



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
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
October 28, 2003 - 7:00 PM

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

* Chair

Staff: Michael Bierman, City Manager
George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Betsi Lewitter, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of October 14, 2003 were approved as presented. M/S Rose/Dargie.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Polled the Commission for availability on November 25, 2003 meeting. Commissioner's will be here.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: None.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letter from Carol Sandona in support of the Factory Outlet Expansion.

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 Request for a recommendation to the City Council to approve the Planned
7 Community District (PCD) amendment for proposed modification of River
8 Oaks/Petaluma Factory Outlet Village Master Plan which will apply to
9 improvements on Parcels B and C.

10
11 This item is continued from July 22, 2003, August 26, 2003 and September 23,
12 2003.

13
14 The City Manager addressed the Commission regarding the changes to the project since
15 the July 22, 2003 meeting. The changes noted were: reduction in square footage,
16 limitation on size of individual stores, a view corridor, relocation of Village Drive,
17 extension of Riverwalk, dedication of open space easement and parking ratios
18

19 Council Member Healy: Asked if it would go to Council first or SPARC.
20

21 Mike Bierman: It would go to City Council first, however, could be changed to go to
22 SPARC first to work out design issues before going to the City Council.
23

24 Council Member Healy: The General Development plan will need to be revised.
25

26 George White: Will be revised before going to City Council.
27

28 Commissioner McAllister: How did you arrive at the amount of square footage? What
29 will be in a 130,000 square foot space if not a Walmart type store?
30

31 Mike Bierman: Furniture, electronics, home improvement.
32

33 Commissioner McAllister: What would be the use on the conservation easement?
34

35 Mike Bierman: Trail or bike path.
36

37 Commissioner McAllister: Can parking be reduced on Parcel C?
38

39 Mike Bierman: Could be done.
40

41 Commissioner Asselmeier: Have concerns about how the buildings are laid out and
42 continuity with the existing Outlet Mall. Did you look at other configurations that would
43 be similar to the Outlet Mall?
44

45 Mike Bierman: Did the best we could with the constraints of the river, setbacks, etc.
46 This is completely different from the existing Village.
47

Planning Commission Minutes - October 28, 2003

1 Commissioner Asselmeier: Questioned the goal and the width of the proposed view
2 corridor.

3
4 Mike Bierman: Explained that the view corridor was proposed to address Planning
5 Commissioners' concerns regarding seeing into the river corridor from highway 101.
6 The width could be ensured with a condition of approval.

7
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Will the development standards include conditions and the
9 memo from the City Manager?

10
11 George White: Will be one document.

12
13 Commissioner Asselmeier: How are you accommodating the trolley with this new
14 proposal?

15
16 Brad Stipe: Showed where he thought the trolley would go, however, noted that they had
17 not received full information from the trolley people about what would be required.

18
19 Commissioner VonRaesfeld: Asked for clarification on the parking ratio.

20
21 Brad Stipe: Kept 5/1000 ratio but over 4/1000 will be compact to reduce paved surface
22 area. Have increased setbacks for Deer Creek and the Petaluma River.

23
24 Chair Barrett: Asked about a legal description for a discount department store – needs to
25 be clear to avoid future problems.

26
27 Mike Bierman: Can define without calling out a name, however, can change in the
28 future.

29
30 Chair Barrett: Asked about distance of development from Capri Creek – there was a
31 discrepancy between the plans and the memo from Mr. Bierman.

32
33 Brad Stipe: The correct width is on the plans, 30'.

34
35 Chair Barrett: Asked if there was a bike path on Village Drive.

36
37 Mike Bierman: Can be conditioned – SPARC and the Bike Committee to look at this –
38 will also have the trolley.

39
40 Chair Barrett: Asked for clarification of location of Riverwalk on south side of Deer
41 Creek.

42
43 Brad Stipe: Explained the extension of the Riverwalk would use the existing bridge
44 across Deer Creek.

45
46 Discussion regarding parking on Parcel C – is to accommodate theater. If retail, parking
47 would be similar to Parcel B. If theater is not developed, remain as open space?

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

Brad Stipe: Addressed the commission regarding the difficulty of going to SPARC prior to the City Council. Need to line up tenants to finalize plans – can go to preliminary SPARC with style of architecture.

Council Member Healy: Amenities within parking lot need to be considered. Asked if the size of stores proposed are consistent with the leakage study that has been conducted.

Mike Bierman: Yes and consistent with where it should be.

Commissioner Asselmeier: What is gross site coverage – was there a significant change from the last proposal?

Brad Stipe: Reduced by 10,000 sq. ft. – less building square footage and less parking – reduced impervious surface.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Need to provide square footage of hardscape compared to the last submittal.

Commissioner Asselmeier: What have you heard from Army Corps of Engineers?

Brad Stipe: Have not resubmitted this site plan to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Fred Etzel: We have not received anything from the Army Corps of Engineers. The mitigation area is driven by their requirements. We have been successful with the mitigations for the existing outlet center.

Commissioner Asselmeier: Questioned what road improvements on Petaluma Boulevard North would be required. Previously the pedestrian and bike committee asked for improvements and a bike lane along Petaluma Boulevard North.

George White: Will be putting in a signalized intersection at Village Drive.

Brad Stipe: Went over the highlights of the changes to the proposal. Because final design is tenant driven, would prefer to go to the City Council before SPARC.

Public comment:

John Mills, 1315 D Street: Vital lack of retail in Petaluma. Need to prevent tax leakage. This type of development will enhance the river as stipulated in the River Enhancement Plan. These types of retails uses will employ Petalumans’ who now go elsewhere.

David Keller, I Street: Spoke to the type of stores that will go into a 45,000 square foot building pad. Opined that City needs to know uses to know what impacts to expect. He requested an economic report to know burdens on services. Suggested the developer be required to build housing for employees as a condition of approval. The previous conditions of approval required the applicant to pay a share of the improvements to

1 Rainier; the applicant has not paid these fees – this is a legal obligation. If a portion of
2 Parcel B is used for the crosstown connector, what exactly is the City going to get on the
3 conservation easement at the southern end of Parcel B? The parcel where Village Drive
4 is proposed is not currently owned by the applicant. Parcel C has drainage to river, but
5 not through a vegetated swale. Where will water come from to sustain the wetlands;
6 what is the impact on 101 from this project; how will the proposed Rohnert Park casino
7 impact the load on 101? The project is an intrusion into the buffers for the River
8 Enhancement Plan. Asked the commission to enforce the River Enhancement Plan.
9 Petaluma deserves better – asked the commissioners to reject the project before the
10 commission.

11
12 Jeannie Lewis, 344 Ridgeview: Want the outlet mall to expand – Petaluma has been very
13 unfriendly to businesses. Urged the Commission to look at the merits of the project and
14 approve this expansion.

15
16 Public comment closed:

17
18 Break @ 8:25

19
20 Resumed @ 8:40

21
22 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked staff or the applicant about the rights for Village
23 Drive.

24
25 Brad Stipe: Yes, we have the rights for an easement.

26
27 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked about compliance with the River Enhancement Plan.

28
29 Betsi Lewitter: Went over the analysis done in the April staff report. The new site plan
30 is more in conformance with the River Enhancement Plan.

31
32 Commission discussion:

33
34 Commissioner Rose: Have a concern about what the River Enhancement Plan is asking
35 for – think it is quite different than what is being done here.

36
37 Chair Barrett: Agree with Commissioner Rose and I also have concerns about 30'
38 setback on Capri Creek.

39
40 Commissioner McAllister: Appreciate the effort that has been made, still does not go far
41 enough and does not conform to the River Enhancement Plan. The constraints (150'
42 setback from the river) need to be the guidelines for the project. Do not feel as if I can
43 compromise on this issue. Buildings on Parcel B are even closer to Deer Creek than the
44 previous proposal.

45
46 Chair Barrett: Agree the developer has done most of the work to meet the River
47 Enhancement Plan. More than beautification plan, it also ensures river unsullied and

1 undeveloped and does not increase flooding. It was made clear at previous meetings that
2 the project should conform to the River Enhancement Plan. Mr. Mills brought up the
3 point that the river has been enhanced by development projects. The River Enhancement
4 Plan, however, wants to maintain the river and does not want the development to
5 encroach on the 150' setback.

6
7 Council Member Healy: Flooding issues were addressed in the SEIR. Believe the City
8 Manager has made very big steps to improve the project. Reduction of square footage
9 and parking spaces has allowed for more flexibility. Would like the parking to be pared
10 down even further. Very excited about the conservation easement on the southern
11 portion of the site. Setbacks from 101 are comparable to the existing development.
12 Development Plan needs to be revised to reflect Mr. Bierman's memo. Want the trolley
13 language worked out. Do think there are some non-specific tenant issues that could be
14 addressed by SPARC before going to council. Want to know more about swales on
15 Parcel C.

16
17 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Agree with other commissioners that the project needs to
18 be in conformance with the River Enhancement Plan.

19
20 Council Member Healy: Setbacks from 101 are better – good articulation on rear of
21 building – should come back to the Planning Commission once again. General
22 Development Plan should be revised to reflect agreement. Want to know that the trolley
23 can work, “tighten parking down” – less than 5/1000, allow better setbacks. Regarding a
24 big box - doesn't want to name specific companies – more input from staff regarding
25 sizes, 65,000 square feet, feedback from community, want Target but not at this site.
26 Noted sales tax leakage to big boxes in Rohnert Park. Swales on Parcel C – runoff from
27 parking lots.

28
29 Commissioner McAllister: Setback from 101 seems to define the site – am not
30 comfortable how far beyond the existing setback on Parcel A. Appreciate the efforts of
31 the City Manager – believe the setbacks should generate the development proposal rather
32 than the other way around. Agree that the parking needs to be reduced, would like to see
33 the ratio used for the Kohl's site. Support retail, however, do not want to compromise the
34 site. Buildings are too massive for the site – appreciate the view corridor, however, if
35 parking was reduced the view corridor could really be an element to weave together the
36 project. Buildings are now closer to Deer Creek and Capri Creek than previously.
37 Would like better circulation between the sites – would like the sites integrated better
38 visually.

39
40 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Issues: river enhancement setbacks; parking ratios, design
41 review, possibly a two-phase; side and rear elevations are important; needs to be a
42 different project than Parcel A – need more vertical articulations. Believe there is a
43 violation of the 150' river setback. Need to condition the project regarding water supply.
44 Start with a parking ratio of 4/1000 for 163,000 square feet, if 5/1000 reduce square
45 footage of project. Everything over 3.5/1000 spaces needs to be compact.

1 Commissioner Asselmeier: Have concerns about shifting buildings B and C closer to the
2 creek, depending on the tenants, which will affect the view corridor. Setbacks for the
3 River Enhancement Plan need to be met, particularly because of the flooding. Want a
4 condition that the City will work with the County to improve Petaluma Boulevard as part
5 of this development, including a bike lane. Would like to see the terms of the
6 conservation easement – want to know what the City’s rights are – do not want
7 development in the future, not even for a roadway. Can we ask the applicant to post a
8 bond in case hydrology data is wrong and flooding occurs – protection for existing
9 tenants. Agree with the reduction in parking. Want more amenities in the parking area –
10 a more pleasant experience for customers.

11
12 Commissioner Rose: Reiterate that it is a buildable project – need more diversified retail,
13 however, needs to be done with care. Can do more to respect that people will be walking
14 in the parking area – reduction in scale of the project will bring it in line with the River
15 Enhancement Plan. Visibility corridor is a big improvement. Want to encourage the
16 developer against one large building. Conservation easement is a harvest for fill for
17 Parcel C - need to respect this.

18
19 Council Member Healy: Need 50’ setback from Capri Creek and 150’ average setback
20 from the river – look at section south of Deer Creek. Request that staff or the applicant
21 look at the analysis of average of the proposed river setback.

22
23 Chair Barrett: Do not agree with Council Member Healy about including the
24 undeveloped portion of Parcel B in the averaging of the river setback – we are concerned
25 about meeting the setback of the River Enhancement Plan in the area that is being
26 developed. Needs to be done in a more thoughtful way. Parking ratios need to be
27 reworked. Parking area is bleak – needs to be addressed at SPARC. Have concerns
28 about potential for building masses to change on Parcel B which would alter the visibility
29 corridor – is an important element to the site. Would prefer to have a view corridor and
30 not just a visibility corridor. Suggested enhancing this with some large trees with a road
31 and no parking. Deer Creek and Capri Creek setbacks need to be addressed. What will
32 the consequences be of taking fill from the conservation easement? Interested in
33 Commissioner von Raesfeld’s “parking ratio swapping” for Parcel B. Parcel C is a sea of
34 parking – don’t need except at Christmas time. Should consider internal shuttle for
35 customers.

36
37 Commissioner McAllister: Would like to see what it looks like to reduce the parking
38 ratio on Parcel C. Agree with Chair Barrett regarding the 150’ setback for the River
39 Enhancement Plan on the developed area.

40
41 Brad Stipe: Noted that the report from Wetlands Research stated that where no biological
42 degradation would occur, the setbacks could be reduced. Reported that Fish & Game has
43 a 100’ setback – looking at total property on Parcel B not just in front of buildings. We
44 are offering dedication of conservation easement over the triangular portion of Parcel B.
45 Cannot accommodate all of the changes the Commission is asking for or we do not have
46 a project. Asking for approval of the modification to the PCD.

1 Council Member Healy: Believe it's worth taking one more shot with the Planning
2 Commission. Can make some fairly minor changes and pick up some support for the
3 project.

4
5 Commissioner Asselmeier: What minor modifications can be incorporated?

6
7 Brad Stipe: Increase river setback, difference to increase 101 setback which we have
8 already done. Cannot do both. Reduce parking on 1 side – leave other at 1/5000 for
9 specific tenant. Conservation easement – have some flexibility – will work with City
10 Manager and City Council to define. Will work with SPARC on specific aesthetics – can
11 do another preliminary review of generic plans. Need flexibility of entry locations, etc.
12 for tenants. Creek setbacks are in compliance for Deer Creek – will need to look at Capri
13 Creek. Transfer of zero net fill – small amount to transfer to C from B – all has to
14 comply with City criteria – will be analysis at that time.

15
16 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Was not proposing additional conditions, will be the
17 purview of SPARC. Do not know if the project is in compliance with the River
18 Enhancement Plan.

19
20 Brad Stipe: We have always felt we were in compliance with the River Enhancement
21 Plan.

22
23 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Suggested putting extra parking on Parcel C instead of
24 Parcel B.

25
26 Brad Stipe: Would be ok.

27
28 Chair Barrett: Two additional issues: internal circulation, moveable visibility corridor.

29
30 Brad Stipe: Heading southbound the only visible portion of the project is minimal – 101
31 elevation looking down on Parcel B. If view corridor moved north, better visibility
32 through view corridor.

33
34 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Need to verify adequate water supply.

35
36 George White: Water supply was discussed in the EIR.

37
38 Council Member Healy: Want stakes on the site showing 100 to 150' setback from the
39 river? Is very close to a project that I can support.

40
41 Commissioner Rose: Agree with Council Member Healy that we are close to an
42 approvable project. Believe we can negotiate and solve the setback issues – need to
43 respect plan regarding the creek setbacks. Do not think the buildings are misplaced on
44 the 101 corridor. Can push some of the parking near Capri Creek.

45
46 Commissioner Asselmeier: Do not want to end up with 1 large and 1 small building –
47 would not be in favor of this.

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

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Reexamine river setback; 101 setback not as much issue as how building is detailed; willingness to maximum hyperstandard to reduce asphalt; look at 4/1000 on Parcel B and transfer 5/1000 to Parcel C.

Commissioner McAllister: Agree these changes will help project – do not think it is as close as other commissioners. Feel there needs to be a more substantial reduction in square footage. Regarding the circulation – think access to Parcel A needs to be improved.

Commissioner Dargie: Agree with most of the comments this evening – feel the project has improved, however, still don't think it's the right project for this site.

Chair Barrett: Fall into the latter camp, however, if the parking is reduced you could meet the setback of Capri Creek. If that happened, would look seriously at what you have. Flooding and traffic are two very serious concerns I have.

M/S Healy/Rose to continue to December 9, 2003.

III. LIAISON REPORTS:

- a. **City Council:** Kohl's was approved; development fees were increased.
- b. **SPARC:** Four preliminary reviews: MMM Business condo; In & Out Burger, Chevron, Dutra Quarry at south end of town.
- c. **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Reviewed Poultry Street development; RNM property;
- d. **Tree Advisory Committee:** Planted peace tree.

Adjournment: 11:03
