



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 28, 2004 – 7:00 PM

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

* Chair

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of September 14, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Asselmeier, 5-0, absent Harris, von Raesfeld

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Notice at places of a demonstration from Granicus for video streaming of Public Hearings. Discussion regarding Holiday schedule.

COMMISSIONER'S REPORT:

CORRESPONDENCE: None

APPEAL STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

LEGAL RECOURSE STATEMENT: Was noted on the agenda.

Public hearing began: @ 8:00

PUBLIC HEARING:

NEW BUSINESS:

II. WOODRIDGE SUBDIVISION, 804 6th Street

APN: 008-232-054

Project File No(s) : 03-TSM-0010

Planner: Kim Gordon

1 Applicant is requesting a recommendation to the City Council to Adopt a
2 Mitigated Negative Declaration, Rezone the project site to the Woodridge
3 Planned Unit District, Adopt the Unit Development Plan, Adopt the
4 Development Standards, and Approve the Woodridge Tentative Subdivision
5 Map for the Woodridge Planned Unit District.
6

7 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.
8

9 Steven Lafranchi, Engineer: Provided background for the project and addressed the
10 project issues.
11

12 Shawn Montoya, Architect: Stated that the PUD guidelines were flexible.
13

14 Sandy Reed, ZAK Landscape Architects: Presented the landscape plan.
15

16 Chris Wood, Applicant: Gave some history of the property and his intention to build a
17 home for his family.
18

19 Steven Lafranchi: Addressed the grading on the site to construct the roadway.
20

21 **Public hearing opened:**
22

23 Bob Miller, 875 Olive Street: Our property would border on lot 3. I believe the project
24 fits the neighborhood and I support the project.
25

26 Christyne Davidian, 43 Raymond Heights: I am directly behind Parcel A and have
27 concerns about the barriers from the private street that are being proposed. I installed a
28 wire fence that would need to be filled in. This is an expense. I am also concerned about
29 the traffic noise. Is there a way that we can be assured that these will be single family
30 homes. Do not want Victoria style development. Raymond Heights has drainage
31 problems, I have mitigated my problems, however, at 6th Street and Raymond Heights
32 there are flooding problems. Read a letter from Ellen Bicheler who were not able to
33 attend the meeting
34

35 Rod Scaccalosi, 125 Olive Street: I am concerned about the access to the proposed
36 subdivision. Existing access serves one home. It is now a driveway but will become an
37 intersection due to Melanie Court. Assume that the intersection does not need a stop
38 sign. It is an angled entry. Emergency vehicles cannot access site if coming from I Street.
39 Drainage swale makes fire truck bottom out. Unclear if improvements can be made
40 without encroaching on private property. The retaining wall impairs vision when exiting
41 the site. Due to 26' width there are no accommodations for pedestrian, bicycles, and
42 handicapped. Gradient of the roadway is 21% which in exceeds what the fire marshal
43 requires. Curd radius seems inadequate. There will be additional traffic to all the streets.
44 The access should be at 804 – 6th Street. This would allow pedestrian, bike and ADA
45 access, less of a slope, and 3way intersection. It makes more sense for the project to be
46 accessed from there. We do not want more trash cans and mail boxes on Olive Street.

1 This is a safety concern for my family. I would like the commission to consider
2 alternatives.

3

4 Cindy Scaccalosi: Have safety concerns about a blind spot when you are exiting the site
5 caused by retaining wall and light pole. Worse on Thursday when there are trash and yard
6 waste containers on Olive Street. Access is only adequate for one home. There will be
7 additional noise and traffic.

8

9 Anne & Bob Gilbert, 101 Olive Street: Submitted a letter for the record and distributed
10 to the Commissioners. We will be the neighbors most affected by the project. We are
11 immediately adjacent to the driveway. Read their letter expressing concerns regarding
12 fire safety, traffic, noise, water run-off and compliance with zoning in the area. Currently
13 have to back out and down the driveway to Olive Street.

14

15 Tom Lewes, 821 – 6th Street: Encourage the commission to take a full impact study of
16 the proposal before you. I am concerned because my house faces the new development. I
17 want to know if the storm drain be adequate. There is already flooding at 6th and I Streets
18 during the winter. I believe there will be an impact on the homes on 6th Street. How does
19 the proposal fit with the existing zoning requirements? Does the private street create
20 additional development potential in the neighborhood?

21

22 Judith Mooney, 860-6th Street: I object to the project because I believe it's important to
23 keep some open space. Have concerns about noise, traffic, drainage, and driveway. Do
24 not see how the community will benefit from the project.

25

26 Barbara London, 802 - 6th Street: I do not oppose the project. Access from 6th Street
27 does not seem possible- not a practical solution.. Would transfer traffic from one part of
28 the neighborhood to another. I believe it would create more noise.

29

30 Eve O'Rourke, 300 - 6th Street: Parcels 4 and 5 are not consistent with the Hillside
31 Residential Development Combining District. If only one lot develops at a time how are
32 the PUD guidelines followed?

33

34 Steven Lafranchi: Responded to comments:

35

36 • Access: There is not adequate unobstructed access from 6th Street. Regarding the
37 access on Olive we have worked with the fire marshal, had it evaluated by a
38 traffic engineer, and are providing a 20 foot unobstructed clearance. Have done
39 everything to address the City's needs.

40 • Drainage: We are proposing a hill side detention system contained in an
41 underground system and minimizing the impact on 6th Street. System designed to
42 mimic predevelopment runoff.

43 • Noise: The biggest noise factor will be during construction and the hours will be
44 restricted.

45 • Hillside Residential Development Combining District: PUD allows flexibility in
46 lot size.

47

1 Commissioner McAllister: Asked if the driveway on Olive could be widened.

2

3 Steve Lafranchi: He would try to accommodate that.

4

5 Commissioner Asselmeier: Work with Olive Street neighbors to address safety issues,
6 including retain wall and site distance. What would the retain wall look like when
7 reconstructed?

8

9 Steve Lafranchi: Could terrace the retaining wall. This would need to have the okay of
10 the property owner since this is an off site improvement. We could work with a traffic
11 engineer to do signage.

12

13 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked if each lot could have a granny unit.

14

15 Shawn Montoya: It is a permitted use per the zoning ordinance.

16

17 George White: The way the guidelines are written, granny unit would not be prohibited.

18

19 Jim Rose: Would 121 Olive Street be part of the HOA?

20

21 Steve Lafranchi: No

22

23 Bill Tomrose, 121 Olive Street: The excavation, cut and fill, and the traffic would impact
24 my property – did not think that was the intent of the developer. Have concerns about
25 water runoff and building height. Do not want mail boxes in front of my house. Want
26 closed fencing as part of project.

27

28 **Public hearing closed:**

29

30 **Commission Comments:**

31

32 Commissioner Asselmeier: Asked Craig Spaulding to comment on safety issues, for
33 example the Gilbert's backing down the private drive.

34

35 Craig Spaulding: This is an existing condition and the applicant is willing to help
36 alleviate this situation, however, it is an existing condition which is not the responsibility
37 of the developer. Part of the driveway for 101 Olive appears to be on the private street.
38 Referred to the Fire Marshal's email in response to adequate emergency vehicle access.
39 Mr. Spaulding also addressed the storm drain system and runoff from the property. We
40 hope to provide adequate sight distance when the road is reconfigured.

41

42 Commissioner Asselmeier: Could any other mitigations be provided?

43

44 Craig Spaulding: SPARC review would allow another opportunity to fine tune review of
45 the project. Could improve Olive Street by widening access.

46

47 Commissioner Barrett: Is it a City standard to require mirrors?

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

Craig Spaulding: No since this is a private street. Could look at site distance, widening drive. Could be evaluated by a traffic engineer.

Commissioner Rose: Want to focus the discussion on Parcel A and determine if the access is appropriate. There is a potential hazard to have cars or trucks going up with some speed to make the grade and meeting ongoing traffic coming down. Slope approaches 20%. Do not think the design for the roadway as proposed is adequate. Need to widen at Olive Street. Needs to be redesigned and not just for the Gilbert's. Lots 1-3 are the primary lots. Lot 4 is subsidiary. SPARC review of the homes provides some comfort and determine consistency with the spirit of the PUD. Do not know if we can do much about the noise. Not sure that noise from 4 lots would be a problem. Could extend and provide denser landscaping to help reduce noise. If we do not consider Parcel A, the project conforms to the spirit of the Hillside Ordinance and General Plan density.

Commissioner Asselmeier: I certainly agree that each home would go before full SPARC. Can we suggest no granny units?

Commissioner McAllister: Concur with Commissioner Rose's comments on the driveway. My inclination is to go with staff's recommendation to increase the setbacks. Want a requirement or language for stepped house plans that work with the grading of the site. Do not feel a need to make a statement about house design or materials. There is a lot of variety in the houses out there. Am more interested in how they fit into the grade and the massing. Do not want these houses to overwhelm the neighboring houses.

Commissioner Rose: If density is increased, the scale of the homes would be reduced. Allowing lower density, will allow larger homes. Could mitigate by reducing the buildable area. 4500 square foot footprint with a 26' height limit could be a gigantic structure. Reducing the buildable area would reduce the scale.

Commissioner Barrett: Need infill to reduce sprawl. Has to be done sensitively. The development needs to fit into the neighborhood. The driveway negatively impacts the neighbors at 101, 121 and 125 Olive Street. Parcel A needs to be very sensitively done – need to work with the neighbors. The guidelines from the planner, Kim Gordon, are important. Do not want to support granny units here. No auxiliary units or detached garages or structures. Agree with other commissioners about shrinking the footprint. Architecture needs to be step up or step down, height and massing should be under SPARC's purview – this is more important than the materials. SPARC should have review of the Homeowner's Association Guidelines and the CC&R's. 101, 121, and 125 Olive Street neighbors should review as well to get buy in. Like layout of Parcel A, except between 121 and 125 Olive Street.

Chair Dargie: There is no project unless we find that the General Plan density and Hillside Ordinance have been satisfied. Since the houses are not designed, cannot visualize the project. We change the PUD guidelines to minimize the impact, however, I can't get past the General Plan and do not feel like project complies. Can rationalize consistency with Hillside Ordinance since the 2 lots are down the hill. It is difficult to

1 approve something that I cannot visualize. Do not want to burden SPARC with an
2 approved tentative map, setbacks, grading. Most of the surrounding lots are smaller.
3 Project is not consistent with its surroundings.

4
5 Commissioner Barrett: I am willing to allow for less dense development here because
6 more density would be more detrimental to the neighborhood. Increasing setbacks,
7 decreasing the massing, not allowing granny units and detached structures would further
8 reduce impacts to neighbors and make more compatible development.

9
10 Commissioner McAllister: Agree with Commissioner Barrett on this. If we increase the
11 density I do not think it fits in the neighborhood. Increasing density creates additional
12 issues. Agree with reducing the mass. Understand Chair Dargie's density comment.

13
14 Commissioner Asselmeier: Making an exception is probably better for the neighborhood.
15 In order to address what we cannot see yet, we can place requirements on the project to
16 make it a better project for the neighborhood- decrease mass, increase setbacks, no
17 granny units or detached structures. Do not want to leave the approval with too much
18 room to maneuver. Based on the access, safety and neighborhood issues, making an
19 exception for the density is better.

20
21 Commissioner Rose: The current General Plan would allow 13 units on the site, but
22 cannot provide infrastructure. This is inconceivable to me. It is inconsistent with the
23 General Plan. Infill is not an easy prospect. I think a compromise with the General Plan
24 is the right solution here. In this area, General Plan should be considered general. The
25 density does not address the site issues very well. I know we need predictable and
26 consistent zoning, however, this is the best we can do. Believe the review by SPARC is
27 essential to the project. Need to give clear guidance to SPARC. Our commentary tonight
28 is our recommendation.

29
30 Commissioner Asselmeier: There is no comprehensive understanding of grading since
31 there are no house plans and the houses will be individually developed. Is there any
32 specific direction we should provide to SPARC?

33
34 Commissioner McAllister: Can the applicant come up with some elevations and grading
35 criteria for certain lots. Possibly develop site sections a little more precisely.

36
37 George White: Could have graphic grading guideline. Section of Lots 1-4. Show how
38 might step with private drive and existing house on Lot 5.

39
40 Commissioner McAllister: Would be helpful to see lot 1 and 4 to see the relationship of
41 the uphill lot to the downhill lot.

42
43 Commissioner Barrett: Is it premature to have story poles?

44
45 George White: Do not know what the height would be or where the buildings would be
46 located. Could be misleading if done now. Could require story poles as part of SPARC
47 review.

1
2 Shawn Montoya: We have provided cut throughs. I am confident that SPARC will deal
3 with the issues - that is their purview.

4
5 Commissioner Barrett: Do not think we should be shy about putting restrictions on the
6 project because that is our job. SPARC can change. Would like safeguards built in as part
7 of Planning Commission review of the project.

8
9 Commissioner McAllister: The level of detail that I am talking about is shown in the
10 sections provided. It would be nice to see the height of the existing residences. Asked if
11 there is consensus on setbacks recommended in staff report, revise PUD standards,
12 require SPARC review, no granny units, no further subdivision.

13
14 Planning Commission consensus on setbacks recommended in staff report, revise PUD
15 standards, require SPARC review, no granny units, no further subdivision.

16
17 M/S Barrett/McAllister to continue to October 26, 2004 5-0. Harris and von Raesfeld
18 absent.

19
20
21 **III. LIAISON REPORTS:**

- 22
23 a. City Council None
24 b. SPARC Approved Lakeville Auto body; preliminary review of
25 Poultry Street mixed use project; Deer Creek Plaza which is all
26 retail; Centex homes on Casa Grande.
27 c. Petaluma Bicycle Advisory Committee: International walk, bike to
28 school on October 6th; reviewed Lindberg Circle project.
29 d. Tree Advisory Committee: Working on updating street tree list;
30 crafting a tree ordinance.

31
32
33
34 **Adjournment: 10: 45**