**
44 **d. Tree Advisory Committee:**

45
46 **Adjournment:** 11:00

Planning Commission Minutes - November 12, 2003

1
2
3

S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\PCMinutes03\111203.doc