



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 generalplan@ci.petaluma.ca.us
planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us

Web Page <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

Planning Commission Minutes January 11, 2005 – 7:00 PM

Present: P. Asselmeier, T. Barrett, K. Canevaro, Chairperson Dargie, S. McAllister, S. Von Raesfeld

Absent: One position vacant

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

GENERAL PLAN 2025 Continued consideration of Draft Preferred Land Use Plan

Director Tuft reiterated certain issues to be clear on the Commission's objectives regarding certain site or property owner-specific parcels.

She referred to “**Packet 0**” regarding the diverse/low designation, of 6.1 to 12 dwelling units per acre. She said this designation was created to address the older established Westside areas, primarily surrounding the downtown area. Mr. Nelson requested that the range be changed to 14 dwelling units per acre (du/acre). She said the existing densities of the Westside were studied and the issues with the existing General Plan had made most of these neighborhoods into “Legal-Non-Conforming Uses”. She said this created problems with remodeling and/or reconstruction. The intent was to bring these areas into compliance with the designation of diverse/low residential. She said staff felt it was not necessary to amend it to 14 du/acre. She said increasing the density number could allow more lots to be subdivided or proposed for additional development than intended by this designation.

Dana Breaux, representing Mr. Nelson, spoke regarding the density of 326 English Street. He reported that Mr. Nelson had indicated in his second letter that a density of 6.1-12.5 du/acre, rather than 12, would bring his property into compliance. He also indicated that a high number of rentals would be brought into compliance with this increase.

Commissioner Barrett asked what the downside was of having some of the rental properties as non-conforming. She asked if Mr. Nelson wanted to subdivide a property.

Director Tuft explained that legal, non-conforming only presents a problem if expansion is proposed or damage occurs beyond a certain percentage and replacement is requested. She said Mr. Nelson has indicated that he wanted to divide the property and provide individual homes to his children, and under the 12 du/ac, he would not be able to do this. She said this designation was an overlap designation between low and medium densities. She explained the Diverse/Low was customized to fit the West side of town. She cautioned about hedging too far on the du/ac since analysis showed additional units would arise with a much higher frequency.

Associate Planner Duiven: Department staff used the City's Geographic Information System to conduct an analysis of densities throughout the City on a block by block basis. The Diverse Low category of 6.1-12.0 units per acre represents the prototypical density of much of the central area west of Petaluma Boulevard. We found that this density range brought the majority of properties in this area into conformance. While incremental infill is possible, this density range does not open the door to widespread subdivision of land within this area. The category represents parcel sizes ranging from 3,630 to 7,140 square feet in size.

Commissioner Asselmeier noted the existing development on the "Hatchery" block and the difference between 12.5 and 12 makes a considerable difference because of all the units that would be dividable. She stated infill must be done very sensitively. She wanted to support staff in maintaining the 12.0.

Commissioner von Raesfeld concurred and asked how this could be challenged. He supported the density as is, to avoid opening up the entire Westside.

Director Tuft explained the justification for a variance is limited to size, shape, and topography of the subject parcel. She said, if for example, a lot was undersized compared to the remainder of the neighborhood and had two previous homes on it, then, Community Development may entertain a variance for this. She asked for Commission consensus to maintain the twelve du/acre and the Commission concurred.

Packet #1 - Lands of Muelrath- The property owners asked for a medium density on the larger of the two parcels, with high density on the parcel between Wood Sorrel and McDowell. At time of development proposal, consistency of lot size and patterning with the established neighborhoods would be assured.

Commissioner von Raesfeld asked if the higher density area desired to be something other than residential in the future, would this be precluded. He said this would be somewhat of a reservation for him.

Director Tuft said it would depend on the final definition, but in most cases, yes, a use other than residential would be precluded unless it served only the development on-site and undertaken as part of a PUD.

Commission consensus was to support staff's recommendations.

Packet #2 - Hansen House on North McDowell - Director Tuft said that Cobblestone Homes had asked for a density of at least 30 units per acre. She explained this would be the upper end of high density. Staff recommended a medium density of 8.1 – 18 to be more consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods on the east side of McDowell.

Commissioner Barrett mentioned the historic nature of the home and that it had been discussed in context with a historic overlay throughout the City. She said the medium density was a good idea, but the historic nature of the site should be respected.

Director Tuft explained the historic overlays would be demonstrated on the final GP exhibit at the Planning Commission's direction.

Commissioner McAllister asked for clarification if a certain area would be blocked out for the historic structure and the density transferred to the remainder of the site, or apply to the residual of the site.

Director Tuft answered that a policy had not been developed for this specific site. She felt the transfer of density to the remainder of the site would be more palatable to the developer by using the gross acreage for maximum density.

Commissioner McAllister she said she was concerned with not only the structure, but the surroundings that were part of the historic fabric of a piece of property. She felt transferring the density would encourage the developer to maintain more of the site intact, especially the large palm trees and accessory buildings. She said this would affect the appropriate density and how it would work in the neighborhood.

Council Member Canevaro said the medium density worked with the neighborhood and the developer could request a transfer of density to protect the existing house.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Janice Cader-Thompson commented on the historic house also mentioning the historic house at the proposed waste water facility site, which was planned to be retained/moved. She wanted to look at the eastside's historic elements to be consistent. She said density designations should also look at the traffic impacts that result and the infrastructure should be in place before projects are approved.

Packet #3 -Lands of Brody - Director Tuft explained the GP's existing designation of High Density of 10.1 – 15 du/ac, and that the property was within the Corona/Ely Specific Plan. She said the prospective buyer had asked the Commission to reconsider

and adjust it to medium density of 8.1 – 18 du/ac to be more in line with the past designation. She said because the property was located near arterials, within easy walking distance to schools and transit sites, it was perfectly suited for high density.

Council Member Canevaro suggested looking at what was conforming and the traffic patterns. He supported what the applicant suggested as better suiting this property.

PUBLIC COMMENT

David Bradley, Ryder Homes and representing the Brody family of 360 Corona Rd., said they supported the current designation of 10-15 units/acre as appropriate and what the existing surrounding neighborhoods would support. He said the proposed 18-30 du/acre would double the community's expectations and neighborhood outreach reflected concerns about the higher density. He requested to maintain the medium density.

Commissioner Barrett agreed with Mr. Bradley and supported medium density of 8-18 with the open space designation along the creek corridor. She felt it would look denser because of the open space. She said the Commission had to be sure that what the City allows to be built would suit the infrastructure available.

Commissioner Asselmeier said the transit-based hub planned for the area would be suited by greater density and that was why she supported the higher density.

Director Tuft said when looking at the potential for high density sites, the location of the transit site did support the proposed designation of higher density. She said if the site were built out at 18 du/ac it would still fit into the existing neighborhood. She explained the concern with the 8.1 – 18 density range was that it would be developed with more of the detached single-family type of development. With few available high density sites available, this site could support a higher density. She explained developers typically prefer to develop single family home since it was easier to process, get acceptability by existing residents, develop, and sell; but a diversity of housing types in the neighborhood would be a plus for the overall community.

Mr. Bradley said he understood. He said they hadn't done the land plan and he had been advised to come in the mid-range with the 8-18 allowing flexibility and consistency with the Corona/Ely Specific Plan.

Commission Chair Dargie said he expected the remaining Brody piece would be developed at a higher density than the first (Traditions).

Mr. Bradley said this was correct. With the urban transit site, the higher density of 10-15 would allow a substantial density increase as it neared the transit area.

Council Member Canevaro asked if consumers were looking for single family or high density housing.

Mr. Bradley said everyone would like a bigger home on more land but this was not achievable. He said the smaller lots had been successful and there was a market for this. He said the higher density with mixed use had a limited market.

Commissioner McAllister recalled discussion of the Specific Plan and maintaining the rural imagery of Corona Road. She stated she wanted to maintain this and if this would be part of the General Plan. She suggested having the front of the property maintain the rural integrity would affect the overall density of the site.

Director Tuft said this had been thought of, especially with the existing beautiful Brody home on Corona Road. She said the Corona/Ely Specific Plan did not provide for the rural density along the Corona frontage for this specific site, as it did east of the Sonoma Mountain Parkway intersection, and that the Specific Plan had designated the entire parcel as high density. Historically, the Plan had intended a curved connection from Sonoma Mountain Parkway and Corona which separated the rural designations from the Brody high density designation. She said the construction of the traffic circle at the intersection, and the rural densities east of this block, the Specific Plan thought of this area as a transitional one. She said this conversation tied into the concept of creating historic overlays, such as the Hansen house, and how best to maintain these landmarks.

Commissioner McAllister said she was leaning toward the lower density to preserve the existing home and keep the creek and open space.

Commissioner Asselmeier noted in the Position Paper that there was a lack of condominiums. She felt this type of housing was lacking in the City and this need supported treating these properties differently.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Matt Maguire, former SMART Commissioner, reminded the Commission of the importance of the potential transit plans in this vicinity. He said this supported the goals of the Plan and the standard density would make the rail option more difficult. He recommended the higher density and to keep the future in mind to replace the automobile mode.

Commissioner von Raesfeld supported the lower density. He said Mr. Bradley's statement supported this as a transitional site because it was one parcel. He asked if it could be designated with more than one density.

Director Tuft said that one parcel could have more than one density designated.

Council Member Canevaro pointed to the development behind Gatti Park with townhomes and residential. He wanted the applicant to have flexibility to make their plan work. He said he would support the lower density and to be creative.

Commissioner Barrett concurred with Commissioner von Raesfeld's suggestion to vary the density on this site.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Janice Cader-Thompson said the property across Corona Road was designated in the Urban Growth Boundary ballot measure as a property to bring in ("possible UGB expansion area") so this had to be considered when looking at the density for this site. She agreed with the varying of densities on this site. She supported affordable homes and the densities necessary to make them affordable.

Roslyn Payne, member of the Air Space Advisory Committee for the State of California for the Transportation Commission, said having two rail stations in one town was very challenging. She favored a transportation hub in this area. She said there were a lot of different elements and she supported the current designation as it made sense to the community on an overall basis. She envisioned a number of different housing types and this would take time to develop and input was needed.

Commissioner Asselmeier also supported multiple designations for the parcel and it would be important to develop the site with integrity. She wanted staff to recommend where the density designations should be colored.

Commissioner McAllister agreed but wanted staff to look at the historical homes and if a special overlay was needed on the map.

Commissioner Barrett concurred with multiple densities as part of the General Plan to set a guideline.

Council Member Canevaro said the community input that Ryder Homes has sought should be incorporated into the plan.

Packet #4 - Royal Tallow Rendering Plant – Director Tuft explained the existing General Plan designated this as industrial and open space. She said the proposal for the new General Plan was to take it to high density residential because of its location and attributes. She also referred to Packet #16 – Park Central - in conjunction with this site, which was proposed as Mixed Use. She said, due to the narrow street frontage at the Tallow site, it would not be conducive to handling traffic generated by an employment or mixed use. She said the Planning Commission originally recommended a commercial strip along Casa Grande, just west of Lakeville, to encourage development of a neighborhood serving commercial center (i.e.: mini-Main Street concept).

Commissioner McAllister had a question regarding Packet #16-Park Central – mentioned when this application was before the Planning Commission the proposal included the adjacent parcel, along Technology Lane. Director Tuft said it was designated Business Park on the Draft Preferred Land Use Map exhibit, but would be changed to Mixed Use to match the larger, corner site.

Commissioner Barrett said her concern was the isolation of the commercial site at the end of Technology Lane. She did not object to the proposed use for the Royal Tallow as it affects the existing businesses. She mentioned the trucking business across the street was concerned with compatibility and with high-density use, it might make it difficult for the businesses across the street that could affect the potential future sale of their property as industrial property. She said the Work Right site was being isolated as well. She also was concerned about the definition of mixed use and it had to be site-specific. She said the General Plan would need to define different mixed-use options.

Director Tuft answered that in the draft land-use plan, the Commission designated neighborhood commercial for both sides of Casa Grande between Lakeville and Rocky Dog Park. She said this was done in recognition of recent development, which created residential neighborhoods isolated from general commercial needs. The long-term plan for redevelopment of the businesses (like the trucking business) on Casa Grande would be toward a commercial neighborhood center. She said this neighborhood could integrate employment, shopping and the residential with high density rentals and some ownership units. She said the definition of Mixed Use was being worked on and will be brought back to the Commission.

Commissioner Barrett followed up asking if the Mixed Use would be site-referenced.

Director Tuft said, "Yes, for some sites." She said when the site was evaluated, needs for specific mixed use and site specific issues were identified to be further clarified. She mentioned a "downtown" type of mixed-use development at the edge of the City could increase development numbers beyond a level of comfort. She said site specific mixed use definitions were being discussed to establish zones of mixed use with density feathering as it moves toward the UGB.

Commissioner McAllister concurred with the Royal Tallow recommendation. She was concerned with Packet #16-Park Central and its Mixed Use definition. She stated she supported not designating the entire site as Mixed Use because the mixed use proposals brought to the Commission in the past were not acceptable. She was also concerned about the isolation and if the whole site should be developed as residential with a small part as commercial. She thought a business park, as in the current preferred plan, was best.

Director Tuft clarified the Draft Preferred Plan showing commercial along Casa Grande.

Commissioner McAllister concurred except for the Mixed Use designation since it becomes residential. She wasn't satisfied with how it worked with the adjacent Work-Right and the Poultry Processors, even though they didn't object.

Director Tuft said #16-Park Central would be kept in abeyance without consent of the Commission and #4-Royal Tallow would move forward.

Council Member Canevaro commented on Park Central and wanted the Commission to consider the number of office spaces currently vacant in the City.

Commissioner McAllister agreed, but since it was a twenty year plan, things would change and the General Plan had to consider this.

Commissioner Barrett said this argued the case for the isolation of Work-Right and would make their property even less commercially viable.

Council Member Canevaro asked if apartments across from apartments would cause any problems. He said he would concur with the rest of the Commission on #4.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Hershman, President of Eagle Equity Inc., regarding Packet #16-Park Central, said they would come back and would be taking the Commission and neighborhood comments into account to make revisions. He said they would specifically address the east side of Technology Lane by keeping it mixed use. He said this would afford them the opportunity to make changes to the site to provide for a denser housing development with open space and play areas. He said the overview of the area did not impact any other residential developments and is an ideal buffer site for the kind of development they envision. He requested that the Commission keep the mixed use designation on the entire parcel.

Chairman Dargie summed up that on #4-Royal Tallow, leave as staff recommended. On #16-Park Central – hold in abeyance.

Director Tuft said that when the project comes forth, the Commission would see and act upon this project. She said the Commission was not allowed to discuss specific project issues in consideration of the General Plan. She said whatever the Commission adopts for the specific project will be incorporated into the General Plan.

Commissioner von Raesfeld felt this project was close to reality and the General Plan was not going to be adopted in time to affect this project.

Director Tuft said at the time of the public hearing the Commissioners would be able to express all their concerns regarding the specific project.

Commissioner von Raesfeld said he supported mixed use as long as it was developed to a certain ideal.

Commissioner Barrett suggested the applicant meet with the General Plan staff and consultants developing the definition of mixed use for this site.

Packet #5 – Crinella and Caulfield – Old Adobe School District surplus land –
Director Tuft explained that with low density designation, this was completely

compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and this was the recommendation. All Commissioners concurred.

Packet #6 & #7 – Garfield / Living Word Lutheran Church site – Proposed school site adjacent to Arroyo Park on Garfield Drive. Director Tuft explained the location and situation about the existing creek and the opinion by the Department of Fish and Game discouraging enclosure of the creek remnant. She said it was inappropriate at this time to take a project specific request through the General Plan process and did not recommend any changes to the church site. The school had said it was not interested in the site for a school. She said the recommended density was compatible with the townhomes immediately adjacent, to the northwest, and the adjacent park.

Commissioner Barrett asked about the creek/culvert that goes through the development for #7 and why wouldn't this be extended.

Director Tuft explained that at the Garfield site there was enough room on both sides of the creek remnant to allow it to be kept as an open swale for the development. She said #7 project would have to go through site specific environmental review to allow approval. She felt the church would be in need of staff assistance and the site requirements would go beyond the General Plan's consideration.

Council Member Canevaro said he would like to direct staff to talk to the Parks and Recreation Department to extend the park to the creek line and the far side of the creek could be developed.

Commissioner von Raesfeld supported this since the park was an awkward transition currently.

Commissioner Barrett asked why the same creek protection wasn't extended to the next parcel.

Director Tuft answered that the protection could be extended but the church was asking for residential density on the remaining piece. She said the creek severely curtailed the potential development of five homes on the parcel as intended by the church.

Commissioner Asselmeier asked if the Commission could indicate where public access connections would be established.

Director Tuft said this discussion would probably be part of the Circulation Map and Element; including having the open space corridor overlay on the creek to be connected to existing paths and/or roadways. Consensus of the Commission was to identify the area south of the creek remnant as park, and designate the area northwest of the creek as Medium Density Residential.

Packet #8 – 400 Casa Grande Road – Director Tuft explained this site was anticipated to be developed with a Petaluma Ecumenical Properties project. The suggested land use

designation was for high density housing for the PEP parcel and the remainder to stay in its current designation. The Commission concurred.

Packet #9 – Surplus Property Casa Grande High School Site – Director Tuft explained the recommendation was to designate it Medium Density, 8.1 to 18. A recommendation for a 3-5 acre park site to connect the city-owned property on Crinella was originally included. She said it had been agreed between the Parks & Recreation Department and the developer that they did not need to provide a community park on this site but it will include a mirror image of the existing City property along Crinella within the project. She recommended reducing the recommended park size and the 16 acres be designated Medium Density residential.

Commissioner Asselmeier was concerned that a five acre park was not to be developed. She said the high school site was not available to the public as needed for active recreation, etc. She wanted a park of at least five acres.

Chairperson Dargie agreed with this.

Commissioner Barrett said this had come before SPARC as a preliminary project and may not be addressable in the General Plan. She said the developer proposed a walk-through for students to Crinella to reach the campus and some facing onto the school property that would include a green area. She said it would not include a park.

Commissioner Asselmeier asked if it would have workforce housing.

Commissioner Barrett said it would include workforce housing as far as she knew.

Commissioner Asselmeier said she was a proponent of making this a special study area as had been discussed, and she strongly recommended that this be put on hold and to look at establishing a park.

Council Member Canevaro asked about the five acre park proposal.

Director Tuft explained that three – five acres is the usual area needed for a neighborhood park, and this area of the community was considered to be lacking in park facilities.

Council Member Canevaro agreed to leave the options open for a park and possibly work with the schools to co-use and establish another field in the area.

Commissioner Barrett said that the concurrence was for the staff's original recommendation, which included a neighborhood park and Medium Density.

Commissioner Asselmeier advocated for five acres. She said it had been recognized that certain areas of town needed parks to serve neighborhood uses and pocket parks do not fulfill this need.

Council Member Canevaro said to indicate three – five acres and the developer can argue their case. Consensus of Commission was to include a neighborhood park on this site.

Packet #10 – Purrington/Mt. View area – Director Tuft said this area was proposed to transition to the rural edge with some areas conducive to combinations of development densities. Staff recommended Very Low Density of .6 to 2 du/acre south of Purrington and Low Density, 2.1 to 8 du/acre, northeast of Purrington. She said development standards the Community Development Department would be preparing with the new Zoning Ordinance would insure consistency with the established neighborhood densities.

Commissioner Asselmeier asked if additional units would be built and how many.

Director Tuft said a maximum potential of 24 – 25 additional units could be designed to conform to the neighborhood. The Commissioners supported staff's recommendation.

Packet #11 – Holmberg Property off Cedar Grove Parkway – Director Tuft said it was recommended to retain the Holmberg area as a neighborhood park with Medium Density residential on the remainder with no mixed use. She said the Holmberg site may have future development possibilities in conjunction with the development of a neighborhood park.

Commissioner Barrett asked how the proposed park would be accessed.

Director Tuft explained through Cedar Grove Parkway and along a river trail. She hoped in the long term to get multiple access points for people in the Payran area since it is so underserved for public (park) areas.

Council Member Canevaro asked how the applicant could combine the 3.2 acres and the remaining 1.8 to incorporate the historic structures.

Director Tuft explained that in the Parks and Open Space Element of the General Plan, the acreage could be specified for the park site. She wasn't sure if a historic overlay could be used. She clarified that some of the area in question was owned by the City, was located within the floodway and was mitigation for the Corps flood project and therefore could not be designated as park land.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carl Euphrat, Work Force Housing Associates, said that he was asking for flexibility in the park designation. He said the property was purchased knowing there were problems and that it had an unusual configuration. He said originally access was to be over Cedar Grove Parkway but the railroad was not in favor of this. He said they had secured adjacent properties on Rocca Drive to provide proper access. He said they will hold a neighborhood meeting to introduce their proposal. He asked for Medium Density on the site. He wanted to incorporate part of the mitigation area into a better park and enhance the area. He said the five acre park would be a huge impact to the site. He said there was

an historical foundation to maintain under the cinderblock building and the Tunstill historic home would be retained and possibly relocated. He said the farmstead home was in too poor of condition to be renovated. He said there were a substantial number of trees to maintain and an Indian midden area as well. He stated all of these factors would affect the park acreage they could provide with a park incorporated into the project, but not in the five acre size the Commission desired.

Council Member Canevaro asked the applicant to work with staff and to be flexible to make the land useable.

Director Tuft said the Parks and Open Space Element would be brought back to define specific park size. She said the Commission supported a park site beyond the mitigation site, and hopefully to include the midden, and they would work with the applicant to achieve this.

Commissioner Asselmeier supported integrating any portion of the Army Corps project possible to be used for a larger park and unite the River access in the area as well. She supported staff's recommendations.

Packet #12 – 6 Magnolia Avenue – Director Tuft explained that the owner had requested the highest density possible; she said the highest would be Medium Density, 8.1 – 18. She stated this was compatible with the neighborhood, traffic impact, and suitable for the constrained lot size.

Commissioner Barrett favored Medium Density and all the other Commissioners concurred.

Packet #13 – 5400 Old Redwood Highway (Old Adobe Lumber Site) – Director Tuft explained the site had recently been purchased by Clover Stornetta. Staff recommended designating the site as Mixed Use with an open space corridor along Willow Brook Creek.

Commissioners accepted staff's recommendations.

Packet #14 – Campus Properties on N. McDowell next to Plaza North Shopping Center – Director Tuft said high density residential was recommended because of its location to shopping, transit, constrained lot depth, shared access with adjacent senior residential project, etc.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Hooper, Campus Properties – Stated this project had been reviewed once by SPARC and they had updated the project for SPARC review on Thursday. He said thirty townhomes units were planned and his company thought this would fit well with the site.

Commissioners accepted staff's recommendations.

Packet #15 – Singleton Property, Rancho Veal, Petaluma Boulevard N. – Director Tuft said this site had been evaluated as a potential for High Density, but was changed to Medium Density due to the topography and future setback needs for the Rainier Plan Line. It was felt that this site would be more suitable for townhomes or apartments.

Commissioner Barrett asked to look at #21 with #15.

Packet #21 – Cinnabar Hill, Thompson piece – Director Tuft offered that a Medium Density designation was favored for this site. It is perfectly situated close to an arterial street, walkable to commercial and transit needs. The property owner wanted to develop his home and a couple others.

Commissioners accepted staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Asselmeier asked if there were any commercial use on property contained in Packet #15. She wanted to discuss why it was in the best interest of the City to move it toward industrial.

Director Tuft said it would lean toward industrial, not commercial. She stated there was originally a concept for preserving a narrow strip of commercial; however, if the Rainier plan aligns at the edge of the parcel, a driveway to serve the subject site from the Boulevard or Rainier would not be desirable. She said these constraints supported the Medium Density designation with commercial land uses continuing south down to the existing shopping center at Payran and the Boulevard. Commission consensus supported Medium Density.

Packet #17 511 Cherry Street and 626 Laurel Street - Infill/Minimum Densities – Director Tuft said that the issues for this particular site could be addressed through exceptions and clarifications in the new General Plan policies regarding infill and dividing multiple structures on an existing lot or to exempt a remainder portion of a parcel improved with an existing residence. She said the Department supported having minimum densities in all of the residential designations. The existing, and expected future, land values and limited resources led to in-fill proposals of high end detached single family homes as the most acceptable in neighborhoods. She said without minimums, only this type of product would be produced. She explained the property challenges involved with this lot and supported the subdivision. She wanted to establish the means to address this type of issue within the text of the General Plan rather than discarding the safeguards provided by minimum densities.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Steven LaFranchi, representing the property owners, clarified the request for a lower density was because of problems in subdividing and meeting the minimum density requirement in the existing General Plan. He said their application had been denied, resulting in the change in their application to request lower densities. He agreed to the

recommendation as long as a policy was established city-wide for minimum densities that everyone agreed to. He said he realized that the land should be used to its maximum within the Urban Growth Boundary. He wanted the policy to allow subdivisions that would maintain the developability of a property for the remainder.

Director Tuft said this was their intent and they would work with professionals to craft language that complied with the General Plan while being consistent within the intent of the Subdivision Map Act without compromising the concept of minimum densities.

Commissioner von Raesfeld said the subdivision would increase the density and would be a step in the right direction.

Commissioners supported staff's direction.

Packet #18 – Fairgrounds – Director Tuft explained the recommendation was to retain a majority portion of the property as public and semi-public south of what would be an extension of East “D” Street. She said the Commission, during earlier workshops, identified the East Washington Street frontage as Mixed Use from East “D” to Washington Street. She said the Fairgrounds was already a mixed use site and could be maintained.

Commissioner von Raesfeld asked if this was designated as such, the Fair would not be non-conforming but would be permitted under the zoning district.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tawny Tesconi, CEO Fairgrounds – Appreciated the designation of public/semi-public for part of the property. She gave a history of the Fairgrounds explaining it was purchased with Park Bond money and to change the designation may require a vote. She indicated this would question how much the General Plan process would affect the Fair's use. She said her concern was to keep the property intact until the community indicated their vision for the use of the property and the future of the Fair.

Commissioner Asselmeier supported the continuation of the public use associated with the property. She said until it was known where the Fair would relocate, it would be best to wait until a new location was found and she did not want to make any changes.

Council Member Canevaro wanted clarification of why Mixed Use would not be suitable.

Chair Person Dargie said he remembered a discussion directing Mixed Use as best for the areas nearest East Washington Street.

Tawny Tesconi said at this point, the General Plan showed a modification of the Fairgrounds and she did not feel the community had had the opportunity to weigh-in on the impacts.

Director Tuft said the draft land use plan could be modified without affecting the Fairgrounds use and allow a Mixed Use designation between East Washington and Fairgrounds Drive to grow the proposed public/semi-public area.

Council Member Canevaro asked if the Mixed Use designation would impinge on the Fair. He asked if moving businesses in would be taken as a threat.

Tawny Tesconi recommended more community input if the Fairground site was affected beyond the removal of the easement. She was concerned about the plans for continuing East “D” Street through the Fairgrounds without further discussions.

Commissioner von Raesfeld asked for the possible range of uses for public/semi-public use, since Mixed Use connoted private sector development; he asked if this would preclude the Fair. He said this was a piece of property owned by the City and leased back for almost the entirety of the General Plan by the Fair and as such, sounded more public than commercial.

Director Tuft asked if the Commission wanted to eliminate the illustration for continuation of the roads (East D Street, Jefferson, Ellis and Fairgrounds Drive) and move it (Public/Semi-Public designation) back out to the eastward extension of Fairgrounds Drive to encompass the Swim Center and the Skate Park within the Mixed Use.

Council Member Canevaro said that this should wait until a later date as currently the City and the Council were in discussion with the Fair Board.

Commissioner von Raesfeld thought this should be discussed when there was a better definition of Mixed Use.

The Commission decided to defer this discussion.

Packet #19 - KOA Properties – Director Tuft said the site was to be designated Mixed Use with an Open Space corridor along the River, and Urban Separator at the edge of the site adjacent to the existing Urban Growth Boundary. She said it was currently designated Agriculture and Industrial. She said because of its location, it was recognized that this would need a special formula within the Mixed Use definition and development potential.

Commissioner McAllister noted this site was a groundwater recharge area and this was an important consideration. Director Tuft noted that future analysis of groundwater recharge priority areas may result in an overlay on a portion of this property to protect groundwater recharge capabilities.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Wayne Wood, KOA Owners, said he concurred with staff's recommendations at this point. He said his property was a good example of mixed use as it existed, but he wanted to be able to make the fullest use of the property in the future.

Commissioner Asselmeier said the consideration of this property as Mixed Use was more satisfactory to her. She asked how intensively the property could be developed and if a maximum density was in the City's best interest. She said it was hard to decide on this until Mixed Use was defined. She saw it as an important issue for storm water detention.

Chair Person Dargie said that it seemed to meet the needs of Mixed Use with community based recreational use.

Commissioner Asselmeier said the Commission had given up the "private recreation" as a designation. She said it would be inappropriate to use the same Mixed Use definition as along McDowell Boulevard and this concerned her. She did not have concerns about the existing KOA use as it served as a recreational amenity.

Commissioner Barrett felt comfortable supporting staff's recommendations.

Packet #20 – Dutra Quarry – Director Tuft said the recommended density was diverse/low for the quarry site and mixed use on the river front portion. She asked if the Commission wanted a park site. She reminded them to discuss this without mentioning specifics of the project.

Commissioner McAllister had a question about the park and that some of the larger parcels should be used to serve neighborhood park purposes. She said this was not a component.

Director Tuft said the Commission could ask for a neighborhood park in the area. She reminded the Commission that no project specific discussions or comments should be offered.

Commissioner Barrett said this was scheduled to come before Council before they would get the Planning Commission's feedback, so this was a moot issue.

Council Member Canevaro said this had gone to an appeal but the Commission was asked for a recommendation.

Chair Person Dargie said as a general designation for the property, he would support adding Park in addition to the other designations.

Commissioner Asselmeier said she had reservations on supporting this. She said the Commission should support having the development be self-serving for the homeowners in the public amenity sense.

Council Member Canevaro supported this and wanted the City to request the developers support parks and other amenities.

Packet #22 – Western Avenue, properties along the south side, west of Benjamin Lane. Director Tuft clarified that on Western Avenue near the existing City limits, the existing designation was Very Low Density but that it had been incorrectly shown in the Preferred Plan as Rural and that it would need to be corrected to reflect the existing designation, as no change was being recommended. She said under the County zoning it would allow for a development pattern of 1.5 acre per unit, a greater intensity than the City had included on the Draft Preferred Land Use Plan.

The Commission concurred.

Meeting Adjourned: 10:10 p.m.