



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
January 27, 2004 – 7:00 PM

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

* Chair

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of January 13, 2004 were approved as amended.
M/S von Raesfeld/Dargie, Harris abstained.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: None

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: None

CORRESPONDENCE: None

APPEAL STATEMENT: Was read.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

Public hearing began: @ 7:00

PUBLIC HEARING:

OLD BUSINESS:

- I. SOUTHGATE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, Frates Road and Lakeville Highway**
AP No.: 017-030-022, 017-150-019
File: 03TSM0417CR
Planner: Jayni Allsep

1
2 Request for a recommendation to the City Council to adopt a Mitigated Negative
3 Declaration and to approve a 40-acre Planned Unit Development (PUD) which
4 proposes 221 detached single-family homes, a 1.34 acre park and a 3.04 acre
5 parcel to be retained for future affordable housing.
6

7 Continued from December 9, 2003 and December 16, 2003. Please note that
8 packet materials were included under previous cover. If duplicate materials are
9 needed, please contact Community Development at 778-4316. Attached are:
10 Letter dated December 9, 2003, from Adobe Del Oro Action Group; Memo dated
11 December 16, 2003, from Jim Carr, Director of Parks and Recreation.
12

13 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report.
14

15 Matt White, Basin Street Properties: Gave a history of the property and presented the
16 current proposal. Mr. White addressed the following issues: Urban Separator, noise,
17 high retaining walls, vehicular and pedestrian's access and safety, non-residential
18 component to the project.
19

20 Chair Barrett: Is the alternative site plan shown here this evening what the Commission
21 should be considering?
22

23 Matt White: Yes.
24

25 Council Member Harris: Asked if the applicant had support of the Del Oro group for the
26 alternative site plan?
27

28 Matt White: Yes.
29

30 Commissioner McAllister: Will retention areas be a site amenity or engineered retention
31 areas?
32

33 Vin Smith: They will be both and more natural in the final design.
34

35 Chair Barrett: Asked for clarification of the paths in the retention area.
36

37 Vin Smith: Have not been fully designed yet – the concept is that the drainage from the
38 subdivision would flow through there before going to the storm drains, however the area
39 will also serve as a park with walking paths.
40

41 Commissioner McAllister: How many months would the area actually be usable as a
42 park?
43

44 Marty Parissenti: In large storms, you may get 18 inches of water over portions of the
45 area. Do not know if it would be suitable for a baseball field, however, would be suitable
46 for walking paths most of the year.
47

1 Commissioner McAllister: You would see it as more of a passive park, only used
2 approximately 9 months of the year.

3
4 Marty: Possibly could have soccer fields.

5
6 Matt White: The intent is a passive park.

7
8 Commissioner von Raesfeld: According to the December 9th site plan, the affordable
9 housing area would need additional access for emergency services, how would this be
10 achieved?

11
12 Matt White: Has been addressed on the alternative site plan.

13
14 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Do you have solutions to Jim Carr's memo dated
15 December 16, 2003?

16
17 Matt White: No.

18
19 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Do you have a City Council date?

20
21 Matt White: February 23, 2004.

22
23 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked what the affordable units would look like?

24
25 Matt White: Don't know yet – are just beginning the design.

26
27 Commissioner Asselmeier: Are there restrictions to what can be put on the PG&E
28 easement.

29
30 Matt White: For overhead transmission lines only.

31
32 John, North Bay Construction: According to PG&E they have no future uses for it. All
33 PG&E requires is access on the easement.

34
35 Matt White: We own the land; they have an easement for poles and lines.

36
37 Barrett: What determines the number of units for the affordable units.

38
39 Matt White: Is up to PEP – they will design the project. As part of approval we are
40 asking for this zoning.

41
42 **Public Hearing opened:**

43
44 Art Kerbel, Adobe Del Oro Action Group: Neighborhood is in support of the project.
45 Current plan is a result of the developer and the neighborhoods working together. Urged
46 the Commission to think about where the City wants to go. Residential is the key to the
47 project. If project is something other than residential, there will be more residents to

1 protest; a density of 216 houses is the maximum the community agrees to. Regarding
2 Frates Road – this is the most adaptable solution for the traffic on this road. This will
3 slow the truck traffic down. Urge the commission to approve the plan presented tonight.

4
5 John McGinns, President Adobe Creek Homeowners: Agree with everything Mr. Kerbel
6 has said. The current plan mitigated most of the neighborhoods concerns. We support
7 the project as proposed tonight.

8
9 Mark Albertson, 1676 Calle Ranchero: Live directly adjacent to the project; Chair of the
10 Adobe Del Oro Neighborhood Group. Group has advocated for a low impact and low-
11 density project. If other land uses are discussed during deliberation, would like public
12 comment opened up again. Focus of the applicant and the neighborhood is now on Frates
13 Road. When Lakeville Road was widened it changed the traffic patterns on Frates Road.
14 The most significant impact is truck traffic. Goal is to reduce the speed of truck traffic
15 and provide safety for the neighborhood to cross Frates Road. Want a 4-way signal at
16 Calle Ranchero, and a 4-way stop at Frates and Ely. Asked to reclassify Frates and keep
17 as a two-lane street, posting speed limit and providing pedestrian cross walks. Want to
18 encourage a well-designed sound wall on Lakeville. If you do traffic calming and have
19 trees on the street and make it unfriendly to trucks, it will reduce the noise. Reduce the
20 traffic generating the noise. Action Group endorses the current proposal as conditioned
21 regarding Frates Road.

22
23 Vera Ciammetti, Director PEP: Thanked the Commission for the questions tonight.
24 Consider this a great opportunity for affordable housing. More than likely there will be
25 78 to 80 units. Will build larger units to accommodate people with special needs. Will
26 hope that public transit will be available by the time the units are built. Current PEP
27 residents are served by volunteers and Petaluma People Services. Retail is not necessary
28 for the residents that we serve. I am not in favor of 3-stories, is cost prohibitive and not
29 as user friendly to seniors. Would like it more like our Edith Street project as opposed to
30 the Lieb Apartments on Douglas Street.

31
32 Mark Ferguson, 112 Rancho Bonito: Am a neighbor who has followed this project.
33 Want future developers work with neighborhoods such as Basin Street did. Urge the
34 Commission to approve the project.

35
36 Christopher Costin: Represent property owners south of the project. Support the project.
37 Applicant has spent a lot of time with the neighborhood. Have a concern about a revision
38 in the site plan shown tonight. My client's property is outside of the City limits. This
39 property is designated as a potential expansion area. Do not want to restrict future
40 development with the design of this project. The new design leaves a street along PG&E
41 access. Want the potential for two access routes into the open separator for a potential
42 expansion area. Could be done possibly with the loss of 1 or 2 houses.

43
44 Jack Osman, 1890 Falcon Ridge Road: Agree with the comments of the other
45 neighborhoods. The proposal is a dramatic improvement over the previous proposals.
46 Thanked the applicant for working with the neighborhood. I have one issue regarding
47 access on Frates Road. Want effective traffic calming, clearly identified cross walks, and

1 a reduction in the speed limit. Support the proposal.

2

3 Dev Goetschius, Housing Land Trust: Southgate is an opportunity for Housing Land
4 Trust to build 3 homes in Petaluma. We are pleased to collaborate with Basin Street
5 Properties on this project.

6

7 **Public Hearing closed:**

8

9 Chair Barrett: Would like to hear from traffic and noise consultants before discussion by
10 the Commission.

11

12 Vin Smith: The consultants are not here this evening. I will answer any questions.

13

14 Chair Barrett: Asked why there was no noise assessment on Frates Road closer to
15 Lakeville.

16

17 Vin Smith: Showed where monitors were placed for the noise assessment. Follows the
18 recognized criteria.

19

20 Chair Barrett: Asked for rationalization of timing of the traffic counts which took place at
21 non-peak hours and on a holiday but not during am and pm peak periods. Have the same
22 comment for the noise readings.

23

24 Vin Smith: We relied on the experts to conduct the noise and traffic studies.

25

26 Chair Barrett: Referred the Noise Mitigation Study dated November 13, 2003. There is
27 no hard data in the study supporting the summary.

28

29 Vin Smith: Summary states interior and exterior noise will be in compliance with the
30 City's goals.

31

32 Commissioner Asselmeier: To avoid 10-ft sound wall on Lakeville and Frates, what
33 would set backs have to be?

34

35 Vin Smith: We did not ask that in the analysis of the noise.

36

37 Commissioner Asselmeier: I have concerns that this project is a gateway to the City.
38 How could the soundwalls be adjusted to deal with this concern?

39

40 Vin Smith: There is 8 ft. of wall on Lakeville and 8 ft. on Frates. There will be a
41 significant amount of landscaping against the 10-foot wall on Frates. Will be planting on
42 both sides of the wall on Lakeville – will be a green living wall.

43

44 Commissioner Rose: Regarding interior noise levels – will particular models be
45 mitigated according to their location?

46

47

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

Vin Smith: The standard Title 24 building code requirements will take care of interior noise issues.

Committee identified project issues for discussion:

- Gateway visual quality
- Sound wall/noise
- Feathering/Urban Separator/Access from Ely Road
- Jim Carr memo
- Access
- Housing types and lot sizes
- Frates Road/traffic issues
- Infrastructure issues
- PEP site/Interface and access
- Land Use/Smart growth
- Density

Break at 9:00

Resumed at 9:10

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Believe there are process issues – the Initial Study does not match the plan presented this evening. How can findings be made?

Chair Barrett: The studies presented in the staff report must consider new plan and address issues. Do not believe the data presented can be imposed on this alternative plan.

Council Member Harris: Do not want to bury this plan in process.

Paul Andronico: The Initial Study looks at impacts – there are extremely minor differences between the two plans. The new plan has less impact – do not believe there is a legal issue. The noise study was revised – is not a legal issue from CEQA standpoint.

George White: The applicant will need to agree to the mitigation measures.

Vin Smith: We agree to most of the mitigations and made some minor adjustments. We would sign any differences.

Commissioner Asselmeier: If we are giving staff further direction, it may be premature to discuss the issues.

Commissioner McAllister: I do not think we are close enough to make a recommendation.

1 Chair Barrett: Do not want to be pushed on this process because the applicant has a
2 Council date. To be fair, we need to look at what is being proposed and look at it
3 carefully. Believe it would be wrong to push it through.

4
5 Council Member Harris: Believe that we should plug through this evening, do not want
6 to slow down the process – believe it is a win-win for the City. Would like to poll the
7 commission on going forward.

8
9 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Would like to discuss the issues.

10
11 **Traffic/Noise:**

12
13 Commissioner McAllister: Want staff to weigh in on the traffic calming proposed this
14 evening and the issue of noise.

15
16 Craig Spaulding: I have not reviewed or evaluated this alternative plan. I have read the
17 initial traffic report. I suggested access on Ely and controlling Ely intersection.
18 Pedestrian safety is paramount. They have proposed a signal and a 4-way stop.

19
20 Commissioner McAllister: Is the unsignalized, free intersection of a concern to staff?

21
22 Craig Spaulding: Yes.

23
24 Commissioner McAllister: How does the City weigh in on the requirements of the
25 County's memo.

26
27 Craig Spaulding: Do not feel there is an issue of capacity.

28
29 Chair Barrett: Regarding a stop sign instead of traffic light – is that better or sufficient to
30 bring LOS up from an E?

31
32 Craig Spaulding: I have not evaluated that.

33
34 Jayni Allsep: In reviewing a study of traffic engineering, Attachment C the conclusion is
35 cumulative traffic plus project, would make LOS go to E. Staff referred to General Plan
36 policy that level of service C has to be maintained. The Initial Study uses the level of
37 significance of the General Plan. If there were changes to circulation and access - traffic
38 could be more evenly distributed and reduce the LOS.

39
40 Commissioner Asselmeier: What is density across the street as compared to the project?

41
42 Jayni Allsep: I do not know the answer to that question.

43
44 Commissioner Asselmeier: Are there other situations where there are variations from the
45 required urban separator – other projects that do not comply.

1 George White: On the West side it varies, the East side is almost entirely 300 feet. The
2 sports complex on East Washington is the first project to allow a structure on the Urban
3 Separator.

4
5 Chair Barrett: Regarding Mr. Albertson's letter addressing traffic calming – has there
6 been any study done?

7
8 Jayni Allsep: Would need to be a Council policy decision to reclassify Frates Road.

9
10 Chair Barrett: If you eliminate a signal at Ely Road and put in 4-way stop, have a four-
11 way signaled intersection at Calle Ranchero and Frates Road then the only safe crossing
12 would be at Calle Ranchero.

13
14 Jayni Allsep: That's correct.

15
16 Council Member Harris: What do we need to give direction on this tonight?

17
18 George White: Want direction on the new plan, apparently there is a time issue regarding
19 Basin Street's council date.

20
21 Matt White: LOS is B at Calle Ranchero intersection. Our alternative plan was
22 submitted December 9, 2003. We did not support access on Ely Road because it supports
23 urban sprawl. The City Council asked us to make the urban separator less than 300 feet.

24
25 **Gateway/Noise Barrier/Aesthetic Issues:**

26
27 Commissioner McAllister: I share the concerns of Commissioner Rose regarding the
28 southwest corner of the project. It is problematic to have a sound wall all the way down
29 Lakeville. Having houses right up against Highway 116 would repeat mistakes. I am
30 supportive of the process with the neighbors; however, I believe their needs to be a
31 compromise in the corner that would be a gateway to our community? Maybe another
32 use on there is more appropriate.

33
34 Chair Barrett: In the General Plan Lakeville is called out as a scenic corridor and a
35 gateway to the City. Project does not promote either of these. Sound wall needs to be
36 treated well, the southeast corner of the PG&E easement and the southwest corner of
37 Lakeville Frates Road needs to be used a gateway.

38
39 Matt White: Is acceptable to me to do a gateway at the corner of Lakeville & Frates and
40 on the PG&E easement.

41
42 Chair Barrett: How will landscaping be maintained along Frates Road? The City is cash
43 strapped.

44
45 Matt White: Will allocate some funds to the park to be maintained by the City.

1 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Believe there is a win-win situation here. If three lots at
2 the corner of Lakeville and Frates can be reconfigured, a gateway can be established as
3 well as the elimination of 100-feet of sound wall. Is problematic that you only have 2-
4 feet to plant something against the sound wall on the Cal Trans right-of-way.

5
6 Matt White: Can establish an acre and a half of gateway. The project is not a perfect
7 solution, however, sound wall on Lakeville is now down to 8 feet.

8
9 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Suggested putting a more multilayered element of street
10 segment on the CalTrans side of the sound wall instead of the development side.

11
12 Matt White: Can take the 4-feet from the inside and put it on to the sound wall
13 (Lakeville) side of the wall to achieve an 8-10 foot landscape area between Lakeville and
14 the soundwall. Can put the 3 corner lots somewhere else.

15
16 Commissioner Rose: Do not feel we need to design the corner – could possibly be
17 developed into a transit center. It is the City's future to deal with that corner as a
18 gateway. The details of the gateway are SPARC issues.

19
20 Commissioner Asselmeier: Still have 600-feet of sound wall at 8-feet. If sound wall is
21 moved, how does that effect noise levels?

22
23 Vin Smith: The noise threshold for backyard is driving the design.

24
25 Chair Barrett: Want to see data to support the effect moving the sound wall will have on
26 the noise levels.

27
28 Commissioner McAllister: Still has a concern about the gateway issue. Landscaping as a
29 gateway element – do not think we really know what it is we are negotiating here. Do
30 not feel this will accomplish goals of a gateway to the City. Do not have an image of the
31 gateway being proposed.

32
33 Commissioner Asselmeier: Suggested these items be addressed, plan updated and
34 brought back to the Commission.

35
36 Chair Barrett: I agree this should come back to the Planning Commission while Basin
37 Street is preparing to go to the Council. The project has been designed without the
38 gateway in it.

39
40 **Public Park/Jim Carr Memo of December 16, 2003:**

41
42 Chair Barrett: How will the issue of the house abutting the park be dealt with?

43
44 Vin Smith: Believe it is probably a security issue. Don't share Mr. Carr's concern and
45 do not know if it constitutes a redesign of the project.

46
47 Matt White: Will reconfigure to adhere to Mr. Carr's standards.

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

Access/Circulation:

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Access will be an issue when the PEP site is developed – believe emergency services will want another access.

Commissioner Asselmeier: I do not debate PEP’s reputation, however, I would like an opportunity to view the PEP plan.

George White: If PUD is adopted as proposed, the PEP project will not come back to the Planning Commission, it will go to SPARC.

Chair Barrett: Want houses that abut the affordable housing piece of the project to have written statements disclosing this information.

George White: Could require that the affordable housing component be a conditionally permitted use that would come back to Planning Commission as a CUP.

Urban Separator/Feathering:

Chair Barrett: One of the best things about the East side is the urban separator – it enhances the area – would like to see it carried on at more than 120 feet. Urban separator on Ely is non-existent – is a recipe for disaster. Believe 300-foot is essential on both sides of the project.

Commissioner McAllister: Share the concerns regarding the 300-foot urban growth boundary. Do not know why we are making an exception here. Part of what can make this project special is having that open space.

Commissioner Dargie: There was a project approved a few years ago that did not have strict 300-foot urban separator. Can understand why the applicant feels there is flexibility. Do not support access on Ely Road.

George White: Point of clarification, City code requires Ely Road to be improved from middle of the street to the property line regardless of access.

Commissioner Rose: General Plan alternatives shows Ely Road as urban growth boundary – this may be vacated and the road may not continue to be a point of access.

Craig Spaulding: There are some roads that go to the urban growth boundary.

Commissioner Asselmeier: General Plan states this is a potential urban growth boundary; want to observe the 300-foot urban separator. The current plan does not show any urban separator on the Ely side. Would want to support staff’s recommendation to have access from Ely, which would lessen the traffic impact on Frates Road.

Council Member Harris: Agree with Commissioner Dargie on this issue.

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 von Raesfeld: Am comfortable with the 120-foot urban separator. Would like to see what the Ely Road separator would look like. Want to make sure SPARC looks at this carefully. Needs to be an amenity for the project.

Matt White: I am fine with a condition. We can make improvements and dedicate to the City.

Chair Barrett: Discussion on the last proposal gave up some of the urban separator footage because it was a mixed-use project. This project is strictly residential and therefore should adhere to the 300-foot urban separator.

Commissioner McAllister: One hundred twenty feet does not meet the urban separator. The neighborhood is trying to dictate community issues and not just neighborhood issues. The rules applied to the mixed-use proposal do not apply here.

Commissioner von Raesfeld: Asked if some lots sizes could be reduced to gain 15 extra feet for the urban separator along Ely Road.

Matt White: Agreed that he could do that.

Commissioner McAllister: What if the interior open space were put on the exterior of the project to create more urban separator. Then it would be seen by the rest of the community as they drive by.

Matt White: Would be happy to explore.

Commissioner Asselmeier: If we expand the twenty feet on the Ely Road side to 38 feet, does that get us closer to the continuity of the urban separator?

Commissioner Dargie: The 300-foot urban separator is not on all sides of the development.

Chair Barrett: This property has that obligation because it is on the urban growth boundary on two sides.

Circulation to Ely:

Consensus of the Commission: If it makes sense to the circulation of the project, will leave up to the developer.

Chair Barrett: Need to be able to get to the LOS and need safety issues addressed by staff.

1 **Setback/Development Standards:**

2
3 Commissioner McAllister: Houses are too large for the lot sizes – need to establish some
4 other parameters.

5
6 Matt White: The commission can dictate setbacks - can we agree to a 15-foot back yard?
7

8 Commissioner McAllister: Would like 20-feet and would compromise on the side yard
9 such as zipper lot configuration, however, that is SPARC issue.

10
11 Matt White: How about a combined 30-foot setback, with a minimum of 15 in back and
12 10 in front and 5 feet to play with.

13
14 Chair Barrett: How about 15 feet for property that backs onto the separator.

15
16 Commissioner McAllister: Support a larger back yard – 20 feet except 15-feet where it
17 backs up to the urban separator.

18
19 George White: Do you want these issues to be dealt with before going to Council?
20

21 The consensus was that all identified issues and/or modifications should be finalized prior
22 to Council reviewing the project.

23
24 **Infrastructure:**

25
26 Chair Barrett: Water issues were dealt with in the Initial Study.

27
28 Matt White: Roads will be designed to City standards and dedicated to the City.

29
30 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Seems inappropriate to impose street maintenance on this
31 subdivision.

32
33 Commissioner Asselmeier: Believe this subdivision is different – the General Plan shows
34 that we do not need this housing at this time and therefore was it possible to create some
35 sort of private assessment to pay for street maintenance. Acknowledged that some sort of
36 policy would need to be established first before imposing this as a condition on
37 development applications..

38
39 Commissioner Dargie: Believe this project should adhere to current standards that other
40 subdivisions adhere to.

41
42 Chair Barrett: Can see both sides of the argument – do not the have the answers.

43
44 Council Member Harris: Do not believe we should change the standards midstream.

45
46 Commissioner McAllister: Would like to see the final synthesis before recommending to
47 council. Realize this is a unique application and it's urgency. Feel hesitant to

1 recommend forwarding without seeing the project again. Do not want to set a precedent
2 here.

3
4 Chair Barrett: Hesitant to approve something that we are have not seen. Many
5 improvements have been made – would not feel comfortable forwarding the
6 recommendation.

7
8 Commissioner Rose: What are logical consequences if it came back to Planning
9 Commission.

10
11 George White: Probably could not schedule until March 9th.

12
13 Matt White: Will work on the changes you proposed this evening while getting it ready
14 to go to the Council.

15
16 M/S Dargie/von Raesfeld to recommend adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration,
17 approving a General Plan Amendment and rezoning to PUD with the following to be
18 finalized, as agreed to by the applicant, prior to City Council review and approval:

19
20 **Prior to the public notice for City Council review:**

- 21
22 1. **Gateway/Noise Barrier/Aesthetic Issues** – The site serves as a gateway to the
23 City. Noise wall along the road, as proposed, is not an appropriate gateway.
24 a. Fix the “problem corner” near Frates and Lakeville by reconfiguring the
25 awkward lots in that corner. Relocate 3 lots elsewhere on site to maintain
26 same unit count for single-family homes.
27 b. Design a landscaped “Gateway” element at Frates/Lakeville corner.
28 Developer would be responsible to build the improvement as part of the
29 project.
30 c. The above redesign would allow the height and length of the noise wall
31 along Lakeville to be substantially reduced.
32 d. Design a “Gateway” element at other end of Lakeville noise wall, near
33 PG&E easement/Urban Separator. Developer would be responsible to
34 build the improvement as part of the project
35 e. Provide for wider planting area along the outside of the wall (toward
36 Lakeville). The proposed two-foot wide planting area is not adequate.
37 Modify yards within the project to achieve an 8-10 landscaped area
38 between Lakeville and the soundwall. Pursue the idea of an encroachment
39 permit with Caltans to widen the planting area.
40 f. The noise study shall include hard data (not just conclusion), which
41 demonstrates that project conforms to General Plan noise standards for
42 residential development.
43
44 2. **Public Park**
45 a. All items in the memo from Jim Carr, Parks Director dated December 16,
46 2003 shall be incorporated into the project.

- 1 b. Relocate park to connect to Urban Separator/PG&E easement, per Urban
2 Separator discussion.
- 3 c. Eliminate lots backing up to park.
- 4
- 5 3. **Urban Separator/Feathering**
- 6 a. Decrease lot dimensions in order to increase Urban Separator to a
7 minimum of 35-40 feet along Ely Road.
- 8 b. Relocate park adjacent to PG&E easement/passive open space to provide
9 more useful open space area/Urban Separator.
- 10
- 11 4. **Setbacks/Development Standards**
- 12 a. Amend Development Standards to provide for a minimum 20-foot rear
13 yard setback, except for lots with rear yards that back up to Urban
14 Separator, which shall have a minimum rear yard of 15 feet.
- 15 b. Delete exceptions to minimum setbacks in Development Standards.
- 16
- 17 5. **Access/Circulation**
- 18 a. Per Municipal Code frontage improvements to Ely Road are required as
19 condition of project approval whether or not access on Ely is proposed.
- 20 b. Per staff suggestions in the 1/27/04 staff report, access to/from Ely Road
21 and a signalized intersection at Ely Road and Frates Road should be
22 considered to mitigate traffic issues and provide for increase bicycle and
23 pedestrian safety on Frates Road.
- 24
- 25 6. **PEP/Affordable Housing Site**
- 26 a. Amend development standards to make affordable housing a conditionally
27 permitted use. Details of the affordable housing project will return to
28 Planning Commission for a Conditional Use permit approval prior to
29 SPARC approval.
- 30 b. Provide a second access to the affordable housing site.
- 31
- 32 7. **Environmental Review** It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that
33 the Initial Study, which serves as the CEQA document for the project, should be
34 revised to reflect the revised project that will be presented to the City Council. All
35 necessary information, including but not limited to the following, shall be
36 provided by the applicant to support these revisions:
 - 37 a. A complete set of plans for the revised project, including civil drawings,
38 street sections, a landscape plan, etc.
 - 39
 - 40 b. Revised PDP Development Standards that reflect Planning Commission
41 recommendations regarding setbacks, Use Permit for PEP site, and any
42 other changes necessitated by the revised project design.
 - 43
 - 44 c. A revised Traffic Study that addresses the revised project, including
45 changes to access and internal circulation. In addition, ITE trip generation
46 rates referenced for the PEP housing site should be consistent with the use
47 designated in the PDP development standards, which is *affordable*

1 housing, not *senior* housing. Vin Smith revised project description to
2 delete "Senior" housing from project description and development
3 standards, and as you know, senior housing typically has a lower trip
4 generation rate. While the difference may not be significant, the traffic
5 study should use the appropriate trip generation rate.
6

- 7 d. A revised Noise Study that includes the following:
- 8 o An analysis which demonstrates that the specified placement and
9 height of the proposed noise wall (based on redesign discussed above)
10 will provide the mitigation necessary to comply with General Plan
11 noise standards for residential development.
 - 12 o Noise contours for future noise levels along Frates and Lakeville, as is
13 typically provided in a noise study for residential subdivisions. This
14 will provide the hard data requested by the Planning Commission.
 - 15 o Reference to the traffic study/data used to determine future noise
16 levels, including the percentage of truck traffic assumed for future
17 traffic volumes. Truck traffic can have a substantial effect on traffic
18 noise levels.
 - 19 o Applicant to agree to the mitigation measures and sign the initial
20 study/Neg. Dec. prior to Council hearing being scheduled.
21

22 Motion carried 4-3; Asselmeier, Barrett, McAllister – No.
23

24
25 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

26
27 **II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS/APPOINTMENT OF LIAISON**
28 **REPRESENTATIVES**

29
30 Chair Barrett nominated Will Dargie for Chair, 7-0. Asselmeier/ Harris nominated
31 Barrett for vice chair, 7-0. Liaisons will be appointed at the next meeting.
32

33
34 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 35
 - 36 **a. City Council**
 - 37 **b. SPARC**
 - 38 **c. Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee**
 - 39 **d. Tree Advisory Committee**
40
-

41
42 **Adjournment: 12:30**
43
44
45
46