

Minutes of the Redding Planning Commission are transcribed in *summary format*. If you are interested in receiving detailed transcripts of the minutes, tape recordings are retained for a period of two years. For further information, contact the Planning Division of the Development Services Department at (530) 225-4020.

REDDING PLANNING COMMISSION  
 Regular Meeting, 4 p.m.  
 Tuesday, January 12, 2010  
 City Council Chambers  
 777 Cypress Avenue  
 Redding, California 96001

## MINUTES

Chairman Chris Young called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Emmett Burroughs, Michele Goedert, Bert Meyer, Cameron Middleton, Randall Smith, and Lynne Wonacott present. Also present were Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Project Coordinator Gary Otremba, Senior Planner Kent Manuel, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioner Lynne Wonacott moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 10, 2009. Commissioner Emmett Burroughs seconded the motion. Commissioner Bert Meyer abstained. The vote carried with six ayes and one abstention.

Commissioner Lynne Wonacott moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 8, 2009. Commissioner Emmett Burroughs seconded the motion, which carried with all ayes.

**PUBLIC HEARING - AMENDMENT TO SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT SDP-5-07**, by Shasta Community Health Center, requesting approval to expand a previously approved 10,165-square-foot addition to include a third floor (6,134 square feet of additional floor area), for a total addition of 16,229 square feet. The building is located on property at 1035 Placer Street and 1160 South Street in "PF" Public Facilities and "RM-10" Residential Districts. The amendment also involves an expansion of the previously approved 38-space parking lot to a total of 64 spaces, with a portion of the spaces to be covered with a solar-panel support structure. Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt. Staff Recommendation: Approval. L-010-390-700

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie summarized the staff report. He noted that since approval of the original site development permit in March 2009, the applicant had acquired an additional parcel to the south in order to provide the necessary parking to support increased floor area to the clinic facility. He stated that two of three existing residences located on the new parking-lot site had been removed since the granting of the previous entitlement; the remaining residence would be removed to accommodate the additional parking-area expansion. Mr. DeMallie indicated that access to the new parking would continue to be from existing internal driveways on the south side of the building. He advised that the objective of the project was to expand and improve the facility in order to meet growing client demand and to provide comprehensive health-care services to the medically underserved populations of the community.

Parking was discussed by Mr. DeMallie, who recalled that upon consideration of the previous building addition, a ratio of one space per 260 square feet was determined to be satisfactory, based upon a comprehensive existing parking-demand survey for the facility. He noted that the survey showed that at times of peak parking demand, 14 percent of the facility parking spaces remained unoccupied, with normal on-street parking and no evidence of parking problems in the near Garden Tract Neighborhood. He said staff attributed this lesser medical-use parking demand to greater use of public transit by facility clients and a higher percentage of building area devoted to administrative functions as compared to a typical medical office.

Regarding building height, Mr. DeMallie advised that the third-story element would reach a height of 51 feet to the top of a mechanical penthouse and shade structure. He explained that the property was in a "PF" Public Facilities District, which did not specify a maximum building height, and noted that allowed heights were established by project approval.

Mr. DeMallie observed that the proposed parking-lot expansion was adjacent to residential properties along the east and south property lines. He remarked that where dissimilar land uses abutted one another, buffer yards were required to ensure an orderly relationship between neighboring

developments, so a ten-foot-wide landscape setback with a six-foot-high masonry wall was required along the east and south property lines to address the noise, light, and aesthetic impacts of a commercial parking lot on nearby homes. Mr. DeMallie also discussed the solar-panel array, which was an open, "airy" structure with substantial metal trellis work, similar to architectural enhancements on the main building. He noted that the solar-panel array would supply approximately six percent of the facility's electrical needs. He mentioned revised plans submitted to the Commissioners at today's meeting, which had been refined to show revised architectural elevations. Mr. DeMallie said staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve Site Development Permit SDP-5-07 Amendment subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. DeMallie responded to questions from the Commissioners. He advised that main access to the parking lot was off Continental Street and that an existing emergency access would remain in place. He mentioned the concern that was expressed during the previous application by a neighboring property owner that the alleyway would become the everyday access to the parking lot. Mr. DeMallie indicated that the conditions of approval stipulated that the access to the alley was only for emergencies.

Commissioner Michele Goedert was pleased to see the solar-panel structure. She noted that in addition to providing energy for the facility, it also provided covered parking for the employees.

Commissioners Randall Smith and Lynne Wonacott agreed with Ms. Goedert. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:22 p.m.

Ron Beyer, applicant's architect, discussed why he proposed the solar-array structure as a covered parking area instead of being placed on the roof, explaining that it would be difficult to install the solar units alongside all the other equipment that was on a commercial roof. He commented that the decorative structure provided shade and that because it was tucked behind the large building on Placer and Continental Streets, it would be less intrusive. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 4:27 p.m.

Commissioner Bert Meyer worried about the vehicles safely exiting onto Continental Street from the parking lot. Mr. DeMallie explained that the driveway location was fixed by adjoining property lines and that this was predominantly an employee parking area.

Project Coordinator Gary Otremba said staff could review the situation during the design stage and possibly realign the curb cuts without the need for additional right-of-way.

**Motion:** Commissioner Michele Goedert moved that the project be found categorically exempt under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and that, based upon the testimony presented by staff, the Planning Commission determine that the necessary findings for approval as identified in Section 18.13.090 of the Redding Municipal Code are in evidence and that the permit amendment be granted subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Conditions 1, 3, 9, and 20; and the addition of Conditions 6, 14g, 14h, 14i, and 19.

**Second:** Commissioner Cameron Middleton.

**Ayes:** Commissioners Burroughs, Goedert, Meyer, Middleton, Smith, Wonacott, and Young.

**Noes:** None.

**Abstain:** None.

**Absent:** None.

***PUBLIC HEARING - RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT GPA-2-09, AMENDMENT TO THE HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE REDDING GENERAL PLAN.*** *The Housing Element is being updated as required by law and addresses a number of issues relative to providing housing opportunities for all segments of the community. It covers the period July 2009 through June 2014. Specifically, the Housing Element provides information on the following topics:*

- *Existing and projected population and housing profiles.*
- *An assessment of housing needs and site availability.*

- *Governmental and nongovernmental constraints to providing housing.*
- *Program accomplishments for the period 2004–2009.*
- *Goals, policies, and programs for the period 2009–2014.*

*Environmental Determination: Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted for the current Housing Element. Staff Recommendation: Recommend adoption of the Addendum and approval to the City Council. G-030-010*

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report. He noted that state law required that the Housing Element (Element) be updated every five years on a schedule established by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). He said this agency was also responsible for certifying that housing elements comply with state law.

Mr. Manuel continued that substantive changes to state law pertaining to high-density housing land-inventory requirements and the establishment of "by right" zoning for homeless shelters had been put into place since the current Housing Element was adopted in 2004. He explained that due to the technical nature of the new requirements, staff referred the draft document to HCD for review prior to bringing the Element to the Planning Commission for consideration. He pointed out that HCD encouraged such reviews and was obligated under the law to conduct them. Mr. Manuel mentioned that the downside was that the review process took over four months, delaying adoption significantly beyond the mandated August 30, 2009, time frame; and the upside was that HCD determined in December that the Element, as presently drafted, met all statutory requirements.

Mr. Manuel continued that the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) was an estimate of the total number of housing units, allocated among four income categories, that were expected to be needed over the five-year planning horizon of the Element. He explained that jurisdictions must plan for the number of housing units needed to accommodate all income segments in the community based on the RHNA. Mr. Manuel stated that the RHNA methodology was a density-based approach. He advised that the City was required to essentially provide much more land zoned for high-density uses than it normally would. He used tables and a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate how the RHNA/Housing Targets were determined.

Mr. Manuel observed that the practical effect of the RHNA process was that Redding must zone considerably more land for higher-density housing than would be required if the allocation was based on historical building trends and projected population increases alone. He indicated that there was sufficient land currently zoned to accommodate housing for lower-income individuals to satisfy the RHNA for this planning period, provided that the City undertook an amendment of the "RM" Residential Multiple Family District regulations.

According to Mr. Manuel, the state had established a "default density" in each jurisdiction for lower-income housing opportunities, of which Redding's default density was 20 dwelling units per acre. He said this meant that Redding must have approximately 150 acres of vacant land zoned to accommodate at least 20 units per acre in order to accommodate the 3,025 very low- and low-income households contained in the RHNA. He stated that based on existing zoning regulations, this requirement could not be met, since the vast majority of lands currently identified for higher-density housing were zoned "RM-12" and "RM-15" Residential Multiple Family Districts.

Mr. Manuel recalled that at its meeting of June 9, 2009, the Commission established a subcommittee (Committee) composed of Commissioners Young, Wonacott, and Middleton to review the inventory of vacant lands already zoned for development between 15 and 18 units per acre and to recommend an approach for a rezoning program that would be consistent with the RHNA numbers and the new default density requirements. He noted that after the review was complete and the potential ramifications of initiating a comprehensive rezoning program to increase densities on properties throughout the City were clear, the Committee requested that staff pursue an alternative means of complying with the intent of state law. He stated that based on this direction, staff amended the draft Element by adding a program to amend the "RM" District regulations to establish a "default density" of 20 units per acre for projects that committed to allocate a minimum of 35 percent of their dwelling units for lower-income households. Mr. Manuel continued that after review, HCD determined that this approach was consistent with the intent of the law, since it would provide high-density housing opportunities for these income groups; thus, HCD would not require that Redding systematically

upzone properties to a higher-residential density, assuming that the City followed through with amendment of the "RM" District regulations.

Mr. Manuel observed that while opportunities for establishing housing for lower-income households were enhanced by the proposed Zoning Code amendment, in reality, it was unlikely that many units would be constructed by the private market, given the significant subsidies that were required.

The issue of homeless shelters and Senate Bill 2 (SB 2) was also discussed by Mr. Manuel. He stated that SB 2, which became effective in 2008, required that each jurisdiction identify one or more zoning districts where homeless shelters were allowed without a use permit or other discretionary approval. He recalled that Redding adopted its new Homeless Shelter ordinance in August 2009, designating the "HC" Heavy Commercial District for this use. Mr. Manuel advised that the draft Element included an assessment of the unmet community needs and a lengthy analysis of the appropriateness and capacity of the "HC" District to accommodate new shelters. He noted that HCD had requested that the City monitor the standards contained in Section 18.43.160 to ensure that they did not have unintended consequences that discouraged creation of new shelters.

According to Mr. Manuel, preparation of the Element also included a public-participation process. He indicated that two separate workshops were held to assist staff in identifying any gaps that might currently exist in the City's housing programs and to determine if existing program activities needed to be modified to increase their effectiveness. Mr. Manuel advised that over 50 organizations and individuals were invited to the first workshop and that the second workshop, which was broadly advertised, focused on the concerns of the general public.

Mr. Manuel also discussed the additional policies and programs that were added to the Element after it was adopted in 2004, which included Activity 2.6, to review the City's "Second Dwelling" Ordinance to ascertain whether its provisions unduly discouraged development of this housing type and Activity 2.8, to consider adoption of "inclusionary" zoning provisions, as well as several Activities. He said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval of General Plan Amendment GPA-2-09, Amendment to the Housing Element of the Redding General Plan.

Mr. Manuel responded to questions from the Commissioners. He explained that RHNA did not establish a housing-production quota; for Redding, the RHNA resulted in the need to land-bank. Mr. Manuel continued that the RHNA housing target of 7,084 from HCD could not be changed but that the City could change its commitment to what it could produce if there was satisfactory justification.

Sarah Haddox, Senior Redevelopment Community Project Coordinator, addressed the rehabilitation costs for owner-occupied and rental units. She explained the requirements and thresholds for qualifying for the expenditures.

Mr. Manuel indicated that the City still had a surplus inventory of multiple-family residential land, which provided flexibility for the City and the Planning Commission when considering residential-development applications.

Commissioner Michele Goedert suggested that more clarification be provided for Activity 2.7 regarding default density in the "RM" District and recommended the wording ". . . high-density multiple-family residential projects" instead of ". . . 20 units per acre for residential projects," which she believed would help to avoid confusion when conversion was being considered. Mr. Manuel felt HCD would not object to the change. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:06 p.m. Determining that no one wished to speak, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:07 p.m.

Commissioner Bert Meyer remarked on the complexity of the item and the enormous amount of staff time required to address the issue and prepare the document. He felt the City's job was to assist people who really needed help instead of producing a state-required bureaucratic document.

Chairman Chris Young agreed.

Commissioner Cameron Middleton thanked Mr. Manuel for his efforts on such a complex item.

Commissioner Randall Smith commented that he had attended a League of California Cities workshop several years earlier in which a participant had stated that she had just received the required RHNA numbers for her jurisdiction in southern California and was concerned because her city was completely built out and could not achieve those target numbers.

**Motion:** Commissioner Cameron Middleton moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval of General Plan Amendment GPA-2-09, Amendment to the Housing Element of the Redding General Plan.

**Second:** Commissioner Randall Smith.

**Ayes:** Commissioners Burroughs, Goedert, Middleton, Smith, Wonacott, and Young.

**Noes:** Commissioner Meyer.

**Abstain:** None.

**Absent:** None.

### ***PUBLIC PARTICIPATION***

None.

### ***COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS***

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie referred to the letter submitted by the City regarding its response to Shasta County's Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for commercial property located at Knighton Road and Interstate 5. He advised the Commissioners that they could call him directly if they had any questions.

Commissioner Randall Smith noted that he had personally responded to the Draft EIR as well. He said he had also noticed the same disquieting lack of findings under the California Environmental Quality Act in the document.

Mr. Smith also mentioned the proposals being considered by the City Council for disposal or reconsideration of some surplus City-owned property. He worried that the parcels might be disposed of and that the Planning Commission would have no input in the process.

Commissioner Bert Meyer referred to the building across the street from City Hall that had been in foreclosure. He said he felt the City Council exercised poor judgment in refusing to purchase the building at the reduced price.

### ***DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Mr. DeMallie informed the Commissioners that the City Council adopted the Commissioners' recommendations on the zoning regulations for marijuana dispensaries and home cultivation.

### ***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Chris Young adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

---

Jim Hamilton, AICP  
Acting Secretary

---

Chris Young  
Chairman