



**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 **Planning Commission Minutes**  
3 **November 25, 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 Lynn Goldberg, Project Planner  
12 Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary  
13

---

14  
15 **ROLL CALL:**

16 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

17 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of November 12, 2003 were approved as  
18 amended. M/S Dargie/Asselmeier.

19 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

20 **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** None.

21 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** Chair Barrett asked if we could schedule a joint  
22 meeting with the Planning Commission and SPARC. George White commented that  
23 there will be a joint meeting once the changes in scheduling have been adopted by the  
24 council.

25 **CORRESPONDENCE:** None.

26 **APPEAL STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.

27 **LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT:** Was noted on the agenda.  
28

---

29  
30 Public hearing began: @ 7:00

31  
32 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

33 **NEW BUSINESS:**

34  
35 **I. BOULEVARD APARTMENTS, 945 Petaluma Blvd. North**  
36 **AP No.: 006-450-018**

1           **File: 03-ZOA-0405**  
2           **Planner: Lynn Goldberg**

3  
4 Applicant is requesting a recommendation to the City Council to adopt a Mitigated  
5 Negative Declaration for the project to build 15 one-bedroom apartments to house 14  
6 low-income individuals with a mental illness and one onsite manager. Rezone the project  
7 site to the Boulevard Apartment Planned Unit District, adopt the proposed Unit  
8 Development Plan for Boulevard Apartments and adopt the proposed Development  
9 Standards for the Boulevard Apartments PUD.

10 Lynn Goldberg presented the staff report. After the packet went out we received the  
11 following correspondence:

- 12           • John and Liz Maxwell, 11820 Mill Street, Petaluma, in support of the project.
- 13           • Rosemary McCreary, 6055 Lichau Road, Penngrove, in support of the project.
- 14           • Brian Rademacher, 216 White Oak Circle, Petaluma, in opposition to the project.
- 15           • Mary and Jim Duensing, 121 White Oak Circle, Petaluma, in opposition to the  
16 project.

17 Katie Crecelius, Housing Consultant: Presented the project and introduced the project  
18 team.

19 Christine Vargas, Kodama Diseno, Architect: Presented the project site plan.

20 Public comment opened:

21 Gary Pierce, Housing Specialist, Sonoma County Mental Health: Expressed support for  
22 the project. Spoke highly of Buckelew Programs. Asked for the Planning Commission's  
23 support.

24 Kenneth Schmidt, 312-12<sup>th</sup> Street: Happy that Petaluma is considering offering housing  
25 to people with mental illness. Spoke highly of Buckelew Projgrams.

26 Michele McCabe, 108 Saratoga Court: I work for the Marin County Public Guardian  
27 program and want to offer a reference for Buckelew Programs. There are misconceptions  
28 about mental illness. People living in the Boulevard Apartments are not people with  
29 acute mental illness. They will be good neighbors and supported by an excellent staff.

30 John Records: Spoke regarding people with mental disabilities needing this type of  
31 housing. Performance and follow through is essential for this type of project.

32 Jeff Ray, Neighbors Establishing Social Priorities (NESP): The majority of residents in  
33 the immediate area are against the project. The applicant promised neighborhood  
34 meetings which never took place. Feel this location is inappropriate for following  
35 reasons: people with major mental illness who need medication sometimes if they are  
36 feeling well, they do not take medications; cost of City services will be increased to  
37 \$900/hr. Asked the Commission to deny the proposed application.

38 Toby Jones, 46 Acorn Circle: I believe this is a constructive way to provide housing and  
39 help for the mental ill.

1 Lynn Berard, 436 Gossage: Commended the City for their support of affordable housing.  
2 I sit on the board of a Buckelew project in Marin County. The Buckelew residents have  
3 been good residents and Buckelew has an excellent reputation. The properties integrate  
4 well into the community. This is an excellent location for this type of project. Requested  
5 the Planning Commission's support.

6 Roy Bateman, Marin County Community Development Agency: Talked of his  
7 experience working with Buckelew Programs. Have funded Buckelew programs in  
8 Novato and San Rafael. Do not know of any problems caused by the residents. Would  
9 have no reservation of having a Buckelew project as a neighbor.

10 Paula Cook, Community Housing Development Corp. of Santa Rosa: This is an  
11 underserved population and this is an excellent project and we urge you to approve the  
12 project.

13 Len Smith, 1400 Caulfield: Spoke in favor of the project. I am a board member of  
14 Petaluma Ecumenical Projects. PEP will manage the apartments and we want to  
15 encourage the Commission to vote in favor of this project.

16 Val Gavozdea, 217 White Oak Circle: Opposed to the project. Mental illness is a broad  
17 definition and unfortunately the project talks very little about the people who will be  
18 residents. The environment will be crowded and noisy – they need an environment of  
19 open space. Putting people in small, cramped spaces is counter productive. The location  
20 is unacceptable for this type of project.

21 Julie Morgan, 308-10<sup>th</sup> Street: I am a close family member of someone with a mental  
22 illness. We need to extend our welcome and help these people. I have been afraid and  
23 hope that the neighbors will open their arms to these people.

24 James Mobley, 143 Acorn Drive: Believe this is an excellent project and am happy that  
25 Petaluma is providing these services. All citizens deserve a chance to live a productive  
26 life.

27 Majida Gibson: PEP; Sonoma County Housing Coalition: Am in support of this project  
28 – it is superior project and this is an excellent location for this project. Buckelew is an  
29 excellent group.

30 John Morgan, 308-10<sup>th</sup> Street: Work for Burbank Housing and echo what has been said  
31 about Buckelew Programs. We have had no problems with Buckelew programs. Mental  
32 illness has come into my immediate family – there is a terrible stigma attached.  
33 Neighbors are afraid that the residents propose a danger. I live near a Board and Care  
34 residence and it is transparent. There is a misperception about people with mental illness.

35 Public comment closed:

36 Jay Zlonick, Executive Director of Buckelew: The term major mental illness does not  
37 equal dangerous. We deal with residents who can be treated. We do not consider this a  
38 crowded site. There is a very successful project in San Francisco which is much more  
39 dense than this project. We are not insensitive to the concerns of the neighbors. They are  
40 the same concerns expressed by residents of Fairfax and San Rafael. We have letters in  
41 support of the project from people who previously opposed projects.

42 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked about the screening process.

1 Jay Zlonick: County mental health does the screening and recommends people and then  
2 Buckelew does a screening. We review history and interview clients and look at the past  
3 behavior. Funding is on a county basis, will do what we can to give preference to  
4 Petaluma residents.

5 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked about the resident managers.

6 Jay Zlonick: The resident manager helps with property management, rent collection; the  
7 on-site manager is not there to manage the mental health of clients. If someone needed  
8 ongoing care they would not be here.

9 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked if residents hold jobs.

10 Jay Zlonick: Yes, some are employed part time and some full time. Other residents do  
11 some volunteer work.

12 Break @ 8:10

13 Resumed @ 8:15

14 Commission Discussion:

15 Council Member Healy: I am sensitive to neighborhood issues. The use proposed meets  
16 a tremendous need. We are lucky that this is a Buckelew Program – referred to the letter  
17 from Fairfax residents in support of the project. This project will be here for 40 years.  
18 Everything needs to be put in writing to ensure what is promised will be carried out,  
19 particularly the two-step screening process, the on-site manager, and on-going services to  
20 residents. These are not conditions for the project. Needs to be something to specify that  
21 this will be a well-managed facility. Ask Buckelew or staff to provide guidance with  
22 how this will happen. Question about on-site parking. Site is constrained because there  
23 is no street parking. Possibly other commissioners can discuss.

24 Commissioner Dargie: Agree with Council Member Healy regarding putting in writing  
25 about screening and an on-site manager.

26 Commissioner McAllister: Agree that agreements in writing would be a good idea.  
27 Support the project and think it is a need for the community. Believe the location is  
28 good.

29 Commissioner von Raesfeld: The issue is a social perception issue. I am in support of  
30 the project. Specific comments: condition from the Planning Division regarding a use  
31 permit.

32 George White: Proposal is for PUD zoning designation which controls all uses and  
33 structures on the property.

34 Commissioner VonRaesfeld: There needs to be a reference to funding sources.

35 Commissioner Asselmeier: Share the comments about use restrictions and funding.  
36 Would like Petaluma residents to receive priority. What aspect of rent control is  
37 provided? Need to continue to uphold Petaluma's reputation to provide this type of  
38 housing. The reputation of Buckielew is commendable. Petaluma should be proud of  
39 this type of project. Additional statement of what amenities would be for the residents.  
40 In development standards, Attachment D, pg. 9 – do not understand the reference to  
41 minor telecommunication facilities.

1 George White: It is standard language – it can stay in the agreement or come out. By  
2 omission it would be prohibited.

3 Lynn Goldberg: Buckelew is trying to model existing residential district development  
4 standards. Would be a permitted use.

5 Commissioner Rose: Do not have a great deal to add. Believe it a fundamentally sound  
6 proposal. The applicant has documented their intentions. Need to have language  
7 regarding the use. Comments by the Police Department were not mentioned in the staff  
8 report – how is this addressed.

9 Katie Crecelius: Buckelew did not feel the conditions were appropriate. We feel a 6-foot  
10 fence is sufficient. We met with the Police Chief and addressed his issues. Would be  
11 very difficult to have all the units' patios facing inward.

12 Lynn Goldberg: Police were more concerned for the security of the apartment residents.  
13 The Police Chief was willing to let the conditions go.

14 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked whether access to the project from Hawthorne Court  
15 was possible.

16 George White: Hawthorne is a private street and will not be extended into the project  
17 site.

18 Alice Thomas: In a similar residence, only 5 residents have cars. Believe this would  
19 hold true for this project. Less than 50% of the residents have cars.

20 Chair Barrett: Concur with the other commissioners. I am happy with the changes to the  
21 project after the SPARC preliminary review. Want to reassure the neighbors, working  
22 with PEP projects and Buckelew they will be in good hands.

23 Additional conditions of approval /issues identified:

24 Provide the following to City Council:

- 25 • Provide a draft of a written understanding between Buckelew and the City  
26 as to the operational characteristics of the facility including:
  - 27 - Specification of Buckelew role for screening and follow-up  
28 before going to City Council.
  - 29 - Use and rent restrictions and HUD funding.
  - 30 - Preference given to Petaluma residents

31 Direction to SPARC:

- 32 • Focus on amenities for the resident, including outdoor seating and  
33 socialization opportunities.
- 34 • Develop the landscape plan further through the SPARC process.

35 Commissioner von Raesfeld: What is the multi-use room on the first floor.

36 Katie Crecelius: Is for the residents.

37 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Maybe you can expand the use of the multi-purpose room  
38 for community purposes.

1 Chair Barrett: Is limited by parking.

2 George White: Will discuss with the applicant and write into the PUD guidelines.

3 Commissioner Asselmeier: It may be restricted by the funding.

4 M/S Healy/Dargie to forward a recommendation to adopt a Mitigated Negative  
5 Declaration, rezone the project site to the Boulevard Apartment Planned Unit District,  
6 adopt the proposed Unit Development Plan for Boulevard Apartments and adopt the  
7 proposed Development Standards for the Boulevard Apartments PUD. 7-0

8  
9

---

10 **II. LIAISON REPORTS:**

11

12 **a. City Council:** Written responses to Paula Lane; stakes on Parcel B at the  
13 Outlet Center; preliminary report on the leakage study – provide  
14 commissioners with copies; Dec 15<sup>th</sup> there will be a General Plan  
15 scenarios presented.

16 **b. SPARC:** Preliminary review for a new building at Northbay  
17 Construction; Gatti Subdivision was continued; BJM condition  
18 compliance was continued.

19 **c. Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Adobe Creek Center at  
20 Lakeville and South McDowell; RMN project.

21 **d. Tree Advisory Committee:** Planted a tree at Bassett and Howard;  
22 reviewed Sonoma County tree protection during construction.

23

24

---

25 **Adjournment:** 9:00

26

27

28

29

30