

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, February 24, 2009
 City Council Chambers
 777 Cypress Avenue
 Redding, California 96001

MINUTES

Chairman Randall Smith called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Jim Chapin, Michele Goedert, Bert Meyer, Lynne Wonacott, and Chris Young present. Absent was Commissioner Emmett Burroughs. Also present were Development Services Director Jim Hamilton, Senior Planners Kent Manuel and Jim Wildauer, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Land Development Manager Marty Wayne, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion. Commissioner Lynne Wonacott left the meeting at 5:30 p.m., as hereinafter noted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Michele Goedert moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 27, 2009. Commissioner Jim Chapin seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING - SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION SDP-1-09, by *Riverfront Playhouse*, requesting approval to establish a 185-seat community theater within an existing building located at 1701 Pine Street (the southeast corner of Pine Street and Placer Street) in a "CBD-SP-BH" Central Business District with Specific Plan and Building Height Overlay Districts. The request includes a building addition, for a total size of approximately 15,000 square feet. *Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt. Staff Recommendation: Approval. L-010-390-700*

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report. He noted that the property was purchased by the Redding Redevelopment Agency (Agency) in October 2004 and that the building had been vacant since January 2006 when the automotive business, Carl's Tire, was relocated to another property. He stated that in August 2008, the Agency entered into a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) with the Riverfront Playhouse for the development of a community theater on the property. Mr. Manuel advised that the interior and exterior remodel would also include a second- and partial third-story addition in order to provide the traditional sound- and lighting-control booth and a mezzanine or flyloft for the theater. He added that the 185-seat theater would include a separate rehearsal hall, set-building shop, concessions and kitchen area, and a manager's office.

Mr. Manuel continued that the property was located directly adjacent to the City's Public Parking Lot No. 4. He indicated that in April 2006, the City Council agreed to sell that property to Building Innovation Group (BIG), formerly Habitat for Humanity, to develop Theatre Square, a mixed-use townhouse development. He said the Riverfront Playhouse Theater had been a part of that proposed development application since April 2007; however, the decision was recently made by the project's proponents to separate the two entitlement applications. He stated that the site design had not been modified and would permit development of the properties to occur as originally planned.

According to Mr. Manuel, because the property was recently rezoned to be included within the "CBD" Central Business District (which did not require individual development projects to provide parking), the theater would rely on public and on-street parking within the Downtown core to meet its needs. He mentioned that Public Parking Lot No. 4 could be used to satisfy the need today, but if the Theatre Square mixed-use development project also moved forward, that parking would no longer be available. Mr. Manuel pointed out that a parking study undertaken for "Downtown in 2007" estimated that there were approximately 100 parking spaces within a one-block radius of the theater, including the City's Public Parking Lot No. 3, located just north of the intersection of Pine Street and Placer Street. He said when the City Council entered into the agreement to sell Public Parking Lot No. 4 to BIG for its development, there was an acknowledgment that although there was not a parking problem in the Downtown core today, Public Parking Lot No. 3 should be retained for off-street public parking to serve the area and these developments in the future. He said staff

recommended that the Planning Commission approve Site Development Permit Application SDP-1-09 subject to the conditions of approval.

In response to questioning from the Commissioners, Mr. Manuel elaborated on the parking issue, noting that the study also looked at private parking, including parking at the banks located in the vicinity, as well as public parking. Mr. Manuel also agreed to a request by Chairman Randall Smith to require "large canopy" trees in Condition 13. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:13 p.m. Determining that no one wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 4:14 p.m.

Chairman Randall Smith supported the proposed project and felt the addition to Downtown would be wonderful.

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 Board of Administrative Review 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 be granted subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Condition 13.

Second: Commissioner Jim Chapin.

Ayes: Commissioners Chapin, Goedert, Meyer, Smith, Wonacott, and Young.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Burroughs.

PUBLIC HEARING - TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-8-07, POPPY HILLS SUBDIVISION, AND VARIANCE APPLICATION V-3-05, by Thomason Development, requesting approval to divide 46 acres into 19 lots for development of single-family homes and two large lots for future subdivision or development on property located at Poppy Hills Drive between Twin View Boulevard and Hilton Head Drive in "RS-3" Residential Single Family, "RM-9" Residential Multiple Family, and "RM-15" Residential Multiple Family Districts. The variance is for establishment of lot setbacks from Churn Creek consistent with those existing in the Fairway Estates Subdivision. Continued from the meeting of December 9, 2008. Environmental Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval. S-101-128

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report. He noted that the developer proposed to record the project in three phases and that the draft conditions of approval reflected this phased approach. He stated that a tentative subdivision map and related variance application covering a portion of the property were initially submitted in 2005 (Fairway Estates Subdivision, Unit 2). Mr. Manuel observed that since that time, the project boundary had been expanded to include proposed Lots 9 and 10 and that the previous map application had been withdrawn. He continued that Poppy Hills Drive, which was currently a private street, would provide access to the development. He said it was not dedicated to the public at the time it was constructed due to uncertainties regarding potential Caltrans plans for the construction of a "flyover" at the confluence of State Route 273 and Interstate 5.

Mr. Manuel advised that the conditions of approval required public dedication of Poppy Hills Drive with recordation of the first phase of the development. He explained that before the street could be accepted as a public street, the developer must either establish that it meets current structural street standards or undertake any necessary work to bring it up to those standards as approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Manuel mentioned that Condition 10, which required a public-service easement for the extension of the existing waterline at the northerly terminus of Hawley Road to Poppy Hills Drive, was revised to add ". . . or as otherwise reflected in the Master Water Plan within the boundaries of the subdivision. The line shall be located within a public street unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer." He explained that constructability and serviceability was of paramount importance to the Redding Municipal Utilities Department.

Stormwater detention and flooding issues were also discussed by Mr. Manuel. He advised that the property was outside the 100-year floodplain of Churn Creek as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), but mapping for the City's Montgomery-Watson floodplain (MWFP) study indicated that a large portion of the property was inundated by the 100-year-storm event. He said when the MWFP analysis was done in 1994, it failed to recognize the existence of a very broad berm that had previously been constructed on proposed Lot 10. Mr. Manuel noted that as part of this tentative map application, the City required an analysis of the impact of the berm on the MWFP and the structural integrity of the berm. He stated that the studies concluded that the MWFP did not encroach beyond the berm and that the earthen berm met standards for geologic stability. Mr. Manuel said Condition 38 required that the developer apply to the City for an amendment to the MWFP based on the results of the study, so that the City's floodplain mapping depicted actual flooding limits. He mentioned that Condition 36 required that the MWFP, as it affected a small drainage swale area on Lot 10, be dedicated to the City on the final map.

Regarding stormwater detention, Mr. Manuel indicated that a detention basin would be, at least initially, constructed to handle the stormwater-management requirements for Phases 2 and 3 and that it would be on Lot 9. He advised that a landscape maintenance district covering all phases of the development was required to ensure long-term maintenance of the facility.

The creek-corridor setback was also discussed by Mr. Manuel, who noted that up to a 50 percent reduction in the setback for newly created lots was allowed, provided that a variance application was approved. He noted that to substantiate that approval, the Zoning Code required that a biological report be provided that addressed potential impacts resulting from a reduced setback. He said the applicant had submitted the required biological analysis, which determined that there would be no impact to Churn Creek or its riparian communities. Mr. Manuel said staff recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-8-07, Poppy Hills Subdivision, and Variance Application V-3-05 subject to the conditions of approval, including the revision of Condition 10. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:36 p.m.

Walt McNeill, Attorney at Law and representative for Don Levenson, owner of the property to the north of the project, objected to the conditions regarding dedication of the waterline easement. He contended that this project as conditioned was not consistent with the Oasis Road Specific Plan (ORSP). Mr. McNeil stated that the ORSP showed a waterline easement going up to the formerly planned location for the Churn Creek Road extension. He contended that even though the road extension was eliminated, the waterline locations and utility easements should still be in the identified location. He requested that there be a waterline easement all the way through the subdivision at the earliest possible time in the processing of this map, so that water would be available for development to the north. Mr. McNeill believed staff should follow the plan that was originally scheduled for the area.

Mr. Manuel addressed Condition 10 that was revised to include the underlined wording: *Public-service easements for required sewer lines, waterlines, electric-service facilities, and other public utilities; drainage facilities; necessary electric- and public-service easements; unobstructed storm drain and overland release easements; and street dedications are to be provided in accordance with the Redding Municipal Code and as specified by the City Engineer. This shall include a public-service easement for the extension of the existing waterline at the northerly terminus of Hawley Road to Poppy Hills Drive, or as otherwise reflected in the Master Water Plan within the boundaries of the subdivision. The line shall be located within a public street unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer. All easements shall have a minimum width of 15 feet, unless otherwise noted in these conditions or as previously recorded.* He explained that the intent was to require the public-service easement with the first map to be recorded. He stated that the condition could be revised to state *with recordation of the first map*. Mr. McNeill felt the revision did not succeed in its intent. He asked for language that clarified the requirement for the entire continuous easement.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay suggested that the Commission not condition the tentative subdivision approval to require dedication of an easement before the final map, as was seemingly being requested by Mr. McNeill. He advised that there were other options to secure the easements. He explained

that the requirements had to be proportionate to the need associated with the item being presented. Mr. Duvernay continued that one of the findings for denying a tentative map was inconsistency with the General Plan. He further explained that a line showing a utility in the General Plan was not something that the Commission was required to follow. Mr. McNeill disagreed with Mr. Duvernay, reiterating that there was inconsistency with the General Plan. Mr. Manuel added that to his knowledge, the applicant was not adverse to providing an easement.

John Schuller supported the project as presented. He appreciated the Commissioners considering the water and drainage issues and trying to be reasonable with the applicant. He felt this subdivision was an excellent example of controlled development. Mr. Schuller asked that the project not be delayed and, regarding the waterline easement, that the applicant not be required to pay for another developer's poor planning.

Eihnard Diaz, applicant's representative, discussed the berm on the property. He explained that the berm provided access to service various manholes that were located within the easement. He believed the conditions should not be revised any more. Mr. Diaz said the applicant was willing to meet with Mr. McNeill and Mr. Levenson's engineer. After discussing the easement and conditions of approval with the Commissioners, Mr. Diaz stated that his client was not amenable to providing the easement at this time because it was not currently needed. Mr. Diaz repeated that he would be willing to meet with the applicant's engineer and representative, whom he felt should have contacted the applicant or himself prior to this hearing.

Commissioner Jim Chapin felt the waterline easement should be established as soon as possible but that the applicant should not be required to construct the waterline other than what was needed for his project.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton noted that a waterline easement, not actual waterline construction, was being requested. He suggested that Condition 10 be revised to state . . . "with recordation of the first map."

Mr. Diaz pointed out that future development on Lot 9 had not been designed; therefore, an appropriate location of the connection between existing Hawley Road and the eventual connection to Poppy Hills Drive could not be determined. He asked how the applicant could identify the easement location if Lot 9 was not yet designed. He contended that by imposing this condition, the City was stating that the applicant could not proceed with Phase 1 until he designed Lot 9 and identified where a public road was going to be, since the waterline easement would be within the road right-of-way. More discussion ensued regarding the requirement for the waterline easement.

Mr. Duvernay explained that the existing 16-inch waterline would be needed to serve Lots 9 and 10 in the future. He was comfortable with requiring the easement as suggested by staff but acknowledged that it could compromise some of the options to design Lot 9. He pointed out, however, that the compromise could happen even if the easement was not required now, because the City could in the future declare eminent domain and place the easement where staff determined it would best serve the area. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:25 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and find and declare that, as set forth in the Government Code of the State of California, Section 66474, none of the conditions as listed in (a) through (g) exists with regard to this proposed subdivision and that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Redding General Plan and approve Tentative Subdivision Map S-8-07, Poppy Hills Subdivision, and Variance V-3-05, subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Condition 10 but **without** the wording ". . . with recordation of the first map."

Second: Commissioner Bert Meyer.

Ayes: Commissioners Meyer, Wonacott, and Young.

Noes: Commissioners Chapin, Goedert, and Smith.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Burroughs.

Motion failed.

Motion: Commissioner Jim Chapin moved that the Planning Commission adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and find and declare that, as set forth in the Government Code of the State of California, Section 66474, none of the conditions as listed in (a) through (g) exists with regard to this proposed subdivision and that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Redding General Plan and approve Tentative Subdivision Map S-8-07, Poppy Hills Subdivision, and Variance V-3-05, subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Condition 10 **with** the wording ". . . with recordation of the first map."

Second: Commissioner Michele Goedert.

Ayes: Commissioners Chapin, Goedert, Smith, and Young.

Noes: Commissioners Meyer and Wonacott.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Burroughs.

PUBLIC HEARING - RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - THE RESERVE AT GOLD HILLS SUBDIVISION UNITS 2 AND 3 PROJECT, by Brian Burk and Ed Beaulac, consisting of the following requests:

TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-4-05, THE RESERVE AT GOLD HILLS SUBDIVISION, UNITS 2 AND 3, proposing to divide 32.6 acres into 114 single-family residential lots in two distinct units. Unit 2 is proposed as a planned development and comprises 50 of the 114 lots and is designed as an addition to the earlier approved The Reserve at Gold Hills Planned Development. Unit 3 is to be developed as a standard single-family subdivision, consisting of 64 lots, and is not a part of the Planned Development. The property is generally located east of Gold Hills Drive and south of Oasis Road in an "RM-6" Residential Multiple Family District and "RS-3" Residential Single Family District. S-101-083

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPLICATION PD-8-07, for a planned development associated with the 50 lots proposed with Unit 2. L-010-210

REZONING APPLICATION RZ-3-07, proposing to rezone the Unit 2 planned development site from "RM-6" Residential Multiple Family District to "RM-6-PD" Residential Multiple Family District with Planned Development Overlay District. L-010-230

Continued from the meeting of July 8, 2008. Environmental Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Recommend to the City Council adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval.

Commissioner Lynne Wonacott recused herself due to a conflict of interest and left the dais at 5:30 p.m.

Senior Planner Jim Wildauer summarized the staff report. He noted that the project was continued from the July 8, 2008, meeting due to objections raised by the adjacent property owner to the south, Jon Thomason. Mr. Wildauer indicated that at issue was disagreement over whether or not the existing land development agreement established with Unit 1 of The Reserve at Gold Hills between Mr. Thomason and the project sponsor, Brian Burk, allowed Units 2 and 3's increased stormwater peaks to be stored in the Unit 1 detention basin. He said Mr. Thomason alleged that the agreement did not so allow, and if Units 2 and 3 were allowed to use the basin, it could result in an inverse condemnation of his property by increasing peak flows, which would inundate an undetermined portion of his property.

Mr. Wildauer continued that Mr. Burk had been working toward resolving the misunderstanding as to the provisions of the agreement and the concerns expressed by Mr. Thomason. He stated that Mr. Burk had now arrived at a solution for providing detention for Units 2 and 3 that did not involve use of the Unit 1 detention facility or otherwise have an impact on Mr. Thomason's property. He discussed the on-site in-stream detention facility proposed within Units 2 and 3 at the southerly crossing of Dry Gulch Creek at Road "I," which would be accomplished by sizing the outlet of the

basin to meter the project's peak flows to predevelopment levels. Mr. Wildauer observed that the hydrology study for this project had been reviewed by the City and was found to satisfy the requirements of City Council Policy 1806 for development of Units 2 and 3.

According to Mr. Wildauer, Unit 1 of The Reserve at Gold Hills was an entitled project with its own set of conditions and obligations to be fulfilled prior to recordation of a final map and that any action taken by the Commission on Units 2 and 3 would not affect the status of the Unit 1 entitlement. He informed the Commissioners that a detailed hydrology study was also completed for the Unit 1 detention facility, which verified the ability of the Unit 1 detention facility to more than meet its detention requirements. He advised that the two detention basins together had more storage than necessary to allow development of all properties north of the Gold Hills Subdivision to Oasis Road that were tributary to Dry Gulch Creek *without* causing an increase in peak flows at any point downstream of the projects. Mr. Wildauer recalled that over the past several years, residents adjacent to Dry Gulch Creek had expressed concern about potential flooding impacts associated with development in the basins. He noted that even though staff had concluded that the proposed detention basins satisfied City Council Policy 1806, an advisory condition (Condition 64) had been included to specifically disclose to the applicant, and potential successors in interest, that they would be responsible for defending any legal action seeking to challenge the project approval.

Wastewater issues were also discussed by Mr. Wildauer. He indicated that the property-owner agreement in place for Unit 1 allowed for a sanitary-sewer easement over Mr. Thomason's properties within Dry Gulch Creek that would serve Units 1, 2, and 3. He noted that although there were no current disagreements as to this aspect of the agreement, in the event an impasse were to develop, Mr. Burk proposed, and the City Engineer supported, an alternative interim sewer-service plan which would not require easements through Mr. Thomason's properties. He described the route of the sewer-service plan and the sewer lift station and noted that maintenance of the facility would be paid for by the subdivision property owners. He continued that once the Thomason properties were developed, the interim facility would be dismantled and connection made to sewer lines being installed with the developing Thomason property in what was the preferred alignment.

Mr. Wildauer advised that a letter had been received from Jeffery Swanson, Attorney at Law, representative for the Gold Hills Golf Course and related parties, opposing the proposed subdivision. He said Mr. Swanson mentioned that property owners downstream of the project had filed lawsuits based on drainage and flooding issues related to Dry Gulch Creek. Mr. Swanson had pointed out that a berm had been constructed along a portion of the creek just south of the golf course, which would limit the area over which stormwater could pass and impact properties both upstream and downstream. Mr. Swanson requested that the project not be approved until the hydrology study was updated to reflect actual conditions in the field. Mr. Wildauer noted that the City's hydrologist had stated that the results of the hydrology study would not be affected by the downstream berm and that an update was unnecessary.

Mr. Wildauer said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-4-05, The Reserve at Gold Hills Subdivision, Units 2 and 3; Planned Development Plan PD-8-07; and Rezoning Application RZ-3-07, subject to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Bert Meyer asked for clarification of Condition 64, the advisory statement regarding indemnification.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton explained that the City was not asking for indemnification, only advising the landowner that the City reserved the right to participate in the defense or not, depending on the circumstances.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay noted that some jurisdictions had a firm policy that required all projects to execute an indemnification agreement but that the City of Redding did not require this in every case. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:43 p.m.

Thomas Andrews, representing several homeowners, observed that he had been addressing the issue of flooding and drainage from Dry Gulch Creek since 2001. He noted that because of flooding

issues, litigation was instituted and a plan was developed to address them. He suggested that a way be found to permanently clear the area so that vegetation did not impact flows. Mr. Andrews indicated that a number of homes along Gold Hills Drive in the vicinity of Dry Gulch Creek were now in the floodplain. He recalled that Mr. Burk had previously approached the neighbors regarding development of a detention pond within Unit 1. He pointed out that this project had still not developed. Mr. Andrews asked the Commissioners to force the developer to do what he said he would do regarding construction of the detention facility. He also asked that staff work with the homeowners to develop a plan to resolve the flooding issues once and for all. He stated that the homeowners were willing to establish an assessment district to help pay for the cleanup to make certain that flooding would not occur because of the increased vegetation growth.

Linda Mahaffey detailed the history of flooding from Dry Gulch Creek. She addressed the changes to the approved map for Unit 1. Ms. Mahaffey stated that when Mr. Burk submitted an application for Unit 1, he proposed to build an oversized regional detention facility that could provide detention for all properties north of Gold Hills Subdivision. She noted that the neighbors did not oppose the project because they felt this project would help to resolve the flooding situation. Ms. Mahaffey contended that with construction of Units 2 and 3, the size of the detention facility for Unit 1 would now be reduced. She worried about future downsizing of the detention facility. She mentioned Condition 35b that required that stormwater detention be met and that the detention facility must be constructed and operational prior to, or concurrent with, development of Unit 2 or 3. She said it was not clear when the detention facility would have to be operational and wondered if it would be possible to go through a winter without the detention facility in place. Ms. Mahaffey thanked staff for providing information to her neighborhood group.

Gail Rich supported the concerns of her fellow neighbors. She mentioned the cleanup she participated in during 2008 that helped to remove the vegetation from a small portion of Dry Gulch Creek. She stated that even a small amount of rain had a big impact on the residents near the creek.

Mary Rose, a resident of Old Shasta, was concerned that eventually she would have to contend with the same type of issues regarding growth that Redding was experiencing. She appreciated the efforts made by staff and the Planning Commission to preserve the beauty of the Redding area.

Mike Dormer, applicant's representative, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., provided a history of the Unit 1 project, which included a detention pond that exceeded the requirements. He explained that the amount of detention required was still being exceeded even with Units 2 and 3 being added. He pointed out that runoff from the nitrogen and fertilizer used by the downstream golf course created additional growth and vegetation in the creek. Mr. Dormer stated that the detention pond would greatly help with the flooding problems experienced by the Gold Hills Subdivision residents. He reiterated that the amount of storage for detention had increased significantly.

Chairman Randall Smith clarified that there was no denial of the preexisting conditions and requirements for construction of the detention pond, the project had just been delayed.

Mr. Andrews said he would be satisfied if staff would submit a new floodplain map which showed that Dry Gulch Creek was staying within its boundaries and that those properties shown in the floodplain were no longer going to be in the floodplain. Mr. Hamilton responded that staff could not commit to define floodplain boundaries. He said the request needed to be made to the City Engineer for consideration.

Brian Burk, applicant, confirmed that new hydrology studies had been conducted. He added that since the original approval in 2006, stormwater-detention capacity had been increased and improved. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 6:29 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-4-05, The Reserve at Gold Hills Subdivision, Units 2 and 3; Planned Development Plan PD-8-07; and Rezoning Application RZ-3-07, subject to the conditions of approval.

Second: Commissioner Jim Chapin.

Ayes: Commissioners Chapin, Goedert, Meyer, Smith, and Young.

Noes: None.

Abstain: Commissioner Wonacott.

Absent: Commissioner Burroughs.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSIONER CONSIDERATION

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton announced that a Notice of Preparation was being circulated for a shopping center at Knighton Road. He said Shasta County staff would be holding a meeting to accept public comment, and he anticipated that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be distributed for the project within the next several months.

Commissioner Michele Goedert noted that she had been contacted by the consultant preparing the EIR, who inquired about commercial properties in the City in order to address economic blight that might develop due to development of the retail center.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Bert Meyer advised that the Rotary Club and the City participated in a joint project for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Center. He said the kitchen was remodeled, with the City donating approximately \$15,000 worth of kitchen equipment and the Rotary Club doing the construction. He remarked that the project was very successful.

Chairman Randall Smith advised that successful revegetation and destruction of the arrundo plant in the Stillwater area had been extended due to increased funding.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Randall Smith adjourned the meeting at 6:39 p.m.

Jim Hamilton, AICP
Acting Secretary

Randall Smith
Chairman