



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
September 14, 2004 – 7:00 PM

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

* Chair

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of July 13, 2004 were approved as presented.
Barrett abstained, Asselmeier and Harris absent.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: None

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: Re: Correspondence from Sonoma State University.

CORRESPONDENCE: None

APPEAL STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

Public hearing began: @ 7:00

Commissioner Asselmeier arrived at 7:10 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING:

NEW BUSINESS:

- I. PARK SQUARE (AKA PARK CENTRAL), Lakeville & Casa Grande Roads**
APN: 005-040-054 and 005-040-055
Project File No(s). : PUD02006/SPC02041
Planner: Irene Borba

1
2 Applicant is requesting a recommendation to the City Council to Adopt a
3 Mitigated Negative Declaration and to approve a PCD-Planned Community
4 District Amendment to the Park Central Planned Community District and a
5 Tentative Parcel Map

6
7 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

8
9 Steve LaFranchi, Engineer, Introduced the project team and gave an overview of the
10 project.

11
12 Michael Hershman, Eagle Lakeville Partners: Presented the project background.

13
14 Steve Hester, Trammel-Crow: Gave a history of the project and Trammel Crow
15 Residential's background with similar developments.

16
17 R.C. Allie, Architect: Presented the project architecture.

18
19 Wayne Kelly, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape architecture and the
20 pedestrian circulation.

21
22 Michael Hershman: Responded to correspondence from neighboring property owners
23 which were included in the packet.

24
25 **Public hearing opened:**

26
27 Ed Coyne: The project will have negative impact on the surrounding industrial uses. I
28 feel the industrial uses will be isolated. The project does not meet the definition of mixed
29 use. There is a problem with incompatibility of uses. Believe Technology Lane is too
30 crowded with truck traffic, parking on one side and two bike lanes. Need to preserve
31 industrial spaces for local employment. Do not think this is a compatible use with the
32 Petaluma Poultry Processors.

33
34 Bruce Carlson, Radius Development: Owner of Steelhead Development. Radius is
35 proposing for sale industrial/office condominiums. The project proposed this evening is
36 not mixed use – it is residential with some retail. Our property will not be viable if this
37 project is developed as residential. The adjacency and isolation are critical here.

38
39 Paula Ash, Workrite Ergonomics: Workrite is the backyard of Park Central. Our
40 building is an open paved playground for the kids in the Park Central Apartments. The
41 rear of our building is hidden from the road and is therefore a place that kids can hang out
42 and not be seen. Our building and lawn have been vandalized after hours.

43
44 **Public hearing closed:**

45
46 Matt Hudson: Responded to public comments regarding open space, bike lanes, mixed
47 use and incompatibility of uses. There were 17 calls to the Petaluma Police Department

1 in the 1450 Technology Lane area that the applicant submitted for the record. Do not
2 know why Workrite has not called Trammel Crow if there is a problem with vandalism
3 by children living in the apartments.

4
5 **Commission Comments:**

6
7 Chair Dargie: Central issue is land use. Would like to poll the Commissioners on this
8 issue first.

9
10 Commissioner Barrett: Saw the project at SPARC. I was on the Planning Commission
11 when the mixed use project was approved and we were all excited. We had concerns at
12 that time about the compatibility of uses. Do not believe this is the correct land use for
13 this type of project.

14
15 Commissioner McAllister: Do not feel that this project is truly mixed use in concept. I
16 cannot support because of the surrounding uses and noise. I also have concerns about
17 losing industrial uses.

18
19 Commissioner von Raesfeld: I am torn because I think this is a transitional parcel. Some
20 of the opposition is design based.

21
22 Commissioner Asselmeier: My concerns relate to the loss of industrial uses. It seems
23 there is an expectation of the other industrial users. I do not think the proposed project is
24 an appropriate use on this site. This site needs more buffer of residential to industrial.
25 Too many streets and too much parking, open space is too scattered to be useable. Might
26 have seen better results if there were more retail/commercial space.

27
28 Commissioner Rose: Am not convinced that this isn't mixed use (loosely defined). I
29 think there are some compatibility issues. Project is disturbing in its execution – isn't
30 being mitigated by the design of the units. Need to reexamine the siting of some of the
31 units. It would do well to have more retail. Want to see higher numbers of units with
32 office capability. Have reservations about orientation of some of the units. I think the
33 project could work; however, it would take some modifications.

34
35 Chair Dargie: Am a little torn although I think the project could work. I am not certain if
36 more residential would exacerbate the problem. The applicant has brought us some
37 "mixed use". My biggest concern is traffic on Technology Lane.

38
39 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Radius Development and Workrite are associated with this
40 development by virtue of their access.

41
42 Commissioner Barrett: The portion of the project east of Technology Lane is very
43 problematic. I believe the adjacency is a real issue. The lack of useable open space for
44 kids 12-16 years olds is problematic. There are new apartments on East Washington
45 Street and Basin Street is building new apartments on the river. Do not think it's a good
46 idea to make a bad situation worse.

1 Commissioner McAllister: I can agree with Commissioner von Raesfeld and
2 Commissioner Rose's point about the site design being problematic. I do not want to
3 craft a compromise and I'm not sure that would be a productive exercise. The concept of
4 this housing project does not work with the adjacent uses.

5
6 Commissioner Asselmeier: There may be a revised plan that might work, am not
7 prepared to say what that is this evening. If there was less residential and more buffered
8 from the industrial uses, it may work. The truck traffic is problematic. Doubling the
9 amount of apartments is not what was envisioned for this site. A different combination of
10 mixed use could work here.

11
12 Commissioner Rose: Don't have a recommendation for the pieces on the east side of
13 Technology Lane. I think the majority of the development could work. If the traffic can
14 be slowed adequately on Technology Lane it might work. Think it would need to
15 integrate more office or live work space into the development. It certainly warrants more
16 than 4 units. Building 6 in northwest corner is in the wrong place for an apartment – this
17 would be a more logical place to increase the retail or for a small office building. There
18 are ways to make it work.

19
20 Commissioner Barrett: What you are suggesting is changing the project by adding more
21 commercial, more live work and the siting of the units on Telecom Lane.

22
23 Matt Hudson: We will step back and look at the project and take the comments into
24 consideration.

25
26 Commissioner von Raesfeld: Club House might be more appropriate to be commercial.
27 Do not understand why Telecom Lane cannot extend to Lakeville Highway. Main Street
28 from primary entry should read more as a street – would gain some rationality. Main
29 Street as it is looks like a parking lot. Main Street could extend from Casa Grande to
30 Telecom Lane and you would see street grids. Bldg. 6 should clearly be mixed use.

31
32 Commissioner Barrett: Suggested flipping Telecom Lane buildings so they face the
33 interior to the project. I hope you will be talking with your neighbors as well as the
34 Commissioner's here tonight. It is important how this development treats its neighbors.
35 The comment about introducing a grid system would help – too suburban for its location.
36 Public spaces are still an issue – need to go further. Group the public area and have
37 something attractive for the 12-16 year olds, possibly a skate park. Want to address the
38 speed aspect on Technology Lane. Upgrade bike lane to a class I because of the truck
39 traffic.

40
41 Commissioner McAllister: Am concerned about the parcel on the east of Telecom Lane
42 Commissioner's Rose's idea would improve it for the residents. Believe this is over
43 parked. If it is mixed use, it would open up the open space possibilities. The open
44 spaces seem to be just left over spaces. Agree with the comment on the building that is
45 on the corner of Casa Grande and Lakeville. If the project goes forward as residential, it
46 needs to be designed appropriately for this site since it is next to industrial uses. Am

1 concerned about the Bike Committee's off site issues – need to address those bike
2 connections. Want to make the bike connections a reality.

3
4 Commissioner Asselmeier: Concur with what has been said. Want to see an impact fee
5 to construct bike and pedestrian pathways. If the applicant offered to do something like
6 that it would go a long way for the Commission. I would say the same thing to the
7 Steelhead property owners as well. Preserve connections to Adobe Creek. Suggested a
8 small local market be part of the retail to serve the residents. Trade off some of the linear
9 streets for more open space. Provide only the parking you absolutely need. Have
10 problems with applications that are over parked. Use the additional space for open space.
11 Provide useable space for residents on the ground floor.

12
13 Chair Dargie: If there is residential on the north side of Technolgy Lane, want to have it
14 evaluated for safety if there is a large amount of truck traffic. Need to have safe crossing
15 on Technology Lane. Is there anything that could be done differently?

16
17 Issues identified by the Commission:

- 18
19
- 20 • Compatibility of uses
 - 21 • Potential loss of industrial uses/areas
 - 22 • Reorientation of areas in the project
 - 23 • More useable open space
 - 24 • Additional retail/commercial (particularly building 6 and buildings east of
25 Telecom Lane)
 - 26 • Parking ratio too high/consider shared parking between retail/residential
 - 27 • Introduce new grid system/too suburban
 - 28 • Traffic impacts/speed on Technology Lane

29 M/S Rose/von Raesfeld to continue to a date uncertain. 6-0, Harris absent.
30

31
32 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 33
- 34 a. **City Council:** None
 - 35 b. **SPARC:** Commissioner Barrett updated the Commission on the SPARC
36 hearings from June 24, 2004 to September 9, 2004
 - 37 c. **Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee:** Reviewed MMM Business
38 condos; continuing to update the Bike Plan; looking at how projects and
39 bike paths are implemented once projects are complete; checking in with
40 the street improvements re: bike lanes; walk to school program.
 - 41 d. **Tree Advisory Committee:** Still working on a tree ordinance.
- 42

43
44 **Adjournment:** 10:20

45
46 S:\PC-Planning Commission\Minutes\PC Minutes 04\091404.doc