

General Plan 2004-2025

Public Forum Workshop

COMMENTS

Saturday, April 10, 2004– 7:00 PM-10:00 PM
Community Center
320 North McDowell Boulevard
Petaluma, CA 94952

Note: [] denotes staff additions for clarity.

1. MOBILITY

INFO: Mitigating local congestion by widening streets such as East Washington Street, Petaluma Boulevard downtown, Lakeville, may adversely impact the walkable character and quality of life along those streets. To avoid significantly widening specific streets increased congestion, during peak hours (commute times), is unavoidable. Citizens have stated that Petaluma's community character is worth saving and more important than rush hour conditions.

QUESTION: IS INCREASED CONGESTION DURING THE COMMUTE HOURS ACCEPTABLE TO AVOID WIDENING STREETS?

- ▶ Cars are dinosaurs. Get with it!
- ▶ The most severe problem is the lack of traffic signal coordination, specifically on Washington Street and McDowell Boulevard. You need to resolve the issue with Cal-Trans so the traffic flows longer and more fluidly between the two adjacent lights.
- ▶ Look at success stories in other cities across the nation; especially those like Petaluma that want to retain charm and accessibility, both for quality of life and economic development reasons. Increase pedestrian opportunities and bike lanes. Get the trolley running on west side. Increase downtown and near-to-town opportunities to walk, bike and use some type of public transportation.
- ▶ Congestion of traffic is fine at peak time and is a small cost to pay to have more pedestrian opportunities.
- ▶ Make Washington Street one-way west bound from Petaluma Boulevard to Webster.
- ▶ Make Western one-way east bound from Webster to Petaluma Boulevard.
- ▶ Why are industrial and business areas built without sidewalks? It is unsafe to walk in business parks to Petaluma.
- ▶ Why are the streets so narrow in the Auto Mall area? No parking was provided for employees so they now park on narrow streets which makes it even less safe to walk?
- ▶ Experiment and install all manner of traffic calming ideas.

- ▶ Need cross-town connector!!
- ▶ Constant accommodation to the car is not the answer. More congestion means more water shortage due to increased use for every new building.
- ▶ I love my car, but I would also like some other options too—like walking, biking and riding the bus. Right now, our options and choices are extremely limited to the auto. Need bike commuting choices.
- ▶ If traffic becomes too congested, it will discourage people from shopping in Petaluma.
- ▶ Too much emphasis on walking/biking alternatives (wishful thinking), to elevate traffic congestion, which will again discourage downtown shopping.
- ▶ If there is too much congestion on East Washington Street, it will discourage both east side residents and out-of-town shoppers from shopping in the downtown area as both traffic and parking will be inconvenient...this will reduce sales tax revenue.
- ▶ Additional parking in the fairgrounds area could be an idea to reduce the downtown parking issue. Could the trolley project transport shoppers from a general parking area to the downtown to shop, thereby reducing traffic in the downtown core and promoting retail sales?
- ▶ We must plan the physical development of our community with the understanding that the private auto is doomed as the primary mode of transportation. All land use should be designed around bus, train, bike, and foot modes of movement. Car-based planning cannot be sustained, either in terms of future petroleum supplies, suburban sprawl, pavement of arable land, and housing and commercial development patterns.
- ▶ What is the true likelihood of a rail access in Petaluma? How can we ensure that we will have funding/regional support? I think it is critical that we have rail in downtown.
- ▶ The price of oil is going up. Oil is not a renewable resource and eventually we will not have any; therefore, alternative resources should be an important consideration.
- ▶ A factor to consider is that a large number of tourists come to Petaluma for many reasons. If they have that miserable traffic congestion to come and go, then we do not gain in buying power. It is not a matter of what has priority you need both.
- ▶ Plan for people and pedestrians, not cars.
- ▶ Is there a valid basis for assuming that widening East Washington will actually improve the flow of cars, let alone make the street better for people? Really, what is the basis for this assumption? I have read about studies that disapprove of this notion.
- ▶ It seems like there are alternatives to this question. It implies that the only options are wide streets for cars or narrow streets for cars. What about more transportation options? Like better transit, more bike and pedestrian paths. Could we find about more about commutes so we can improve transportation for commuters in other ways besides making all the roads bigger?
- ▶ Mobility is related at least as much to land use – where stuff is, where people need to go for the stuff they want - as it is to paving over the ground we live with. Please do not persist in the single-minded assumption that widening streets is what affects mobility. This has not been studied to hold true over time. (NB – the East Bay, Orange County, Anaheim)

- ▶ Lets move-traffic, sitting in traffic is a poor quality of life and we need to strike a proper balance.
- ▶ Congestion is good. It is needed to convince people to use other modes (walking, biking, transit). More people walking and biking makes the City more livable.
- ▶ An actual transit system would help a lot. I am talking about buses that would service areas other than the malls.
- ▶ Increase bike path safety and corridors for school kids and adults. As traffic and congestion increases, pedestrian and bikes are left at odds and safety drops.
- ▶ Look forward not back. Other communities have excellent examples of increasingly pedestrian and bike-friendly transportation arrangements. All would be consistent with and enhance the quality of life and charm that draws people and visitors (and money/economic development) to Petaluma. Congestion (traffic) during peak times is a small price to pay for all the rest of the day, evening and weekends.
 - ▶ Bicycles, bicycles, bicycles!! Provide bike lockers at transit stations for rent. Businesses over 30 employees must provide/encourage bus passes, locker/showers for cyclists.
 - ▶ Widening streets may not be necessary if we create alternative outlets. I am very concerned about widening Petaluma Boulevard downtown.
 - ▶ Feet, bikes, buses and support for them to be preferred to cars. I have lived in New York City and Portland and our commute in Petaluma across town is not so bad.
 - ▶ Consider making street narrower downtown.
 - ▶ It is possible that Petaluma Boulevard would flow more freely for people, bikes and cars if we had three lanes through downtown? It would also then be a more enjoyable thoroughfare and more welcoming for shoppers and businesses.
 - ▶ Capacity should not be expanded in the downtown area. Keep it as is or even reduce capacity. Lakeville is already maxed out as is. Consider expansion (widening) of Old Redwood overpass and Corona overpass. Addition congestion is acceptable in most locations noted.
 - ▶ Build in new infrastructure for pedestrians and bicycles, but no to widening East Washington and Petaluma Boulevard North.
 - ▶ One-way streets!
 - ▶ Congestion during peak hours is acceptable. Build bigger roads and invite more traffic and development. Visit San Jose to see what that leads to.
 - ▶ Increased congestion is acceptable; widening the street downtown is not. I like the idea above of making some streets downtown narrower and maybe even closing some to traffic so the outdoor area in front of stores and restaurants can be used.
 - ▶ If widening the streets will lower the quality of life along these main streets, community living members will have to be the first priority and increased congestion will have to be acceptable.

2. MOBILITY

INFO: The traditional “grid system” of streets provides the most efficient and effective mobility systems. With three north-south barriers (Highway 101, the River and the Railroad), Petaluma is challenged to improve the east-west grid. One or two additional cross-town connectors could spread the traffic flow and offer alternative routes for all modes of transportation. The Land Use & Mobility Alternatives Report provides the following alternatives:

Alt. A. Extend Rainier Avenue through a Highway 101 underpass and a full Highway 101 interchange, to connect to Petaluma Boulevard North; add Caulfield Lane Extension to cross the Petaluma River to Petaluma Boulevard South (Southern Crossing).

Alt. B. Improve Corona Road with full Highway 101 interchange; provide cross-town connection by extending Rainier Avenue through a Highway 101 underpass, to connect to Petaluma Boulevard North; add Caulfield Lane Extension to cross the Petaluma River to Petaluma Boulevard South (Southern Crossing).

Alt. C. Extend Rainier Avenue through a Highway 101 underpass to connect to Petaluma Boulevard North; widen Corona Road overpass and provide a full Highway 101 interchange; add Caulfield Lane Extension to cross the Petaluma River to Petaluma Boulevard South (Southern Crossing).

QUESTION: IN AN EFFORT TO INCREASE CROSS-TOWN MOBILITY OPPORTUNITIES AND INCREASE COMMUNITY CONNECTIVITY, LIST YOUR HIGHEST PRIORITIES FOR ENHANCING CROSS-TOWN MOVEMENT (North/South, East/West, or both):

- ▶ Let the experts decide which north connector is best and then leaving it to the political process to get it done.
- ▶ In thinking about development, this is an issue that should be fundamental. Because of lack of forethought or perhaps just because of developers bugging and developing pieces of land here and there, there are, as one gets closer to the boundaries of the City, series of dead-end roads, contorted little pathways through developments, and a general sense of separateness – congested separateness.
- ▶ East/West – Alternative B – Rainer is too close to Washington Street and should only be an on/off ramp.
- ▶ Too ambitious. Just extend Caulfield. Forget about Rainier. We have Washington, Corona and Redwood Highway. The addition of Caulfield extension is enough. These other connectors are simply to force unnecessary development.
- ▶ Alternative B with bike lanes under Rainier.

- ▶ Alternative B. Corona is a better alternative for a freeway on-ramp because it connects to roads further to the east and west; i.e., Adobe Road. Rainier would not be as successful in relieving traffic pressures.
- ▶ Why not have an option for Rainier to have a Highway 101 interchange on all three Alternatives; we need that to avoid another underutilized cross-town connector like Corona.
- ▶ Alternative A is definitely the best. This allows easy access to the retail outlets and downtown retail growth. Without the east side, will find it easier to shop outside of Petaluma.
- ▶ Alternative C with bike lanes on Rainier.
- ▶ Alternative A should be the alternative as it was originally planned to give access to Petaluma Valley Hospital and relieve Washington which is a nightmare most of the time. Also, Corona would not sustain the traffic.
- ▶ Alternative A – both for Washington Street relief and to minimize development pressure further north.
- ▶ North, Rainier, Caulfield and East Washington connector. Four lanes for Old Redwood Highway.
- ▶ Rainier cross-town connector was promised to be built in about 1976. It is about time it is completed.
- ▶ As density increases, moving people efficiently can be done with a network of bike lanes and pedestrian paths. In the not so distant future as Petaluma gets congested, people will only travel as far as necessary rather than racing all over town. Alternative mobility links will be important.
- ▶ Mobility in people's lives is determined by the ability to circulate to the places one wants and needs to go. Ready access to frequently visited locations (bank, grocery, post office) dispersed around the community makes travel in Petaluma easier and even friendlier. This is a sustainable, human-level alternative to wide, unfriendly, traffic-filled streets connecting freeways and "big box" low-wage employees.
- ▶ I would like to see a transit line that goes back and forth on Washington all day long so you could catch a bus or train, whichever one, every 15 minutes. I know if I thought I could actually find a bus within 15 minutes, I would use it and lots of other people would to – maybe we could try this first.
- ▶ Corona as an interchange and include a transit site at Corona, yes.
- ▶ An alternative to more cross-town mobility is to have some (any) youth sport facilities on the west side. We need to lessen cross-town at 5 – 6 pm. Do this by giving kids a place to play on the west side.
- ▶ Bicycle transportation must be facilitated throughout the City and promoted. The town is flat and can truly utilize this mode. This includes accommodating bikes in cross-town connectors – all of them.

3. MOBILITY

INFO: On the northern portion of the City, all analysis to date, identifies Rainier as providing the most relief as well as feasibility (physical and financial participation options). If built as an underpass with connections to adjacent land with development potential and bicycle lanes and sidewalks to connect to existing and new pathways.

QUESTION: WOULD YOU SUPPORT THE BUILDING OF THE RAINIER CROSS-TOWN EXTENSION AND HIGHWAY 101 INTERCHANGE?

- ▶ Well, we love Petaluma. We did not choose Anaheim or East Bay. I do not envision how paving into and over part of the heart of our River beauty and heritage, that is, and can be a source of recreation and beauty in our community forever and how this could enhance the quality of life for us. The River helps enrich Petaluma. It is value. Rainier development would decrease that forever. Congestion may very well get worse whether we develop Rainier or not. Why lose a tremendous resource in the process? More roads means more cars.
- ▶ It is true that a Rainier route may decrease congestion on East Washington; however, with more roads comes more cars and more cars on Rainier means more consumer availability. Businesses will buy up all the land around the area and it will go from residential to business area. In the end we will be left with the same congestion in both places and lost resource.
- ▶ Historically environmental reviews in Petaluma appear lacking. Whatever connector produces the least environmental impact, do that one.
- ▶ Underpass is so much better than overpass. Bicycles must be accommodated.
- ▶ Decentralize facilities so less traffic is needed.
- ▶ All three proposals assume a Rainier crossing. Is this already a done deal?
- ▶ I would only suggest the Rainier crossing if it did not have a significant environmental impact and did not facilitate retail development in the flood zone.
- ▶ Agree with the above, but no interchange.
- ▶ No to Rainier.
- ▶ Will the underpass to Rainier be "above grade" to the lowest flood level in the Corona Reach area? I think not.
- ▶ Yes, we have been talking about Rainier too long. Let's build it.
- ▶ Yes, to the above statement.
- ▶ No interchange. Maybe an underpass as a cross-town connector with bicycle/pedestrians separated from cars.
- ▶ Yes, should have been done at least as a connector. We should be talking about a southern crossing. Note: New development in downtown specific area and along River. The Outlet Mall should not have been allowed without providing free access. It should not be expanded without it. Do not require a crossing. On/off on both sides of freeway like at Yolanda in Santa Rosa would relieve traffic at Washington and McDowell.

- ▶ Underpass, yes – Rainier; overpass, no.
- ▶ Wants underpass with bike lanes with no freeway connection.
- ▶ Yes, it is time to stop talking about having Rainier as a feasible cross-town connector. Various voting and polls indicate a “GO”.
- ▶ Yes, if it has been on the books for a long time.
- ▶ Rainier will not do much good when gas becomes prohibitively expensive in the next 10 years.
- ▶ Does the analysis to date provide someone to pay for Rainier?
- ▶ No, building a freeway overpass or underpass through one of the most beautiful river locations is a mistake everyone will have to live with for a long time – maybe if the location were moved I would support it.
- ▶ No, who pays? Who benefits?
- ▶ Corona is very underutilized at this time (little traffic). What would make Rainier be any different?
- ▶ No, there is no money for it.
- ▶ Yes, we need to be realistic about transportation and Washington Street is over used now as the main feeder.
- ▶ Yes, studies show this is best. We cannot afford to ignore those costly studies.
- ▶ What will development of Kenilworth area do to traffic?
- ▶ No; however, I think I an on/off ramp there would be extremely beneficial.

4. MOBILITY – GENERAL COMMENTS

- ▶ Regarding congestion versus destruction caused by widening – the historical, pedestrian and esthetic ambiance contributes to mental and physical health with a sense of history and place. It is essential to keep it. But it makes no sense to add more density of housing (more cars!) to the downtown and river area. Stop before you destroy it for all Petalumans and visitors. Do not destroy the ten sheds along the River, as they are a historical museum in their current existence. They are a sense of history – of muse and a handsome presence along the River. They are the view that makes the River special in that whole stretch. They are the special view from McNear Island that we will visit. They contribute the change of consciousness needed daily for human well-being. Knowledge of their past keeps us aware of our cultural context. Jericho dredge should stay, as is very interesting visually and important in many ways. Many of us walk to see this part of the River environment. Do not build a five-story parking garage by the Fire Station. It is ugly thinking and will further block the view of the Sonoma hills that makes Petaluma Boulevard downtown special to citizens and visitors who come here for the hills - the River - River industry in the historical sense and the ten warehouses that were built for River shipping and are well used now. Do not take peoples homes on E Street. Do not get rid of Petaluma Coffee Company. Do not put the Fire Station on Petaluma Boulevard between E and F Streets. That area is a historic part of

- Petaluma and a quiet neighborhood. Why let developers steal people's homes, ambience and current livelihoods to enrich developers who have other options?
- ▶ Leave the congestion. Think of other suitable ways of transportation and cater to them. Offer incentives to carpool, bike, walk or use public transit. Leave the streets alone.

1. WATER RESOURCES

INFO: Given a fixed supply of water from the Sonoma County Water Agency. The City is pursuing a recycled water program, conservation programs, and groundwater opportunities to address its needs.

QUESTION: WHAT IMPLICATIONS OR CONCERNS DO YOU HAVE WITH ANY OF THE ABOVE STRATEGIES?

- ▶ We should strive to implement recycled water to all homes for irrigation, not just parks and golf courses.
- ▶ Any new development should pay for system efficiency improvements sufficient to recapture those amounts of water that the new development will use. (Reference Ned Orrett to Grayson James – “Avoided Costs” concept.)
- ▶ Support and encourage gray water reuse. I am plumbed now to run bath water to the garden, but am told it is illegal to do it.
- ▶ To compensate the excessive runoff, due to concrete, paving and building, we should collect more rainwater.
- ▶ First of all, it seems intelligent not to plan on increasing the water supply. Strategies for making do with what we've got of a finite resource, as well as for allowing for drought, etc., are prudent and appropriate. We can both enhance our heritage beauty and also retain water resources by landscaping (public, residential and commercial) that use little or no irrigation, and that retains moisture (by shading, etc). Large urban shade trees offer one of my favorite ways to implement this. Once established, they do not require irrigation, they reduce urban heat (reducing energy requirements), and they enhance the feel of our community.
- ▶ Our conservation program does not seem to be aggressive enough with rate structures, landscaping audits, commercial re-use, etc. We need to be constantly educating and reminding users of our conservation programs.
- ▶ Petaluma “the City” is going in the right direction. We need to set a strong policy to conserve water.
- ▶ David Brower's CPR – conservation, preservation and restoration, fits here. Gray water is great for lawns, etc. Go for it.
- ▶ The premise of a fixed supply of water from SCWA is defective. As other towns along the Highway 101 corridor continue to grow, all users of water will see their allotment decrease.

- ▶ Yes, to above.
- ▶ Agree, to above.
- ▶ Multi-level pricing of water use needs to be aggressive. The more you use, the costlier the gallonage. Promote greatest reuse of water.
- ▶ Agree, to above.
- ▶ Change out water wasting fixtures on all commercial and residential locations. Start with City Hall.
- ▶ Consider global warming and its possible effects in your planning.
- ▶ Do we have a reliable water supply as energy costs increase? What about conservation?
- ▶ Recycled water – gray water is great. Include costs for public education. Do this ASAP. Conservation measures should be dramatically increased. Also, ASAP before identifying new water source needs (amounts). If you find the water, building will increase to accommodate it. Reduce demand first. Do not suck up groundwater and help people understand ground and surface water relationships – inextricably linked.
- ▶ How about education so people know where their water comes from and that there is a finite amount.

2. WATER RESOURCES

INFO: Recent analysis of the floodplain, subsequent to the construction of the flood reduction project in the Payran area and completion of the modeling analysis of the watershed indicates that the floodplain will, in the future, be reduced in area. Recognize that a portion of this land is not currently within the floodplain and is therefore developable. The cost of improving the Petaluma River corridor with the provision of parks, open space, increased flood capacity, and public access amenities is out of reach of the City's fiscal reality.

QUESTION: IS A LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD FACILITATE THE PROVISION AND PERPETUAL MAINTENANCE OF RIVER ORIENTED OPEN SPACE, PUBLIC ACCESS AND ADEQUATE FLOOD STORAGE CAPACITY ACCEPTABLE?

- ▶ We need to make access to the River a priority. This is one of the key features and benefits of our City. We should strive to balance protecting the river access with complementary development. The town of San Antonio, Texas has balanced recreation, retail and residential with the River.
- ▶ Agree with above, except San Antonio River in town is completely concreted in. We have a still-naturally function river/estuary in town for the most part (except the Army Corps project area) and should strive to keep the natural functions and natural beauty for quality of life of Petalumans, potential tourist money and the threatened and endangered and other species that depend on a natural river system. Development in floodplains is being stopped and avoided all across America. Why is Petaluma going backwards and spending lots of money to do it? Lets learn from other communities and grow smartly. Use current science and planning – not from 30 years ago. Plus this question is

confusing and potentially leading – asking for an answer that encourages floodplain development.

- ▶ Having recreational access to the River as well as facilities to support that access should be a priority in order to build appreciation for this natural resource.
- ▶ Development is related to more than water. Areas around the River should be carefully considered as part of Petaluma's beautiful natural environment. Also, the effects of mall development on the downtown are a concern. You cannot and should not reduce it do a question of flood storage capacity.
- ▶ Does the recent analysis of the floodplain which indicates that it will be reduced in areas, consider contrasting factors which might actually increase its size (e.g. global warming, higher sea level)? As we know, the cost to the community of inappropriate development on the floodplain is virtually inestimable. Parks and open space along the River and in the floodplain do not threaten the City with catastrophic costs or loss of homes in businesses ever.
- ▶ Development in the floodplain is not acceptable. Ball fields and other recreational opportunities are acceptable.
- ▶ Question sounds like an invitation for commercial/residential growth in the floodplain. I have never heard of a plan that is not an "apology" for growth that would endanger our floodplain, which is still being created. Pedestrian access to channels and River are critical in all areas. Paths along these promote healthy lifestyles and minimize traffic.
- ▶ Promote water conservation by using native plants wherever possible in City landscaping. Promote use of natives to replace lawns.
- ▶ Concern about where we get our water from - Eel River will not be diverting as much. How can we support the additional population?
- ▶ Why is more information not published to the public to show that the \$38 million flood project will allow for development north and therefore more revenue for the City?
- ▶ Parks and open space are essential. The question, obviously, is how to pay for it. Though some development will probably be necessary, other alternatives should be explored first. They include use or park fees. Parcel tax (ok, not too popular).
- ▶ If the level of development does take into consideration a means of allowing for seasonal flooding in the area.
- ▶ Water pressure is a problem in some hillside areas. Particularly Paula Lane and Sunset. The Fire Department puts that area at just at necessary flow for emergencies. Any additional development will exacerbate the problems we already have.
- ▶ Drainage is also a problem throughout that area down to flooding of Marin Creek.

3. WATER RESOURCES

Current & Future XP-SWMM Model Uses

INFO: As shown in the Presentation this morning, future uses include:

- **Riparian implementation projects.**
- **Development Project Impact Evaluation**
- **Storm Drainage Planning and Design**

- **Regional Watershed Analysis**
- **Water Quality Impact Analysis (NPDESII)**

QUESTION: WITHIN THE PETALUMA WATERSHED, WHAT AREA(S) SHOULD BE THE CITY'S NEXT HIGHEST PRIORITIES FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF THE CORPS AND THE DENMAN PROJECTS?

- ▶ Protection of the floodplain north of downtown to ensure that our natural drainage is not sacrificed for mediocre retail chains.
- ▶ Continued development and support of the waste water project south of town.
- ▶ Use the floodplain adjacent to the Outlet Mall for sports fields, not development.
- ▶ The floodplain is an excellent location for much needed playing fields, parks and recreational opportunities!
- ▶ Set backs with protected riparian areas.
- ▶ Maintenance and restoration of the creeks (i.e., Jessie Creek). Under no circumstances should a creek be relocated, moved or displaced.
- ▶ In the west side of Petaluma, groundwater recharge areas – Paula Lane and Sunset Drive, preserve as it borders other County lands with wells.
- ▶ Water pressure on Paula Lane and in immediate area is low and will remain so. Please be aware of this.
- ▶ Preserve the riparian corridor along Petaluma River. No big factory outlet expansion there.
- ▶ Stores/commercial development in Factory Outlet areas should be allowed.
- ▶ Let's daylight buried creeks! Restore Thompson Creek!
- ▶ A healthy river is the heart of a healthy community. Protect natural functions of floodplain wetlands (absorb water, filter and clean water, recharge ground water). Implement parts of Plans that increase public access to River; i.e., six mile long river walk that will be a tourist draw and help economic development, while preserving natural features/resources and preserving and enhancing the charm and quality of life in Petaluma.

4. WATER RESOURCES – GENERAL COMMENTS

- ▶ What is the current status of our contract with SCWA? Do we have a guaranteed allotment of water? How predictable is our water allotment?
- ▶ Our conservation program seems to be just beginning. We need to enlighten all of our water users.
- ▶ Rohnert Park allowed more growth than it has water to support. Is there a clear simple way to keep the public aware of our water resources vs. "need" for water represented by new business and housing (i.e., what is responsible growth versus water for Petaluma)?
- ▶ The Russian and Eel River are in trouble and yet City Planners believe we can continue to grow. Water dictates sustainability and we ran out of sustainable water years ago. There is only one viable alternative. No more growth.

- ▶ Outlying areas with sensitive balance of environmental factors are also of great concern; i.e., west side rural lands that relate to Marin Creek tributaries have significant areas for groundwater recharge, and special topographic features for sustaining wetlands. Preserve and protect for generation to come. Please listen to neighborhood concerns.
- ▶ The SCWA does not appear to be very accountable.
- ▶ Preserve groundwater recharge areas.
- ▶ The General Plan should include ways for the community to access and utilize the river in a recreational manner. This could include an aquatic center, open to the public use. This will build the community's appreciation for our natural resources.
- ▶ Water pressure in the Paula Lane/West Street neighborhood is pathetic and will only worsen with continued development in that area, and as more groundwater recharge areas in this neighborhood are paved over, flooding issues experienced by residents will become acute.
- ▶ Let's modify the plumbing codes so homeowners can modify their pipes to collect gray water. Education so that people know they can do it and learn how.
- ▶ How about a pedestrian bridge from the Foundry Wharf to McNear Peninsula (a drawbridge)?
- ▶ The Marin Creek flood problems from Victory runoff is not addressed. Nor other areas within Petaluma's proposed expansion area that cause increased runoff to Marin Creek, why? Will this increase to flooding in County area and Stony Point to Petaluma River be considered?

1. ECONOMICS

INFO: The City Council identified three priorities for the new General Plan, one of which is to achieve sustainable economic health and continuing current levels of service. Analysis has shown that expanding retail sales tax revenue, which presently goes to neighboring cities, would assist in the effort toward economic health. Citizens have indicated an interest in expanding retail opportunities but do not appear to overwhelmingly support "big boxes" or large discount chains. Recently approved projects will bring new shopping opportunities to Petaluma while several active applications will provide more stores, if approved.

QUESTION: SHOULD THE NEW GENERAL PLAN PROVIDE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR DEVELOPING AN EXPANDED RETAIL BASE FOR PETALUMA, WHILE IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC PARAMETERS, SUCH AS LIMITING BUILDING SIZE OR THE SIZE OF A GIVEN PROJECT?

- ▶ Goals should be set, absolutely, but they need to be reasonable, achievable and sustainable. The goals should be based on reasonable assessment of population growth, achievable economic growth and sustainable development.
- ▶ Limit building size and focus on sustainable, ecologic products. No big boxes or other quality of wages downgrades that takes money away from Petaluma.

- ▶ Can Petaluma support all the proposed retail? Regarding the models used for retail expansion, did they factor in Internet shopping? Which studies are used to address this shift in retail models?
- ▶ Are Corporate Headquarters a more economically profitable type of development for Petaluma (considering the better jobs that would be generated)? If so, what can we do to attract these Headquarters?
- ▶ We need a Macy's here in Petaluma so people do not spend all their money in Santa Rosa and San Rafael. We also need places for teens to go for entertainment on the weekend. Business that caters to teens.
- ▶ Goals for developing the retail base should perhaps begin with renovation of aging shopping centers. As they dry up, the enormous space they take up is wasted while developers look toward the beautiful hills and outlying areas. Start with space that is already retail and limit size.
- ▶ Aren't current expansion plans about double the stores/businesses we have now? Yes, we need to capture more retail dollars, but let us not overdo it and lose what we love about this town. Use existing vacant lots in town first. This is state of the art planning. Gobbling up open space and building in floodplains has stopped in many, many communities across the country. Why are we moving backward? Petaluma was a leader and an example in graduate planning classes of leadership with its UGB (determined to be good for economic development). Shame on us and our leaders if we continue to go backward now and put in big boxes or other chains that will sap the economic life out of the heart of Petaluma. Why should we be different than other towns that have allowed/promoted such thoughtless and unsustainable development? Please do what is environmentally, economically and socially right for the community, not what is right for out-of-town developers.
- ▶ Yes, goals and objectives for expansions in our retail base should be intelligently and rationally formulated to provide the diversity and flexibility that will allow sustainable economic and social health over time. Such objectives should consider whether the owners and employees of businesses will live in Petaluma, whether they will earn enough to live on their incomes without becoming a burden on City/County resources, and how much of the businesses' incomes will be recirculated in Petaluma and Sonoma County, versus outsourced to global corporations.
- ▶ Absolutely, incremental growth and anti-"big box" please.
- ▶ Limit building size. Promote independent businesses.
- ▶ Sounds great. The goals should also include figuring out what people need here and introducing those kinds of businesses or encouraging them.
- ▶ Yes, otherwise Petaluma will lose its charm.
- ▶ Yes, but be tasteful! Petaluma planners lack broad experience as to tasteful development. Start by educating themselves.
- ▶ Limit building size. Preserve architectural distinctiveness of Petaluma. Insist on parking facilities that include canopy trees and landscaping. Mitigate traffic impact.
- ▶ Yes, retail opportunities are long overdue. Everyone knows that. Responsible officials can recruit retailers that will combine to attract shoppers from other areas just like we have been going to Novato, San Rafael, Santa Rosa and San Francisco to shop.

Enhance small businesses and restaurants downtown. Attract clothing, techno-orientated businesses, and food and other retailers in accessible shopping areas on east side. We do not need a Wal-Mart.

2. ECONOMICS

INFO: Reducing revenues, due to State funding reductions, and increasing costs of services (i.e.: Public Safety, Street Maintenance and Reconstruction, Park Development and Maintenance, General Governing Services) may result in reduction of existing service levels. In order to provide desired or expected services, the City must rely on more than just property taxes to ensure a sustainable economic balance. General Plans can be a tool to guiding development in a manner to increase revenue potential.

QUESTION: SHOULD ECONOMIC GROWTH BE TIED TO SPECIFIC GOALS SUCH AS:

- **PROVIDING DIVERSITY OF RETAIL PRODUCT AVAILABILITY IN THE PETALUMA AREA**
- **GROWTH OF TOURISM AND/OR ECO-TOURISM OPPORTUNITIES**
- **REDEVELOPMENT OF AGING, LESS-PRODUCTIVE SHOPPING CENTERS**
- **PROJECTED SALES TAX REVENUE FIGURES**

- ▶ Growth should pay for itself and be sustainable. Why allow building without covering all its costs? Roads, flood control, parks, etc. Past expansion caused double classing in schools, gridlock and sewer plant overflow, then building moratoriums. We put in growth control and obtained federal \$\$ to widen Washington overcross[ing] and build Caulfield, then built Petaluma back into its current problems. Show us a model that builds us out of time.
- ▶ Yes, we need to create an inviting place for people to come visit with diversity of retail product on one hand and invest in park and recreation areas for citizens and guests to gather, celebrate special occasions, play and relax. We have to continue connecting our neighborhood with bike laws and have inviting places to walk.
- ▶ Tourism can be a future source of money. We are on the border of Carneros Wine Region. We have a wetlands bird area. A river for recreation. Potential hiking areas on Sonoma Mountain. Important to maintain historical character that differentiates Petaluma from other areas.
- ▶ Be careful not to create a bunch of low paying jobs when setting goals.
- ▶ The Chamber of Commerce should have done this years ago. It is a continuous process. Do not rush it but create these plans commensurate with quality of life.
- ▶ Especially with the new wetlands area hopefully to become a wildlife sanctuary. Ecotourism is a sustainable, renewable, perpetual base for economic and community vitality. Imagine a rim trail all around Petaluma, connected to the greater Bay trail. Petaluma can be a nucleus for walkers and hikers from all over California and the world who visit here to rejuvenate in our natural splendors, much as travelers now go on walking tours in Ireland, Scotland, England, etc.

- ▶ Yes, tie growth to specific goals mentioned.
- ▶ From 2005 to 2025, Petaluma is in a great position to create ecotourism opportunities. With the new polishing wetlands on the east side and documented abundance of wildlife - birds, badgers, deer, etc. On the west side, people could be encourage to book to stay at the Sheraton, visit wetlands for birdwatching, shop in revitalized downtown and visit west Petaluma for birdwatching, organic farm visits and true rural life experience all in one trip. Golfers could golf as well. Look at Petaluma's big picture of what each one has to offer. More tourist money.
- ▶ Future growth is going to happen and should be done in strategic manner with goals to protect what makes Petaluma unique – natural resources and historic, charming downtown. Let's not make it "anywhere USA" as so many other communities our size have done in the name of economic development. Studies show economic development around natural resources (river, estuary) are sustainable over time, both for people and wildlife, birds and fish. Also, new buildings should pay for themselves, including for new roads and damage to water quality, etc. Shopping centers are deadly and limit individual options for small businesses due to expensive rents. Also, there are often vacancies. They have no individuality and spoil more esthetic and health giving environments. They exacerbate low water tables and increase runoff. People come from Florida, Texas, Chicago and New England to name a few places, for the quaint beauty of Petaluma as expressed in the paintings of local artists. Yes, paintings of the reflections of the tin sheds in the River south of D Street and north of D Street bridge, is a valuable attraction to tourists, including scenes and walking tours of the Railroad tracks and the street side of the River's tin sheds. Tourists and tours depend on those tin sheds and other old River industry. They all shop here so don't kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Stay firm on all the historical preservation. Do not bargain our treasures (any of them) away to development by obsolete thinking and taking what is not theirs – our quality of life. Keep tourism diversity. Focus on small businesses of unique or high quality contributions in trade. Focus on sustainability and show and control growth. Why build a three story Fire House while reduced funds limit public safety? and why?

3. ECONOMICS

INFO: Continued development of employment opportunities contributes to maintaining a jobs and housing balance in Petaluma (a goal of the existing General Plan).

QUESTION: SHOULD BALANCING RESIDENTIAL GROWTH WITH EMPLOYMENT GROWTH REMAIN A GOAL IN THE NEW PLAN?

- ▶ Yes, with affordable housing. No one needs those 3,000-5,000 sq. ft. houses.
- ▶ Affordable housing is subsidized. We need 900-1,300 sq. ft. market-rate housing.
- ▶ Streamline the approval process.
- ▶ What is the right balance? If we do not build jobs we create traffic. If we do not build housing we create traffic.

- ▶ What we really need are small houses and shared living. Not everyone is a nuclear family. We have plenty of four bedroom, two bath houses now so let's create some other opportunities like granny-unit rules being expanded so single people in their twenties and thirties can live somewhere without roommates.
- ▶ First, identify what the employment growth is, or should be. Employment growth needs to be balanced between high, moderate, and lower paying jobs. If we rely too much on retail leakage and retail expansion, we will be creating lower paying jobs, so balance retail with high tech, communications, self-employment, etc. Then identify residential growth needs—it's a balance.
- ▶ Sustainable design and alternative energy sources are essential to the economics and future viability of Petaluma, the region, state and... The General Plan must contain language that encourage both of these. It could include goals, or financial incentive for photovoltaic and other alternative energy sources though it may not be feasible that all projects are LEED (Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design) certified. It may be feasible to have projects adhere to or address the LEED standards.
- ▶ Somewhat – retail opportunities may be a better focus. A lot of people will still commute to jobs in San Francisco and live here.
- ▶ I like the concept of home-based businesses. Example: the Paula Lane neighborhood has several child daycare, info technology marketing, medical services and educational consulting, etc.

4. ECONOMICS

INFO: The recently drafted Retail Leakage Study identified specific locations ideal for expansion of retail opportunities. These sites included Kenilworth Junior High/Fairgrounds Site and the property on N. McDowell at Rainier.

QUESTION: IF MAJOR PUBLIC ROADWAY AND RIVER CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS WERE PART OF THE APPROVAL CONDITIONS, DO YOU SUPPORT REDEVELOPMENT AND/OR DEVELOPMENT OF THESE SITES FOR RETAIL?

COMMENTS:

- ▶ Yes, if the development pays for itself. The rezoning creates value. That increased value should be shared with Petaluma (the Redevelopment Agency tax increase on vacant land is proof), otherwise it is taken out of the community by spectators.
- ▶ Kenilworth, yes. Rainier, not too sure.
- ▶ The Kenilworth site currently and historically has provided a significant amount of playing fields for our children, accessible from both east side and west side. If Kenilworth is a good site for opportunities to limit "retail leakage" by establishing outlets for goods and services that are wanted and needed by our residents, an alternative site for playing fields is in the central city area adjacent to the present Outlet Mall. This would be a good site for meeting important community needs in a floodplain appropriate manner.

- ▶ Kenilworth is a poor high volume retail location—traffic in and out—removal of play fields and courts. Fairgrounds are a very important part of Petaluma.
- ▶ Developing Kenilworth for retail would add more stress to Highway 101 and East Washington, which is already bad. The amount of new proposed retail development concerns me. I do not want Petaluma to become like Rohnert Park. Perhaps we could better utilize existing retail space.
- ▶ Kenilworth is a better location for retail and mixed use than North McDowell, but how do we obtain the necessary major public roadway improvements? One development cannot pay for it all, so setup beneficial assessment districts and make the improvements to the infrastructure before final approval of development; i.e., Lakeville Industrial Park.
- ▶ I am not favorable to do anything that would support a freeway over or underpass at Rainier simply because that area is one of our City's treasures. It is a beautiful river area with a bend in the river and lots of Oaks. Isn't there a way to just use Corona or move the overpass somewhere else? I would like more transportation choices to we can shop downtown without always driving.
- ▶ The loss of recreation must be mitigated if Kenilworth is developed. Fields, pool, gym—all must be relocated in easily accessible areas to children on bikes and buses.
- ▶ Yes, but let's agree to divert the retail from national chains. We do not want to become another slave to big box retailers that provide low paying jobs and no local character. The profits are not reinvented in Petaluma but rather the corporate headquarters. We do not want to become another Rohnert Park.
- ▶ Is it possible to develop Kenilworth without sacrificing playing fields? --a balance I would support. It is feasible to the freeway and central in location. How about redevelopment within "Plaza North" on North McDowell. A lot of parking space there is always available.

5. ECONOMICS – GENERAL COMMENTS

- ▶ There is no such thing as a free lunch. First rate of economics not considered! Why not? This is the third time Petaluma has put itself into gridlock/financial disaster. Now once again the solution is to build us out of these problems. How do you explain that something has not worked in the past (opposite facts) is now expected to?
- ▶ Do a sensitivity analysis on a 20-year depression starting 2010 based on an economic model by H.S. Dent.
- ▶ Development of renewable resources (solar, wind, etc.) could save our City a lot of money in the future. When considering new residential and commercial development, use solar hot water and solar panels.
- ▶ Green building.
- ▶ Sustainable planning and building with plans for higher density affordable housing is a great opportunity to create building designs that are sustainable and cutting edge in terms of solar, renewable building materials; i.e., green. Will attract national media coverage and Petaluma can be a leader. Never bad for economic.

- ▶ In Burlington, Vermont, 31% of the City's energy comes from renewable sources. In Portland it is 10%. In Santa Monica, all public buildings use renewable energy. What about Petaluma?
- ▶ In expanding retail base, I agree as it is needed. Let's not do what everyone else has done (Wal-Mart, Food 4 Less, etc.). Let's do something that will attract people regionally, not just let Petaluma residents buy their usual goods closer to home. IKEA, or something that draws people from a distance, should be considered before "the usual suspects." Keep in mind "factory outlets" aren't much of a draw—so many places have them. It is like osteoporosis—let's not just prevent bone loss, let's promote bone growth!
- ▶ Yes, IKEA, yes Frys.
- ▶ City should secure State Park Bond funding and other opportunity; designate staff as grant writer, designate grant goals as City Manager goal.
- ▶ In Santa Monica, 75% of the City's public works fleet runs on alternative fuel.

1. LAND USE

The citizens of Petaluma enacted a 20-year Urban Growth Boundary, set to expire in 2018. With limited land available, increased pressure is applied on the need to provide for a reasonable growth pattern including expanding our retail base, providing opportunities for jobs and housing, and expanding our recreational amenities to meet current and future community needs. Please offer comments on the following issues:

INFO: Petaluma residential inventory consists of over 80% detached single-family dwellings. This housing stock is out of reach to many people now renting and/or working in Petaluma. Higher densities to encourage development of detached and attached single-family dwellings on smaller lots, or townhomes, on selected infill sites, could provide opportunities for developing a wider range of housing prices to meet the needs of current workers and residents.

QUESTION: SHOULD THE CITY INCREASE DENSITIES ON VACANT INFILL PARCELS AND ON PARCELS FRONTING MAJOR ARTERIALS FEEDING INTO THE CITY TO ACCOMMODATE A MORE DIVERSE (PRICE AND TYPE) HOUSING STOCK?

- ▶ Consider first, gateways into the City existing neighborhoods and areas for new parks, especially in northwest Petaluma where parks are nonexistent. Consider having Jessie Lane/Petaluma Boulevard North vacant land, the only flat piece of land left in that area, for ball fields rather than high density housing. How nice to say if the land is not yours.
- ▶ Apartment type living above retail spaces is a great alternative for a lot of singles and couples. Families want homes with yards. Single family (small) homes first and/or duplexes with yards next. Real affordable housing for first time homebuyers and the next generation of Petalumans! A whole development would be best with restrictions for residency as a requirement.

- ▶ Only in the downtown and CPSP area. Not every parcel needs to be mixed-use, high density, or retail. Provide a balance and diversity of land use types. Feather the density down to rural on all edges of the City (not just some). Another words, create higher densities in the core and low densities on the edge. Extend the UGB from 2018 to 2025 to coincide with next General Plan update. Implement and allow growth to occur within framework and its own economic pace. Do not force growth and do not force high densities on every parcel.
- ▶ Yes, we need more diverse housing. Studio apartments, co-housing, student housing, etc. Not everyone is a four-bedroom family.
- ▶ Shoving more homes into smaller areas does not necessarily make affordable housing.
- ▶ Infill means inside of developed areas, not expansion to the UGB. Make gateways into town attractive maintain large trees on streets.
- ▶ If your idea of retail in box stores, how is that wage base going to make any housing affordable?
- ▶ I am for infill; however, if you keep expanding the boundaries it all starts to look like sprawl.
- ▶ Yes, but not at the sacrifice of single-family housing, consider two to four unit/acres as well as multi and apartments.
- ▶ No, densities are high enough! Newer single family homes are already on top of each other and we have already allowed “zipper lots” that do not allow you to have access on one side of your house.
- ▶ This encourages piece meal annexation with inappropriate density without looking at existing neighborhoods. We must also look at areas such as northwest Petaluma (Petaluma Boulevard North) as a gateway into Petaluma and enhance the beauty of this rural area rather than destroy it with pockets of high-density projects.
- ▶ We are told higher residential density in a City’s core brings a safer, more economically healthy town. We need this now in our competing regional cities (Santa Rosa, etc.) are in the process of doing this.
- ▶ Higher density has allowed new housing development that is nothing but cement factories that have created echo chambers. Somehow we need more room for trees and grass that help absorb the noise.
- ▶ State law only require we have a “physical development plan.” It does not require growth. We are no longer a small rural community. Growth is not inevitable if the public and political will exist to restrain growth. The UGB passed to keep growth down. That is the public will. Now the City Council must enforce the public’s desire. No more development. Open space inside the City limits/UGB are irreplaceable and a tonic to the eye and the soul.
- ▶ Why so much growth? Too much density does not add to the community well being.
- ▶ It appears we are rushing forward in a very pro-growth development. It would appear prudent to step back and see how the community reacts to all the new developments doing on downtown. Has the traffic increased to a point of gridlock? Are we able to fill all the commercial space? Our Outlet Mall is at ½ capacity of possible tenants.

- ▶ The purpose of the UGB is to prevent sprawl into rural areas. In order for this to be successful, growth due to population and economic pressure needs to occur inside the UGB. That being said, we need to maintain and expand open public space.
- ▶ Absolutely, we need to cluster high-density homes near our regional transit centers or the center of town for pedestrian/bike/public transit access.
- ▶ Keep the density low. People do not want to live on top of one another. I miss having an actual backyard. Do not allow developers to put 30 houses on a lot where there should be 20. Young families need space. Do not overdevelop.
- ▶ No densities of existing neighborhoods should be considered.
- ▶ Ok to higher densities on vacant parcels near downtown and in already developed areas with intermittent vacant parcels. No to the proposed "Hillside Residential 2-4 units/acre" on west ridges, UGB areas and sensitive lands in the County. This would require sewage disposal capacity by the City and thus annexations. No piece meal annexation to accommodate developers wishes. Consider Benefits Assessments Districts to see if communities who are impacted by proposed changes want them. Especially in County zoned west side neighborhood whose rights as property owners have often been ignored.
- ▶ Increased noise and lighting impacts in sensitive west side rural neighborhoods (wildlife, home-based businesses, senior citizens, etc.) would not be appropriate.
- ▶ No to any development of west side ridges, even low density on hillsides. We need to see treetops and hillsides up there, not rooflines.
- ▶ Yes, to high density along corridors and downtown. We need to go up. Grain towers already establish a high sight line of 7-8 stories. We do not need to go that high.
- ▶ Absolutely increase densities.
- ▶ Reward smaller construction. No one needs those 3000-4000 monstrosities now building above Bodega at North Webster.

2. LAND USE

INFO: Over the last 20 years, the City has successfully achieved a continuous Urban Separator (greenbelt) along the eastern edge of the City. This was achieved as large, relatively flat parcels were proposed for development. Using the developer's ability to transfer density to adjacent lands allowed the City to obtain title to the Urban Separator without having to purchase the land. The City's western edge does not, for the most part, present similar circumstances. The land is often hilly with much smaller parcels and ranchettes already developed. Opportunity to achieve an Urban Separator, with continuous public access, is far more difficult given the lower densities that exist in these areas (typically one unit per 2 acres). The County areas, to the west and northwest of the City's Urban Growth Boundary have also subdivided to create 2 to 5 acre ranchettes.

Community input to date has strongly supported creating a continuous Urban Separator at the City's western edge. This does not seem feasible with current development patterns and the opposition to any significant development potential.

QUESTION: HOW DO YOU SEE A VISIBLE WESTERN EDGE BEING ESTABLISHED TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN CITY AND COUNTY DEVELOPED AREAS?

- ▶ Renewable resources (solar/wind, etc.) are very important to incorporate into all land use and used in all current structures (City Hall, Community Center, Police and Fire Station). Also encourage this in new development, both commercial and residential.
- ▶ I fully support a greenbelt or open space on the western edge. This can be accomplished with a string of parks or a perimeter tract around the City. The alternative to place high value homes as our City boundary is not in the collective best interest.
- ▶ Regarding Western greenbelt, preserve the hillside northwest of La Cresta so that a green hillside is visible from downtown. In general, keep any currently empty hillsides that are visible from downtown from being developed and use places not visible for development of smaller homes like Victoria and homes of a more reasonable size.
- ▶ The Urban Separator does not need to be 300 feet wide everywhere on the west side. Where necessary just a path 10 to 15 feet wide can continue until the space opens up. Suggests anywhere from the path width to 300 feet wide, to keep continuous.
- ▶ The Urban Growth Boundary on the west side near Paula Lane needs to be preserved. Also, the concept of “feathering” (less density as development approaches the UGB) needs to be reiterated and respected, not ignored as it was on Sunset. Keep the semi-rural character of the Paula Lane neighborhood, and need the wishes of the residents, rather than “hit and run” developers.
- ▶ Preserve areas for abundant wildlife on west side.
- ▶ What if future ranchettes and developments allow public access on their land creating a green zone on so-called private land as part of the solution?
- ▶ Wildlife ends up dead on Petaluma Boulevard North and lies there till it rots.
- ▶ Not possible. Make a feathered transition coming into town. Petaluma Boulevard North should have large parcels fronting the Boulevard.
- ▶ Do what can be done, even if small scale. Keep a path going if that is all that can be delivered.
- ▶ UGB is good for Petaluma, but it will need expansion before 2018.
- ▶ There was a term called “feathering” to allow development to plan as we approach the City’s edge. Just as important, is to have a greenbelt which allows a visual, scenic and recreational buffer on our western edge.
- ▶ The “transfer of density” provision in the General Plan is in direct conflict with the mandatory provision to “reduce density as you approach the greenbelt.” Provisions that are in conflict violate the mandatory requirement to be consistent. Transfer of density rights should be deleted. We witnessed higher density in Cross Creek development, which is a perfect example of a developer dictating terms in conflict with the General Plan.
- ▶ Look at the areas that exist on the west side--start there, then expand vision as to how to create as contiguous of an Urban Separator on the west edge as possible. Important consideration: This is something that seems to have been either completely ignored or consciously disregarded, that is because of development moving westward with lack of provision for open space and protection of wildlife species, the environmental sensitivity

on the west side is heightened. Thus, for the future, extra care to these issues needs to be given. Also, the historic nature of early rural agricultural communities on the west side, some still intact, should be recognized and protected. So for an Urban Separator area on the west side, the additional protected benefits are wildlife corridors, historic rural agricultural communities and open space.

- ▶ Put a 200' – 300' feet Urban Separator on Paula Lane from Bodega Avenue to Schuman Lane.

3. LAND USE

INFO: The Northwest section of the City's Urban Growth Boundary, served primarily by Petaluma Boulevard North, Skillman Lane and Gossage Avenue was included in the 1987 Urban Limit Line, and the 1998 Urban Growth Boundary. In 1987 this area was designated Rural Residential, for the most part, and held in reserve by the designation of a Specific Plan. The City Council, in directing the preparation of a new General Plan, indicated that no Specific Plan areas were to be included within the Urban Growth Boundary. Since 1987 the area has developed slowly under County developments standards. The new General Plan will address the feasibility of this area for urbanization through the three proposed Alternative scenarios, which offer a variety of densities. Increasing density along Petaluma Boulevard North, where topography suits development potential, providing for reducing that density as topography increases or the land approaches the western edge of the UGB may allow for development patterns to justify extension of utilities and City services. The alternative is to leave the area in the County, contract the UGB at some point in the future, and request the County to restrict development to a 2-acre minimum with no future availability of City services (water, sewer, Police, Fire).

QUESTION: WHAT IS YOUR VISION FOR THIS AREA (DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL, GATEWAY CORRIDOR AMENITIES, ETC.)?

- ▶ If you want to have a status quo in land use, yes, plan to increase population growth to 75,000+. You need to use areas shown in three plans. We tend to forget that Sonoma County is going to have 250,000 - 300,000 people in 2040 and estimates 85,000 – 89,000 in Petaluma. Status Quo is not the direction we should plan for.
- ▶ Not true that all of the area on Gossage was included in the UGB. Gossage itself is outside and most of the south east side was also. This area is agricultural and should stay there. Alternative suggestion is to expand outside the UGB Sphere of Influence and city expansion areas. It is not noted that a vote of citizens will be required to increase the UGB.
- ▶ Do not plan to expand beyond the existing UGB. The expansion in the northwest area is not the appropriate location to accommodate future growth.
- ▶ I agree with the above statement. Why do we need urban expansion in the northwest area and south of Frates? Let's not become another San Jose. My family and I moved to

Petaluma in 1975 and enjoyed the fact that the City had open space on four sides. The City needs expansion in parks and open space, not more urban development.

- ▶ Mixed use and higher densities for Petaluma Boulevard South and North and Magnolia, etc.
- ▶ Preserving the farmland around the City is vital to preserving the agricultural tourism, which brings money to Petaluma.
- ▶ The City can provide services – sewer and water without increasing density. The Boulevard is a gateway and any development should include scenic corridors.
- ▶ Vision of a beautiful gateway into Petaluma via Petaluma Boulevard North enhancing it with bike paths and walkways, keeping density congruent with existing neighborhoods, to keep the feel and look of the historical rural/farms.
- ▶ I feel that the area in question should be developed on a limited basis to maintain the lower density of building and traffic.
- ▶ Sensitivity to scenic resource zoning; i.e., per County here, is important though this development (City) locked area should be considered for incorporation and density/services changes.
- ▶ The Plan's stipulation for feathering to the UGB must be followed – meaning no development should be approved for higher density and any housing that exists further away from the UGB. For example the development proposed for Paula Lane has significantly higher density than many of the yards/houses on the other side of Paula, farther from the UGB -- the same for Jessie Lane.
- ▶ Any annexation of County land must include consideration of those who currently live in the county. Some proposals would be difficult to fully implement without the agreement by County residents to be annexed also, which many do not want.
- ▶ Hillside land use creates challenges and increases problems in some areas with water pressure.
- ▶ Animal habitats (badgers, deer, birds) should not be disturbed.
- ▶ As with the destruction of the “feel” of Petaluma by widening downtown street, (which I hope does not happen), streets that are near the UGB on the County line have a distinctively rural feel (walk Paula Lane at night, see Jessie lane). People who choose to live there specifically choose not to live in or near a development. People who plan and profit from the developments do not live where they are directly affecting the quality of life of those who do live and work at home there.
- ▶ The value. Neighborhood meetings. General Plan Ambassadors, I can act as conduit for input in my Sphere of Influence. People who know I am an ambassador would be able to funnel their written comments/questions through others or me for meetings. Neighborhood walking paths - bike path enhancement. Turtle Creek – great ideas for a development – paths, park, bridge, winding streets, landscaping and frontage wall. With traffic enhancement we need beautification. Pretty good on Washington and McDowell – we can do better. City encourages remodel and enhancing existing housing for homes in need of repair/beautification. Lower permit fees. Tax rebate – recouped on increase in resale values and taxes.
- ▶ One thing that stands out to me on Petaluma Boulevard North is a beautiful tree canopies thoroughfare that is absurdly endangering to both pedestrians and bikers and to hectic for

people in cars to enjoy. There are a variety of ways to calm auto traffic and to make bike/pedestrian travel safe and inviting. These measures should be part of any development affecting this corridor.

- ▶ Urbanization of the west and northwest areas of Petaluma would meet significant environmental constraints. Preservation of protection of west side lands is paramount to those of us who live in these areas.
 - 1) Contract the UGB on Paula Lane from Bodega to west to Paula Lane itself. Maintain the County residential density of AR-2, one house per two acres. This is a rural area. Continue the UGB on Paula Lane as Paula Lane from West Street to Schuman Lane. This provides consistency and clarity to developers that high-density housing proposals are NOT appropriate in this area and infrastructure challenges would be significant, with current resident quality of life and safety impacted.
 - 2) Preserve and enhance open space and wildlife corridors on west side, especially Paula Lane. We as a community will be seeking a Historic District designation for the County zoned rural agricultural lands from Bodega to Schuman.
- ▶ Developers may want to sniff out any vacant land not developed on the west and northwest side and make their case to pave over beautiful rural areas. This is NOT the vision of people who live on west and northwest sides.
- ▶ Contract UGB to Paula Lane – Bodega to Schuman!!

4. LAND USE – GENERAL COMMENTS

- ▶ Extend UGB from 2018 to 2025 to coincide with the next General Plan update.
- ▶ Take definition of “mixed use” and expand; i.e., mixed use, high density (downtown) (CPSP); mixed use, vertical, moderate density (freeway frontage) (Kenilworth); mixed use, horizontal, moderate to low density (industrial and retail centers); mixed use, residential centers, low density.
- ▶ Meet ABAG population projections without expanding UGB and with densities that start high at the urban core and feather to rural at the edge (all edges) of the City, including east, northeast and southeast side of town.
- ▶ Encourage neighborhood retail that has 3600 residential around center to at least ¼ mile and more. Do not propose or encourage neighborhood retail on major roadways.
- ▶ The agriculture in the boundary of Petaluma does not appear to be considered. I have left you a copy of farm trails map showing the family farms around Petaluma. If supporting agriculture is a General Plan goal, why do you show these acres as a proposed expansion area?
- ▶ Consider requiring a six-foot by eight-foot storyboard and story poles for all housing developments. The board should be readable by viewing from a parked car. The City of SeaTac, Washington requires such notification even for single homes on a flag lot.
- ▶ More diverse housing including shared living and co-housing developments, as well as relaxed second unit/granny unit standards to there could be more small living units for someone to live alone or as a couple.

- ▶ Land use looked at as a whole with pedestrian and bike access built in existing areas linked together with paths. For example, so I can walk from the Foundry Wharf to Whole Foods without going through glass-strewn lots, old concrete chunks, busy streets and freaky areas.
- ▶ Regarding the Environmental Review, please write into the General Plan an intention to perform complete reviews under CEQA, with particular emphasis on adequate documentation of special animals and plants. We do not want to lose any more in Petaluma due to incomplete information in the California National Diversity Database. It is not complete if this is a reference you are using for the revised General Plan environmental information.
- ▶ Ball fields should be developed in the floodplain.
- ▶ Preserve west side open space. Limit development and avoid further annexation.
- ▶ Do not pack us in like sardines.
- ▶ Want ball fields and park area on Jessie Lane. Do not forget the children.
- ▶ Preserve existing west side open space. Add traffic-calming measures on Paula Lane to reduce speeding hazards created by those taking Paula Lane as a shortcut between Bodega and Magnolia.
- ▶ No more zipper lots in Petaluma. Just say no.
- ▶ There are no ball field in west Petaluma and losing some at Kenilworth. If we do not get some parks in the Payran Reach Area to Corona, where can it go?
- ▶ We cannot build into fiscal health.
- ▶ Development is inevitable. Our children will need housing. Unused property is a fire hazard and money out the door.
- ▶ If we are going to develop the land around the river, it cannot be all industrial. We need to provide the community with access to the river so that it is the entire City that will be benefiting from this natural resource. Plans for land use should include a recreational aquatic center.
- ▶ Fairgrounds must be designated as "park," as it is perfect for a west side sport complex, and is especially good since it is City owned.
- ▶ Bike/Walking paths along creeks was brilliant. Newer developments have been pretty good about addressing this. Great paths will: 1) give greater pedestrian safety, 2) lowers pedestrian/bike use of streets, 3) raises quality of life, 4) raises property values. Europeans recognize this as in Germany it is possible to cross the countryside on bike paths mostly away from streets. Pathways go through neighborhoods between homes and off streets.
- ▶ How about land use that requires a campus community development to include a ball field which would be good for employee lunch uses available for city/youth evening and weekend use? Parking would already be available and use at opposite peak times. Development could use park fee on their site. Development could maintain.
- ▶ City needs west side sports field complex.
- ▶ City needs to develop more ball fields. Currently is critically short of this need.
- ▶ Focus on local neighbor retail/service needs so that people could work from home and reduce auto trips.

- ▶ More local parks for community needed. The ones we have need more maintenance.
- ▶ More recreational facilities on west side.
- ▶ Adults need ball fields on west side. Use floodplain areas for open space/recreation/parks, meeting many goals give floodplains back to the river (reducing flooding and flood-related costs; improving health and function of the river) and providing much-needed west side ball fields, etc.
- ▶ More discussion from presenters to explain options A, B, and C in detail. I would favor C which emphasizes neighborhood community, allowing some commercial in residential areas so less driving is necessary. Less population growth.
- ▶ Do not count school fields as “park”; school fields are less and less available to the community; Casa closed and others not maintained. Schools do not fill park needs. We need access to the Petaluma River on both sides throughout the City.
- ▶ The five story-parking garage near the Fire Department is a City uglification no matter what design. The prior building torn down and near there was supposed to upgrade Petaluma Boulevard appearance and the City image. What a horrible message to congest and block the views from that area which was nostalgic and now there is an opportunity to respect the River area and downtown by keeping views, access, dignity and smaller scale. The Turning Basin’s new buildings are a heart breaking assault on the public views from Petaluma Boulevard and the Turning Basin. We must respect our one and only River, even if it is not Yosemite Falls and clear. It is a treasure and has been assaulted visually. Turn it around and keep it open and do not degrade it by development--overscale view and access blocking. That is not the river and is human lack of comprehension. It draws people and feeds the soul. In Burlington, Vermont, pesticides are not allowed in parks, lands and waterways. Let’s do that here too.