



*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 **March 23, 2004 – 7:00 PM**

4

5 Commissioners:

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

7 \* Chair

8

9 Staff: Pamela Tuft, Director of General Plan Administration

10 Dean Eckerson, Engineering Manager, Dept. of Water Resources & Conservation

11 Scott Duiven, Associate Planner

12 Shelly Kappel, Administrative Secretary

13

14

---

15 **ROLL CALL**

16 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

17 **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** None

18 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:** None

19 **CORRESPONDENCE:** Letter to Pamela Tuft from Paula Lane Action Network  
20 (PLAN) regarding Land Use Mobility and Alternatives 2025 Technical Appendix Index

21

22

23 Public Workshop began: 7:00 p.m.

24

25 **NEW BUSINESS:**

26

27 **GENERAL PLAN 2004-2025: Discussion and comment on the Land**  
28 **Use and Mobility Alternatives Report**

29 Present: Rajeev Bhatia, Dyett & Bhatia

30 Matthew Ridgway, Fehr & Peers

31

32 Pamela Tuft: Presented Alternatives Report and invited the Commission to participate in  
33 the upcoming public workshops, March 24<sup>th</sup> and April 10<sup>th</sup>. General Plan Administration  
34 staff is available to the Commission for additional workshops, as needed, to  
35 accommodate Commission participation in recommending a Preferred Land Use and  
36 Mobility Plan to the City Council.

37

38

1 **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

2  
3 Ira Bennett: Has been a developer for 25 years. Became interested in Land Use issues  
4 when serving on Citizen Committees for General Plans in the early 70's in Mendocino  
5 County. Has been involved in at least two dozen General Plan updates. His perception is  
6 that this General Plan team is one of the best he has ever seen in terms of depth of  
7 knowledge, analysis and clarity that everyone is bringing to it.

8  
9 Susan Kirks: Lives on the west side of Petaluma and is speaking on behalf of her  
10 neighborhood organization, Paula Lane Action Network (PLAN). Materials were  
11 provided to Pamela Tuft's office and the Planning Commission today that consists of  
12 detailed comments and biological reports for the General Plan process. PLAN is a  
13 neighborhood organization of about 70 families and households on the west side of  
14 Petaluma. As shown on Alternatives A, B & C in the revised General Plan map,  
15 specifically on Paula Lane between Bodega Avenue and Schuman Lane, it appears that  
16 the recommended increase in density would be to rural residential two to four houses per  
17 acre. A discussion with a County General Plan team member, working on the revision of  
18 the Sonoma County General Plan, disclosed that this type of zoning change would require  
19 sewage services from the City. The County currently does not have an intention of  
20 changing the designation on the County properties in our neighborhood from the current  
21 agriculture, residential, one house per two acres. We would appreciate a reflection in the  
22 revised General Plan of the actual zoning in our neighborhood on County properties. On  
23 the map in the underutilized land, figure 2-4, the increased zoning, rural residential  
24 zoning, some of the properties that are currently AR2. PLAN believes there are three  
25 between Bodega Avenue and Sunset Drive shown as underutilized land. With the current  
26 AR2 zoning designation, which we understand will not be changed, we would question  
27 the proposed designation. Those particular properties are three old Petaluma and Sonoma  
28 County farmsteads that all have homes on them, some have barns, and some are currently  
29 used for domestic animals. PLAN requests that a reconsideration of that underutilized  
30 land on Paula Lane be designated to be similar to County AR2. Regarding the Urban  
31 Separator (US), PLAN of course favors an official designation of what has always been  
32 considered on our side of town, that the west side of Paula Lane, between Bodega  
33 Avenue and Schuman Lane and going northward is a US and we see that on all three  
34 Alternatives. PLAN requests that at least 200 feet of an US, keeping in mind that the  
35 General Plan policy is a maximum of 300 feet, be considered in the planning process. We  
36 would ask that in the planning process, those writing the plan, be cognizant of 1) the  
37 historic relevance of Paula Lane to early Sonoma County and Petaluma rural agricultural  
38 heritage; 2) environmental constraints in areas such as traffic, traffic congestion,  
39 hydrology, including drainage, water pressure, ground water recharge, potential wetlands,  
40 sewage disposal, and visual esthetic uses; and 3) wildlife corridor which is the Paula  
41 Lane land from Bodega Avenue to Schumann Lane, keeping in mind the importance to  
42 our community of wildlife habitat protection (American Badger) as well as over 61 bird  
43 species.

1 Clayton Engstrom – Have been a resident of Petaluma for about 35 years. Has concerns  
2 about where this General Plan is heading with respect to his neighborhood (Jessie Lane  
3 off Petaluma Boulevard North). Specifically, about how we do grow and how we adopt  
4 the Plan that is going to be respectful of the built environment. Concerned that there is no  
5 US on the west side of town (Jessie Lane). Petaluma Boulevard North as gateway  
6 development standard is a concern and would like to see something built in that corridor  
7 to be proud of, rather than a sound wall similar to the east side of town.

8  
9 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

10  
11 Commissioner Barrett: Regarding Chart 2-2, residential density, in the description of  
12 traditional and PUD zoning and how it would be affected under the proposed alternatives;  
13 i.e., #4, Old East Petaluma, traditional zoning; there would be additional potential for 17  
14 units—do you mean that there would be additional potential for 17 units without making  
15 anymore lots, which would be a net gain of 14 units? Is that 17 additional units plus  
16 granny units? Question about granny units actually applies to everything about residential  
17 development. When we talk about increasing medium densities to 18 units, do we mean  
18 18 plus everyone can add on a granny unit too?

19  
20 Pamela Tuft: The intent would not include granny units. Granny units are intended for the  
21 detached single-family dwelling neighborhoods. In the past, density calculations have not  
22 included granny units in the detached single-family dwelling zones. According to Mike  
23 Moore, Community Development Director (present at the meeting), the City does not  
24 permit granny units in the RC (Compact Residential) zone. Not sure what the  
25 development standards will be after the General Plan is completed but it is the intent that  
26 the multiple-unit designations would not accommodate the placement of granny units.

27  
28 Scott Duiven: There was a misconception because the density ranges that are proposed in  
29 the land use classifications imply that there was a whole scale doubling of density within  
30 a community, which was not our intention. We took representative neighborhoods, from  
31 throughout the community, and looked at what the impact of these land use  
32 classifications in those neighborhoods with the intention of preserving those  
33 neighborhoods the way they are. We looked at the land use in terms of number of units to  
34 the acre, looked at parcel size and determined how many units would be allowed based  
35 on whether they subdivided or whether they did duplexes/triplexes.

36  
37 Commission Barrett: Regarding the same example (#4 Old East Petaluma), when you are  
38 saying there is a potential for 17 additional units, would that mean there would be  
39 tear-downs in order to make those 17 additional units or would you assume that the units that were  
40 there would stay there and somehow 17 more units would be squeezed in there?

41  
42 Scott Duiven: It could happen either way but if you look at the exhibit you will notice a  
43 few really large parcels that are long and deep, so people could build additional units on  
44 their parcel without having to necessarily do a tear-down.

45  
46 Commissioner Barrett: It would not rule out tearing down?

1 Scott Duiven: No, that would become more of a policy discussion.

2  
3 Commissioner Barrett: On #5, West Petaluma traditional zoning, it shows the plot of land  
4 where Pepper School and the Hatchery is--currently it shows two parcels that have that  
5 land use designation. The Hatchery is looking to become a multi-unit development which  
6 would substantially change the impact of this neighborhood. Would only those two  
7 outlined lots be considered high-density residential?

8  
9 Scott Duiven: Yes. In this case if you look at the actual alternatives it looks at that block  
10 in terms of the high density being on those two and some of the smaller parcels  
11 surrounding them, but looks at maintaining the office use currently in the Hatchery as one  
12 alternative. Another alternative looks at office and mixed-use for that site.

13  
14 Commissioner Barrett: What if the owner of the Hatchery wants to make it into multiple  
15 housing – what would they have to do to achieve that? What are we doing to them by  
16 adopting any of these alternatives? Are we restricting their development there? Can they  
17 get a PUD there?

18  
19 Scott Duiven: It depends what the Planning Commission and ultimately the City Council  
20 decides in the Preferred Plan will determine what the potential is there; i.e., office use,  
21 high density housing, etc. The option for a PUD will be addressed through the  
22 preparation of Development Standards, subsequent to the General Plan.

23  
24 Commissioner Barrett: I'm not seeing how that is addressed in any of these Alternatives.

25  
26 Pamela Tuft: For the Hatchery building, we were not looking at it for a possible  
27 conversion to residential. If the Planning Commission is interested in doing that, what we  
28 should do is look at it in context with the surrounding neighborhood and whether the  
29 Alternatives should look at something compatible with the neighborhoods to the west and  
30 northwest, or for compatibility to RMG zoning designation. We would look at the  
31 neighborhoods in that context and offer a recommendation to the Planning Commission,  
32 after discussing with the Community Development Department, the possible use of  
33 Diverse Low Residential, similar to a portion of the west side older neighborhoods.

34  
35 Commissioner Barrett: The two outlined are clearly already non-conforming. Could that  
36 kind of development exist throughout the area?

37  
38 Pamela Tuft: No. We are looking at the existing neighborhoods and trying to bring the  
39 General Plan into more consistency with what is there, particularly with the Diverse Low  
40 designation. When areas are designated up to five units (Urban Standard), but are actually  
41 close to ten (units per acre); in our opinion, the Plan would not respect the quality and  
42 density of the community fabric that is there. Our intent was to bring it up so the existing  
43 lots are consistent with the General Plan. One option for the two high-density complexes  
44 on that block is to look at something less than what would bring them closer into  
45 conformity. They are built at 28/29 units per acre and the highest density that we are  
46 offering goes up to 26.

1 Commissioner Barrett: It was mentioned in the presentation whether or not a mobile  
2 home park designation would be useful. What would you think that would include and  
3 why did that come up?  
4

5 Pamela Tuft: The subject came up during the early public workshops and also at the City  
6 Council during the rent control discussions on mobile home parks. The major concern  
7 from residents was that a high- or medium-density designation in the General Plan could  
8 be converted, once the people were moved out and the mobile homes were moved off the  
9 site. The land value for apartments may be a higher net value than continued use as a  
10 mobile home park. Mobile home park designation in the General Plan would preserve  
11 that value of its current use, rather than entice a landowner to seek redevelopment  
12 opportunities. Several City Council members indicated an interest in creating General  
13 Plan designations for mobile homes to preserve the sanctity of land use for our existing  
14 mobile home parks.  
15

16 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Are they currently zoned PUD's?  
17

18 Pamela Tuft: For the most part RMG and in the General Plan Urban Diversified and one  
19 (Little Woods, Lakeville) might be Urban High. **[Note: Following the meeting this was**  
20 **rechecked and all are Urban Standard, 2.1 to five dwelling units/acre, except Little**  
21 **Woods, which is Urban High.]**  
22

23 Commissioner Barrett: On page 7, Table 2-1, you have senior housing—does that number  
24 include mobile homes in the senior housing?  
25

26 Pamela Tuft: No. The senior housing units are subsidized or dedicated to senior only  
27 units.  
28

29 Commissioner Barrett: Are mobile homes included in any of the number of homes?  
30

31 Pamela Tuft: They are a residential unit. They are not designated as senior housing.  
32

33 Commissioner Barrett: So it would be under the single-family unless it was for senior  
34 only.  
35

36 Pamela Tuft: Yes.  
37

38 Commissioner von Raesfeld: The logic of the areas designated as possible UGB  
39 expansion areas, is simply those as indicated in the ballot initiative or is there more to  
40 their selection?  
41

42 Pamela Tuft: In the 1998 Ballot Measure, we looked for those instances where a specific  
43 need would predicate a consideration of an exception. The ballot identified the criteria for  
44 exceptions but a concern was identified by the public as to where those exceptions apply.  
45 What would be a typical exception? So we identified the four possible expansion areas,  
46 not to say those were the only areas that could be considered, but in all likelihood, where  
47 was a possible benefit: 1) Lakeville, southeast of Frates; 2) Near the Ford Ranch on

1 Petaluma Boulevard South; 3) Corona Road, northeast of the rail crossing; 4) Beyond  
2 Redwood Business Park II and III in the open field that is within the City’s UGB and  
3 extending partially up the hill toward Denman Road, extending parallel to the freeway.  
4 This fourth area ended up being designated Community Separator in the agreements  
5 between the County and the City. Alternative C offers a new fourth possible UGB  
6 Expansion Area Alternative, for discussion purposes, to follow the ridge that runs parallel  
7 to Gossage Avenue on the northwest edge of Gossage. Part of Gossage is presently in the  
8 UGB and part of the road is not. We could look at Urban Separator options--parks to  
9 serve the northwest quadrant of the community and some transitional housing to feather  
10 the density toward the rural land uses.

11  
12 Commissioner von Raesfeld: If you look at the graphic and the color assigned to the US,  
13 in some cases it is a “real” US and in come cases it is a “possible” US.

14  
15 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

16  
17 Commissioner von Raesfeld: If you look off Lakeville around Frates, in all three options  
18 it is configured slightly different.

19  
20 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

21  
22 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Those weren’t driven by topography?

23  
24 Pamela Tuft: No. When you look at the 1998 UGB Ballot Measure, my original  
25 suggestion was to look at the UGB in this quadrant to follow Ellis Creek, a natural  
26 boundary, with a concept of having a wide US on the City side of Ellis Creek as it wraps  
27 around in a northeast direction and touches Frates, in the vicinity of Adobe Road; it  
28 would be an appropriate edge of the City. The attempt on the Alternatives looked at  
29 property lines in one and did not follow property lines in the other two Alternatives.

30  
31 Commissioner Barrett: Regarding the XP-SWMM (Service Water Management Model),  
32 does it take into consideration what the buildouts of Alternatives A, B & C would be  
33 outside the town; i.e., the Marin Creek area or the KOA area?

34  
35 Pamela Tuft: The XP-SWMM recognizes the flows that enter the City. We worked with  
36 the Sonoma County PERM on the possibility of General Plan Amendments and  
37 intensifications (their General Plan Amendment process does not anticipate development  
38 potential increases from their existing Plan). We added impervious ratio increases to the  
39 water coming into the City. The analysis did not see backup of water in the model runs  
40 that would adversely affect upstream Liberty/Marin channels. FEMA has changed one of  
41 its storm assumptions pertaining to mean high tide in identifying the 100-year storm  
42 elevation.

43  
44 Dean Eckerson: When you do a watershed analysis to determine your flood plain, you  
45 need to model against a known starting water service elevation. In the case of our current  
46 FEMA map, the starting water service elevation is what is considered the 100-year high  
47 tide. The current analysis for FEMA purposes for determining flood plain, models against

1 the mean higher high water, which is the mean of your high tide and that water service  
2 elevation is about 2.3 feet lower than the 100-year high tide. That is one of the reasons  
3 when looking at the flood plain mapping, it is a comparison of the two. That is one of the  
4 things contributing to the difference in the depicted flood plain.

5  
6 Commissioner Barrett: So it is not as conservative as the 100-year high tide?

7  
8 Dean Eckerson: Yes. It would be less conservative.

9  
10 Commissioner Barrett: So you might get more water in places because it is not as strict.

11  
12 Dean Eckerson: Yes. It is a change in how the Corps determines our FEMA flood plain.

13  
14 Commissioner von Raesfeld: I think we are all referring to Figure 3.2. The word  
15 “existing” is confusing because it also meaning a new mapping criteria. We are still using  
16 the green model?

17  
18 Dean Eckerson: Yes.

19  
20 Commissioner von Raesfeld: So even though we are using the existing, it doesn't mean  
21 it's the model we are using.

22  
23 Dean Eckerson: Yes. We are using what is mapped in green and we will continue until  
24 we use the XP-SWMM to do a new FEMA flood plain mapping and get it approved by  
25 FEMA so we can have a new map. It will be undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the  
26 new General Plan.

27  
28 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Is the local municipality the lead at re-mapping and FEMA  
29 is the approving agency?

30  
31 Dean Eckerson: They review and approve it. The XP-SWMM is now accepted by FEMA  
32 as an acceptable method of determining your flood plain.

33  
34 Commissioner von Raesfeld: We may want to re-think the word “existing” in the legend.

35  
36 Pamela Tuft: It is the wrong term on this exhibit. It is a current model run under existing  
37 conditions. We will continue to use the 1989 maps and the current FEMA exhibits with  
38 all the Letter of Map Revisions (LOMR) and Map Amendments (LOMA) that have been  
39 approved by FEMA and the Corp of Engineers (CORP).

40  
41 Commissioner von Raesfeld: The amount of hours we dedicate to public comment  
42 associated with flooding, I think it would be wise to identify this in the public outreach  
43 process.

44  
45 Commissioner Barrett: Can the XP-SWMM be extended to follow the water outside the  
46 City that is affected by development within the City because those are the people we hear  
47 from?

1 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

2

3 Commissioner Barrett: Is the County adopting the XP-SWMM?

4

5 Dean Eckerson: I do not know what they are using as far as their model. Our model is  
6 currently setup to depict the upper Petaluma river watershed down to approximately  
7 where Adobe Creek enters the Petaluma River. It is designed to model the entire  
8 watershed. In discussions with the Sonoma County Water Agency through Zone 2A, in  
9 using the Model for the benefit of discussion and looking at the watershed as a whole,  
10 they were receptive. Hoping to see regional benefit.

11

12 Pamela Tuft: Dean Eckerson and I have participated in the County General Plan  
13 Committee meetings and they have indicated an interest in recommending that the  
14 County move toward recognizing watershed standards, similar to the City's, in the  
15 Petaluma Watershed.

16

17 Commissioner Asselmeier: Can you take from this map, Figure 3-2, that there is an  
18 improvement that we are expecting? With this better data, can we feel more confident  
19 that there can be increased density along the River without impacts?

20

21 Pamela Tuft: It is not necessarily better information, it is the benefit of the recently  
22 constructed Payran area - Corp project. With the completion of the Corp project and the  
23 upcoming replacement of the river bridges, we expect improved volume to capacity ratios  
24 in that reach including the free board that is designed into the Corp Project. It will not  
25 necessarily shrink the flood plain even further upstream, but the actual analysis of the  
26 base flood elevations may be improved, once the two bridge blockages downstream are  
27 removed.

28

29 Commissioner Asselmeier: Is the information presented as the Alternative B along the  
30 River based, in part, upon the Corp Project and the improvement?

31

32 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

33

34 Commissioner Asselmeier: Can we take from that there is consistency now and what is  
35 being proposed as a possible Alternative, is consistent with other requirements and what  
36 we are now going to expect to see along the River?

37

38 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

39

40 Commissioner Rose and Commissioner von Raesfeld: Regarding Figure 2-4, what is the  
41 definition of underutilized land?

42

43 Scott Duiven: It is looking at lands that have a use on them but have additional potential  
44 uses under the existing General Plan.

45

46

1 Commissioner Rose: It states in the Alternatives Report approximately 986 acres of lands  
2 within the UGB are vacant. We do not have a similar statistic as to the number of acres  
3 that are underutilized.

4  
5 Scott Duiven: Yes. It is 772 acres.

6  
7 Commissioner Rose: Are all of those designated on Figure 2.4?

8  
9 Scott Duiven: They should be.

10  
11 Commissioner Rose: It seems to me that there are parcels that I notice around town that  
12 do not appear designated and have one residence on a very large parcel surrounded by a  
13 denser neighborhood, so am wondering if that is inventoried and if it is in the 772 acres  
14 but does not appear graphically.

15  
16 Scott Duiven: For the residential parcels, we looked at those that had the ability to qualify  
17 as a major subdivision, we did not look at those that had potential for four or less because  
18 the chances of those converting were less. We did not want to give a false impression that  
19 all of these parcels, especially on the western fringe, are going to be redeveloped.

20  
21 Commissioner Rose: So your figures are conservative to some degree:

22  
23 Scott Duiven: Yes.

24  
25 Rajeev Bhatia (Consultant): This figure is really just for our calculation purposes. We are  
26 not suggesting that these are the only parcels that might change. We did not include all of  
27 the potential re-development. If you have a higher proposed density on a site that is  
28 underutilized, it is more likely to turnover than if you were to zone it for a lower density  
29 use.

30  
31 Commissioner von Raesfeld: In the 700 acres, is that the gross acres, not the undeveloped  
32 remainder?

33  
34 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

35  
36 Commissioner Asselmeier: Regarding growth along the River, in preparing the  
37 Alternative B, did you look at other communities in other states to get a sense of how  
38 successful that type of river-oriented development has been; i.e., Portland? Are there  
39 other models out there in other cities/states where it has shown to be successful?

40  
41 Pamela Tuft: We tried to work with the River in a multifaceted way, intensification in  
42 certain areas to a true urban environment; i.e., Lynch Creek, between Turtle Creek and  
43 Kingsmill. It is one of our most pristine reaches of our urban creeks, when you are in the  
44 creek area you would never know you have neighborhoods on either side of it. In the  
45 different aspects of the River itself, and the various creeks, we tried to look at where we  
46 could meet the storm capacity needs within a width of corridor, provide for habitat  
47 enhancement, improve water run-off quality through opportunities for filtering swales,

1 and allowing the density to come up against the corridor, to the extent possible, to fit  
2 within the framework of those goals. We are recommending, for consideration, some  
3 higher density along the River. Consider the various zones, then look at overlaying  
4 acceptable levels of intensity that would work well with the habitat that is there, the  
5 habitat that has potential of being there, the need to convey storm water; then recognizing  
6 the more people near the River, the better it will be loved, enhanced and preserved.

7  
8 Commissioner Asselmeier: There are going to be zones along the River?

9  
10 Pamela Tuft: That is what we are proposing. Also, widening out the River “corridor” in  
11 areas we feel the need is there to address habitat and capacity needs. We are not  
12 proposing the use of any projects along the lines of the Corp Channelization Project, the  
13 engineers’ solution of concrete walls and retaining structures.

14  
15 Commissioner Asselmeier: What capacity does the River have to really attract this  
16 growth and hold it and have that be appropriate for our size of community? Are we  
17 overinvesting and overfocusing growth along the River if it really can’t hold that and  
18 attract the investment whether it is commercial, office or residential? Have you taken a  
19 survey of other towns, based on our size of River?

20  
21 Pamela Tuft: No. We have not done a survey that ties population, river volume capacities  
22 but would be interested at looking at that possibility. Every lineal foot of the River needs  
23 to be addressed with great care.

24  
25 Commissioner Asselmeier: Can you briefly address the consistency with the River  
26 Access and Enhancement Plan and what is being proposed with Alternative B?

27  
28 Pamela Tuft: The River Access and Enhancement Plan is pivotal to the General Plan.  
29 When we develop the Draft Plan, it is our intent that the River plan will continue to be an  
30 appendix document. The setbacks that are called in the River Plan will be reiterated in the  
31 General Plan and the locations where flood terraces are called for, the actual setback for  
32 the terraces will be called out in the General Plan as either development constraints or as  
33 a green corridor along the River. Alternative B identifies a flood corridor.

34  
35 Commissioner Asselmeier: So there is complete consistency?

36  
37 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

38  
39 Commissioner Barrett: Regarding the H<sub>2</sub>O-Net Modeling, is that going to have to drive  
40 all three Alternatives or the preferred Plan?

41  
42 Pamela Tuft: The H<sub>2</sub>O-Net is to address the capacity of the existing system (pipes and  
43 pumps) or the capacity needs of an improved system to meet fire and domestic flows; i.e.,  
44 Paula Lane—getting minimum pressures is problematic so we did not want to address  
45 proposed densities that would exacerbate that system. It is a long-range tool that we will  
46 use to analyze proposed projects and to maintain the system in a workable fashion. We  
47 created it to “test the waters” on the Alternatives so that we didn’t box ourselves into a

1 land use proposal that did not work when we identified the Capital Improvement Program  
2 needed for implementation (one of the directives of the General Plan). We do not want to  
3 present something with hidden costs later that are a surprise to the community or not  
4 feasible to build.

5  
6 Commissioner Barrett: So you are saying that Alternatives A, B & C do pencil out.

7  
8 Pamela Tuft: What we did is we took the most intensive, which is Alternative B, ran it  
9 through the model and met with the engineers that did the evaluation.

10  
11 Commissioner Barrett: The number of housing units that are proposed in each of the  
12 Alternatives, with B being the most intense, how do those compare to what the  
13 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) assumes Petaluma will need during the  
14 lifetime of this upcoming General Plan?

15  
16 Pamela Tuft: I cannot speak for ABAG, but have had discussions with their Principal  
17 Planner who deals with the housing allocations. None of the Alternatives create barriers  
18 to providing our affordable housing (fair share numbers). ABAG does not tell a  
19 community what growth you need; they have always respected our Residential Growth  
20 Management System in preparing their projection numbers. The Projections 2003  
21 document did not incorporate the changes that have been undertaken by the City in the  
22 last year or so, such as the changes through the CPSP or the number of other recently  
23 approved projects that entailed General Plan Amendments. ABAG looks at the document  
24 that is in place at the time. I am assuming that with the adoption of the CPSP and other  
25 General Plan Land Use Amendments that have occurred over the last year, that the next  
26 ABAG projections document will identify different figures.

27  
28 Commissioner McAllister: Are the population projections based on approved plans for a  
29 particular city or they somehow regionally based? How do the numbers in the  
30 Alternatives match some, or do not match, meet population projections for the Petaluma  
31 area?

32  
33 Pamela Tuft: The ABAG projections are based on local land use regulations.

34  
35 Commissioner McAllister: So the population data at the beginning of the Report is based  
36 on only approved plans?

37  
38 Pamela Tuft: Yes.

39  
40 Commissioner McAllister: Regarding the H<sub>2</sub>O-Net Modeling, how will overall water  
41 supply allocation affect this Plan?

42  
43 Pamela Tuft: We take the issue of allocation from Sonoma County Water Agency  
44 (SCWA) very seriously. The City Council was wise to identify back in 2000, that Water  
45 Resources was one of the top three issues of this General Plan and why the four Master  
46 Plans for the General Plan Water Resources Element of our community were  
47 incorporated into the General Plan preparation process. We are currently preparing

1 Master Plans for: 1) Recycled Water (tertiary and secondary treated effluent), 2) Ground  
2 Water Feasibility Analysis, 3) Surface Water Management, and 4) Water Supply. These  
3 Master Plans need to intertwine with all of the other Elements of the General Plan as we  
4 identify the development patterns that we want through the year 2025 and beyond.

5  
6 Commissioner McAllister: Are we going to end up needing to prioritize development  
7 according to this water allocation, which seems scant, given the intensity of some of what  
8 we are looking at? This comes up from time-to-time when projects come in for review.  
9 There is a concern that we might run out.

10  
11 Pamela Tuft: This conversation needs to be held in the Public Forum and as we move  
12 towards a Preferred Plan specifically in the policy preparation section, on which this  
13 Commission will weigh heavily.

14  
15 **BREAK**

16  
17 Chair Dargie: Asked Pamela Tuft to go over what the Planning Commission needs to  
18 achieve tonight.

19  
20 Pamela Tuft: The purpose of tonight is to introduce you to the Alternatives Report, to  
21 become comfortable with the content, ask questions and begin the discussion process.  
22 Would like to set another workshop meeting with the Commission with specific topics of  
23 discussion to help guide with the preparation of policies and the identification of the  
24 Preferred Plan. Wants the Commission to be active in the upcoming Public Workshops.

25  
26 Commissioner McAllister: On the Alternatives, regarding the block with the Hatchery  
27 (8<sup>th</sup> and “F”) on it, some parcels have different land use designations, with the fine level  
28 of detail, how do we as the Planning Commission get to that level of discussion or is it  
29 driven by the property owners?

30  
31 Pamela Tuft: The discussion can be parcel specific if the Planning Commission wants it  
32 to be parcel specific. We are working now on a data set that shows existing General Plan  
33 and the three Alternatives. The biggest step we opted to do on this General Plan is to not  
34 take a “broad brush” approach of doing whole swaths of a land use designation. We  
35 recognize for a great part of the community, this will probably be the last General Plan  
36 that they will see. Regarding the Hatchery block, as a past Planning Director, on more  
37 than one occasion owners of the Hatchery building wanted to do something that was not  
38 consistent with the General Plan. We tried to address the fabric of the neighborhood  
39 keeping the focus on a more specific-structure preservation level.

40  
41 Commissioner McAllister: Agrees also that we should not go parcel by parcel but what  
42 happens to those parcels that escape the notice of the reviewing agencies but there were  
43 some alternative ideas? Would your office decide how to allocate this?

44  
45 Pamela Tuft: We used the existing land use as a foundation document in the old historic  
46 neighborhoods.

1 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Do you have a guess of the range of parcels within the  
2 current City limits.

3  
4 Pamela Tuft: Just over 22,000.

5  
6 Commissioner von Raesfeld: If you look at a large portion of east Petaluma, they are all  
7 existing residential, so maybe 10% of the parcels will be a-typical parcels and has that list  
8 been done, as in the ones that are a-typical to their neighborhood or a-typical because  
9 they are undeveloped or underutilized; i.e., Petaluma Boulevard South? If you look at the  
10 existing land use map and the legend of the proposed Alternatives, we are introducing  
11 some new categories and zoning is one of our primary tools to implementing the General  
12 Plan. Is the Zoning Ordinance rewrite going to be concurrent with, or after, the adoption  
13 of the General Plan?

14  
15 Pamela Tuft: The rewrite has been authorized and will follow soon after the General Plan  
16 (concurring by Mike Moore, Community Development Director).

17  
18 Commissioner von Raesfeld: The current analysis and studies assume Highway 101 will  
19 be six lanes--what do we have if this does not happen and the General Plan says this? We  
20 may not see this in the life of the General Plan.

21  
22 Pamela Tuft: If it is a reality that we are not going to assume the Narrows Widening  
23 Project somewhere in the early teens, as it is now scheduled, then we need to re-think the  
24 Level of Service or need to have a policy workshop at the City Council level.

25  
26 Commissioner von Raesfeld: What do we do on the Planning Commission level if this  
27 does not happen for several years?

28  
29 Pamela Tuft: This needs to be discussed--do we continue to plan with the Regional  
30 Transportation assumptions that everyone else in the County is modeling?

31  
32 Commissioner Asselmeier: Is there precedent for setting project approvals to be  
33 somewhat contingent upon a timely completion of a particular transportation  
34 improvement? Is there some way of tying project approvals to the actual completion of  
35 transportation improvements?

36  
37 Pamela Tuft: Discussion needs to be held with Community Development and General  
38 Plan Executive Team for a more definitive answer as to method.

39  
40 **ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED/CLARIFIED**

41  
42 Commissioner Rose:

43 — Need guidance on Residential Growth Management—do we retain a management  
44 system and limit growth by virtue of x number of units per year?

1 Commissioner Asselmeier:

- 2 — Possible UGB Expansion Areas—would like to further explore the implication of  
3 discussing certain areas and get a better understanding of what this Plan means  
4 when adopted with those additional areas.  
5 — More familiarity and understanding with the Ballot Measure.  
6 — US – If we keep expanding, what does that mean to the US? Does it get replicated  
7 again? Does it become an internal recreational corridor?  
8 — Would like position papers to identify the main issues and work through the pros  
9 and cons.

10  
11 Commissioner von Raesfeld:

- 12 — Define: “Maintaining Economic Development is desirable or vital.”  
13 — Regarding Alternative C, introduction of neighborhood area plans, certain areas  
14 are challenged; i.e., if a owner on the west side wanted to bring back an old style  
15 grocery store, this owner would not do a General Plan Amendment. Build in  
16 reasonable flexibility.  
17 — Water Element – Ground water recharge needs to be discussed.  
18 — Discuss the lack of interface between the 2018 UGB timeline and the 2025  
19 General Plan timeline.  
20 — The interface between the assumptions embedded in the General Plan; i.e., six  
21 lanes on Highway 101.

22  
23 Commissioner Barrett:

- 24 — The UGB Expansion Areas—One of the possible UGB expansion areas was taken  
25 off because it has been designated as a scenic area Community Separator by the  
26 County--is that what people wanted? Several of the Plans are showing a lot of  
27 concentration in the Jessie Lane/Gossage Avenue area and there is some concern  
28 for what is very similar to the Paula Lane area that consist of rural ranchettes and  
29 all of sudden they are going to find themselves with 18 units per acre density  
30 possibility. Needs to be serious consideration about the whole western  
31 development and the UGB sensitivity.  
32 — US needs to be utilized as much as possible on the west side.  
33 — Using the XP-SWMM to look at where this water goes outside our town to the  
34 areas that are affected by the development in Petaluma.  
35 — The Bike and Pedestrian Plan needs to be respected in the proposed Plan. In order  
36 for people to get around safely, there needs to be a viable Class 1 style bike lane  
37 and pedestrian walkways.  
38 — Would like to see proposed extension into any UGB, such as suggested in the  
39 Corona area.  
40 — Discussion about how many units we will be developing yearly. What will the  
41 water needs be?  
42 — Retain and preserve downtown neighborhoods.  
43 — Zoning discussions – mobile home park designation, river dependent industry,  
44 Agricultural support industry, commercial, and private recreation.  
45 — Discuss commercial private recreation.

46

1 Commissioner McAllister:

- 2 — Discuss the subareas within the General Plan; i.e., Corona Road, northern entry  
3 which includes the Stony Point area, the interchange, Petaluma Boulevard South  
4 and North, western boundary outlining areas and south entry. How do we envision  
5 these areas?  
6 — Achieving community character.  
7 — Residential densities; i.e., hillside rural residential with a maximum density of  
8 four dwelling units per acre.  
9 — FAR's – is there any kind of floor area ratio for residential? Is concerned with  
10 large houses on small lots.  
11 — Residential Growth Management System – Look at other communities and bring  
12 in precedent on what other communities are doing; i.e., Windsor.

13  
14 Councilmember Harris:

- 15 — More discussion on mobility, possibly a position paper. Have the pros and cons  
16 looked at.

17  
18 Chair Dargie:

- 19 — Review the land use designations that are being proposed—large houses built on  
20 small lots.  
21 — Discuss the differences between Alternative A, B, and C.  
22 — Discussion on how development along the River would work—more  
23 concentration on this than along thoroughfares which is proposed in Alternative  
24 A. What would the implications be? What would the City look like?  
25 — Discussion on congestion, on the Level of Service in intersections.  
26 — Discuss the cross-town connector.  
27 — Discuss Petaluma Boulevard North past the Police Station.  
28 — Would like lead background piece for pros and cons for any of the previous issues  
29 brought up tonight.  
30 — Wants a better understanding of the Alternatives Report so suggested to Pamela  
31 Tuft to bring up issues that she feels the Planning Commission needs to discuss.

32  
33 **MORE QUESTIONS**

34  
35 Commissioner Barrett: Does the river dependent industry have to be industry not travel,  
36 entertainment or tourism?

37  
38 Pamela Tuft: In context of the dredging, the commercial tonnage is the only weight that is  
39 counted. That does not mean that the merits of recreational shouldn't be weighed heavily  
40 with regard to community benefit.

41  
42 Commissioner Barrett: Would transportation, if you had ferries?

43  
44 Pamela Tuft: That has been discussed, but at this point in time (in the ranking that we are,  
45 which is so far below ports like Oakland, San Diego, we are in such a different category)  
46 the indication has been that, no, it would not be included.

1 Commissioner Barrett: Agriculture support industry could mean frozen food processing  
2 factory?

3

4 Pamela Tuft: Yes, it could, depending on the definition and the policies that support that  
5 definition.

6

7 Commissioner Barrett: There is a lot of rural area in Sonoma County that has a lot of  
8 traffic congestion because of the wineries, which I don't think people realized what  
9 Agricultural support industries might mean. Would that fall into that category?

10

11 Pamela Tuft: We have not defined it. The intent was to address the needs of our existing  
12 agricultural industries; i.e., dairy and food processing, and auction yard, etc.

13

14 Commissioner Barrett: Regarding commercial private recreation, what if a driving range  
15 owner wants to retire and sell and it becomes a drive-in again?

16

17 Pamela Tuft: Parking lot for RV's would be a real change in direction. A drive-in movie  
18 theatre is commercial recreation. Is the inventory of privately-owned recreational  
19 activities in this community so important that it needs to be preserved or protected or  
20 clouded by a General Plan specific designation? In my opinion, no, it does not.

21

---

22 **II. LIAISON REPORTS:** None

23

---

24 **Adjournment:** 10:25 pm

25

---