

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, March 11, 2008
 City Council Chambers
 777 Cypress Avenue
 Redding, California 96001

MINUTES

Chairman Michele Goedert called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Emmett Burroughs, Jim Chapin, Bert Meyer, Randall Smith, and Chris Young present. Commissioner Randy Memeo arrived at 4:05 p.m. Also present were Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Land Development Manager Marty Wayne, Executive Assistant II Anita Felion, and Administrative Assistant II Emily Lopez.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Jim Chapin moved approval of the minutes of the meetings of January 22 and February 12, 2008. Commissioner Emmett Burroughs seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - Street Renaming, by the City of Redding. *Request to rename a portion of Auditorium Drive to Sundial Bridge Drive. The proposed renaming would apply to that section of Auditorium Drive between its intersection with Park Marina Drive/Butte Street on the south side of State Route 44 and the Sundial Bridge. The portion of Auditorium Drive that branches west just north of State Route 44 would remain Auditorium Drive. Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval to the City Council. S-070-230*

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie summarized the staff report. He noted that in October 2007, the City Council directed staff to pursue a name change of a portion of Auditorium Drive to the name Sundial Bridge Drive. He stated that the portion of Auditorium Drive that branched west just north of the State Route (SR) 44 ramps would remain Auditorium Drive. Mr. DeMallie mentioned that the main considerations during this process involved contacting potentially affected agencies and property owners to determine the concerns of the proposed street name change. He said the agencies affected were those that had responsibilities involving addressing, such as public safety departments, the United States Post Office, and Shascom. Mr. DeMallie remarked that no comments were received from the public and that representatives of Turtle Bay, the Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Shascom, Caltrans, the Convention Center and Visitors Bureau, the Redding Police Department, and other City departments had all endorsed the proposed name change and indicated that the change would not adversely affect their operations. He observed that as part of this effort, Caltrans had indicated that it would provide staff to install a series of wayfinding signs along SR 44 between Interstate 5 and the Sundial Bridge off-ramp to identify the new street name and further aid travelers in locating the Sundial Bridge. Mr. DeMallie said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed street name change.

Commissioner Bert Meyer believed the name change for the highway overpass might confuse an out-of-town visitor. Mr. DeMallie explained that the sign on the off-ramp would advise visitors to turn the correct way to get to the bridge.

Commissioner Randall Smith voiced concern that Caltrans staff might make a sign that referred to SR 44 as Highway 299W, the previous name. Mr. DeMallie stated that he would bring it to the attention of the representatives who were working with Caltrans.

The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:12 p.m. Determining that no one wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 4:13 p.m.

- Motion:** Commissioner Randy Memeo moved that Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed street name change.
- Second:** Commissioner Randall Smith.
- Ayes:** Commissioners Burroughs, Chapin, Goedert, Memeo, Meyer, Smith, and Young.
- Noes:** None.
- Abstain:** None.
- Absent:** None.

TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-9-05, STONESFAIR SUBDIVISION, by Shasta Lake LLC, requesting approval to divide 51.2 acres into 118 lots for development of single-family homes on property generally located 0.4 mile south of Rancho Road and west of Clover Creek in an "RS-3" Residential Single Family District. The project includes a 7.6-acre land reservation/dedication for a planned larger Pacheco School District/City park site. The project also entails the extension of Shasta View Drive south of Rancho Road to provide access to the subdivision. Environmental Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval. S-101-093

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie summarized the staff report. He noted that access to the subdivision would be provided by construction of an extension of Shasta View Drive south of Rancho Road for a distance of approximately 0.4 mile. He advised that adjacent to the subdivision, in addition to standard vehicle-lane improvements, Shasta View Drive would include a decorative masonry sound wall, landscaped parkway with a ten-foot-wide separated pedestrian/bicycle path, and a landscaped median. He mentioned that the proposed project was adjacent to the Shastina Ranch Planned Development approved by the Planning Commission and City Council in 2005.

Issues discussed by Mr. DeMallie included traffic circulation, fire safety, tree preservation, drainage, internal-street connections, the extension of Shasta View Drive, and the reservation/dedication of land as a portion of a planned larger Pacheco School District/City park site. Regarding the traffic-circulation improvements, Mr. DeMallie recalled that the Shastina Ranch Subdivision was conditioned to prohibit development on the west side of Clover Creek until the intersection of Rancho Road/Victor Avenue/Churn Creek Road was improved or had a plan in place for the improvements. Mr. DeMallie stated that consistent with the Shastina Ranch Subdivision approval, the draft conditions included a stipulation that no lots could be recorded in the Stonesfair Subdivision until the Community Facilities District (District) or similar funding mechanism was in place, ensuring that the intersection would be improved. He mentioned the roundabout alternative that was previously before the Commissioners, which staff supported and the Commissioners agreed with. He recalled that the City Council stipulated that the District be formed to finance the improvement. Mr. DeMallie noted that staff had since met with property owners and developers; there had been some progress made toward formation of the District, but they were not anywhere near finalizing an agreement. He reiterated that no maps could record for the Stonesfair project also, until the District was formed.

In reference to the tree-preservation issue, Mr. DeMallie advised that Condition 62c stipulated that deed restrictions be included to provide notice to the purchasers that removal of native oak trees from their lots would necessitate a tree removal permit from the City, and Condition 62a required verification from a certified arborist that the proposed construction and grading methods would not have a significant adverse effect on the trees to be preserved. He mentioned that Condition 61 had been revised to reference Redding Municipal Code Sections 66479 through 66481 of the State Subdivision Map Act, instead of Section 66478. Mr. DeMallie said staff recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-9-05, Stonesfair Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval, which he reviewed.

Commissioner Randall Smith observed that Jeb Allen had been involved with both the Shastina Ranch and Stonesfair Subdivisions. He asked why Shastina Ranch Subdivision did not have to donate land for the school/park site. Mr. DeMallie explained that the two projects were very different and that the majority of the Shastina Ranch Subdivision was within the Overflight Safety Zone from the Redding Airport's runway. He stated that the Department of Education mandated that a school could not be located within this zone. Mr. DeMallie added that the Shastina Ranch

Subdivision would provide a smaller neighborhood park site, with some playground equipment and small fields.

Mr. Smith appreciated the fact that canopy trees would be planted along the boulevard. He lauded staff's efforts in following the Tree Management Plan. Mr. Smith observed that almost one-third of the Shastina Ranch Subdivision was dedicated to public open space. He believed the Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District (ACID) canal that impacted both the subdivisions should be utilized for walking trails. He also inquired when the roundabout would be completed. Mr. DeMallie believed right-of-way had not been acquired yet. He thought the developers had pulled back a little on that effort, and the responsibility for forming the financing District lied with the property owners.

Commissioner Bert Meyer was told earlier that the property owners were still in negotiations.

Commissioner Chris Young asked about the ownership of the school/park site. Mr. DeMallie explained that the City and school district were obligated to buy the property within two years. Mr. Young asked what would happen if the City and school district purchased the parcel but the subdivision did not get built. Mr. DeMallie noted that the park/school site was necessary to accommodate development in the area. He pointed out that someday the area would build out and that the City had to take the opportunity to acquire the land.

Commissioner Jim Chapin inquired about the park site. Mr. DeMallie indicated that there were no requirements for the applicant to build the facilities on the park site being reserved. He explained that the Subdivision Map Act limited the requirements being put on the map approval to infrastructure improvements. He continued that regarding school facilities, under State law, a certain amount of money was collected to go toward construction of school facilities. He said oftentimes, the amount was not enough and the school had to seek other types of financing. He believed the park would be developed with the school.

Commissioner Michele Goedert asked if the City could require storm-drain labeling through the landscape maintenance district. Mr. DeMallie stated that the storm-drain system itself was not part of the landscape maintenance district. He said the subject could be approached with the developer. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:58 p.m.

Tim MacLean, applicant's representative, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., was in agreement with the conditions of approval. He requested that if the school did not proceed for any reason, that adjustments be made so that the three parcels involved in the planned park site bore an equitable share of the parkland dedication.

Commissioner Bert Meyer commented on the cumulative traffic impacts from all developments mentioned in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. He asked what would happen if one project developed before the other. He worried that without sidewalk and curb or other barricades preventing access to adjoining undeveloped lands, the area would become a dumping ground. He suggested that a barrier be installed to stop people from dumping their trash.

Rich Rhodes, Pacheco School District representative, thanked City staff for helping to set aside land for a school. He said the timing for development of the school would depend on how the subdivision developments moved forward and how many school-aged children moved into the area. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:08 p.m.

Commissioner Randy Memeo addressed fire-protection issues and asked if the California Department of Forestry (CDF) would be able to respond to an emergency in time.

Fire Marshal Bruce Becker said there was no guarantee that Station 43 from CDF would be able to respond under the mutual aid program the City had with CDF; it was one of the busier stations. He stated that the City had a program to increase staffing for the engines but that implementation had been delayed.

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-9-05, Stonesfair Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Condition 61.

Second: Commissioner Chris Young.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - AMENDMENT OF THE CITY OF REDDING ZONING CODE, by the City of Redding, proposing to establish a new chapter pertaining to building heights. The proposed Chapter 18.58, "BH" Building Height Overlay District, will implement the building height policies of the General Plan, which establishes the appropriate locations for mid-rise and high-rise buildings in the City. The Chapter will also provide the Planning Commission with the authority to review and approve such buildings and provides for the development of "design guidelines" to ensure that these buildings are appropriately designed given their surroundings and the expectations of the City. Environmental Determination: Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Recommend to the City Council adoption of the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval. L-010-500

RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - AMENDMENT OF THE CITY OF REDDING ZONING MAP, REZONING APPLICATION RZ-1-08, by the City of Redding, proposing to apply the "BH" Building Height Overlay District to those areas where mid-rise and high-rise buildings may be approved. These areas are generally described as follows:

High-Rise Buildings:

Downtown—generally bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad, Shasta Street, East Street, and South Street.

Mid-Rise Buildings:

Downtown—generally between the high-rise district boundaries (see above) and Court Street, Eureka Way, Lincoln Street, and Continental Street.

North Market Street—the east side of the street, generally between Traveled Way and Benton Drive.

Hilltop Drive area—generally bounded by Interstate 5, SR 44, Churn Creek Road, and East Cypress Avenue.

Environmental Determination: Addendum to the Zoning Map Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Recommend to the City Council adoption of the Addendum to the Zoning Map Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval. L-010-500

Due to a potential conflict of interest, Commissioner Bert Meyer recused himself and stepped down from the dais at 5:12 p.m.

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report. He noted that based on last year's recommendations of the General Plan Update Committee (committee) and the Planning Commission to allow taller buildings in specific areas of the City, the City Council amended the Community Development and Design Element of the General Plan. He said those changes permitted unlimited height in the Downtown core and allowed mid-rise buildings surrounding the core, as well as along the North Market Street corridor and the Hilltop Drive/Churn Creek Road corridors.

Mr. Manuel commented on the advantages to using the Overlay District, which included providing developers the opportunity to have a different height limit, compared to other areas of the City. He mentioned that the ordinance would require that proposed projects be considered by a "design review committee" if such a committee was eventually required by ordinance adoption or resolution of the City Council. Development standards and criteria were also discussed by Mr. Manuel. He pointed

out that design criteria would take time to develop, but staff felt there was a need to get the Overlay District in place so that the property owners who wished to have taller buildings would have a mechanism in place to do so without a conflict with the Zoning Ordinance. He said staff's intent was to begin work in the coming months on drafting design criteria. Mr. Manuel stated that some felt it would be preferable to use outside consultants who were familiar with high-rise buildings, but due to budget constraints, it was highly unlikely that outside consultants could be retained. He said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the Addendums to the Mitigated Negative Declarations prepared for the Zoning Code and Zoning Map, adoption of Chapter 1858, and adoption of the amendment to the Zoning Map.

Commissioner Emmett Burroughs appreciated the efforts of the General Plan Update Committee.

Commissioner Randy Memeo thought the purpose of the Overlay District was based on concerns regarding community form. He indicated that the proposed code amendment mentioned several benefits, but form was not among them. He believed the community form discussion did not really follow what the General Plan committee discussed. Mr. Manuel responded that the recommendations of the committee presented to the City Council included a full list of benefits related to taller buildings. He said the question was how these taller buildings affected the community, and all the issues were discussed by the committee. Mr. Memeo countered that he was told that the committee's intent was to look at community form.

Chairman Michele Goedert advised that community form was the major focus of the committee; other comments from the committee were an aside.

Commissioner Chris Young asked why the southeast boundary of the Downtown District was laid out the way it was. He felt it made sense to extend the boundary down Market and/or Pine and East Streets. Mr. Manuel replied that the intent was to concentrate the taller buildings in the Downtown area away from the residential areas around the Safeway store and Pine Street. Mr. Manuel responded that the zoning was flexible and could be changed at a later date, if the City felt it appropriate to do so.

Ms. Goedert felt the changes watered down the committee's strong feelings that an architectural review committee was needed, but she was not opposed at this point, because she believed that as the issue was delved into further, people would find it was more complicated than believed today, and necessary adjustments would be made to ensure good design. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:27 p.m. Determining that no one wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:28 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Emmett Burroughs moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the Addendums to the Mitigated Negative Declarations prepared for the Zoning Code and Zoning Map, adoption of Chapter 1858, and adoption of the amendment to the Zoning Map.

Second: Commissioner Jim Chapin.

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

Noes: Commissioner Randy Memeo.

Abstain: Commissioner Meyer.

Absent: None.

Mr. Meyer returned to the dais at 5:29 p.m.

COMMISSION CONSIDERATION - *Review of Project Study Report and General Plan Consistency Determination regarding Airport Road Widening Alternatives.*

Chairman Michele Goedert asked if the Commissioners felt they had enough time to review the Project Study Report (PSR), since there had been a delay in the delivery of the packet. The Commissioners agreed to hear a presentation of the item but suggested postponing a decision until the next meeting.

Commissioner Bert Meyer felt the connection between the City and the County was not explained very well. He noted that he did not have an overview of a map to see the City/County boundaries.

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie explained that the PSR was a document the City would be using when reviewing projects with frontage on Airport Road to focus in on whether or not right-of-way would be needed for the widening of Airport Road.

Chuck Aukland, Project Coordinator, noted that the future need to widen Airport Road was identified in the City's General Plan, and a segment of the widening was factored into the City Traffic Impact Fee structure. He stated that Airport Road was one of the major transportation links between the cities of Redding and Anderson, as well as unincorporated portions of Shasta County. Mr. Aukland pointed out that as the eastern portion of Redding continued to grow and develop, the existing roadway would not be sufficient to handle the additional traffic volume. He indicated that the PSR would be utilized to define right-of-way needs, to establish the basis for programming future improvements, and for planning the management of access to achieve the expressway designation of the General Plan. He added that the document would also help to pursue Federal funds for the future development of this area.

Mr. Aukland continued that the PSR evaluated a total of three alternatives—a "no-build" alternative and two "build" alternatives. He noted that traffic volumes, environmental constraints, potential costs, and safety (including number and type of accidents) were considered. He said with the "no-build" alternative, by 2030, 8 of the 11 intersections within the project boundary could not accommodate the forecasted traffic volumes and would be operating at LOS "F" during the peak hour. He stated that the second "build" alternative was proposed to widen Airport Road to a six-lane expressway. Mr. Aukland observed that based on the 2030 forecasted traffic volumes, the additional lanes were not warranted, except for turn lanes at key intersections, which were included in the preferred alternative.

Mr. Aukland commented that the preferred alternative developed in the PSR proposed to widen Airport Road to a four-lane expressway between State Route 44 and Dersch Road. He stated that additional lanes and signalization were proposed at key intersections, in addition to curb and gutter, sidewalks, landscaped medians, and storm-drain systems. He remarked that the preferred alternative also included frontage roads and connector roads, where feasible, to help reduce the number of access points along Airport Road to reduce congestion and improve safety along the corridor. Mr. Aukland indicated that the preferred alternative would have the area north of Preserve Boulevard as a standard expressway. He noted that development would be conditioned to build out portions of the corridor. He pointed out that input for the PSR included County officials, Airport personnel, and residents who lived along the corridor.

Mr. DeMallie reiterated that Airport Road had been determined to be an expressway and needed to be widened as development occurred. He said it was important that the City be prepared for the future growth and accept the Plan Line and widening alternative recommended with the PSR as being consistent with the City's General Plan.

In response to questioning from the Commissioners, Mr. DeMallie advised that each individual development and City capital project (widening the road, etc.) would require a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document.

Commissioner Bert Meyer recalled that a traffic study done in 2006 said there would be a 40 percent increase in traffic on Airport Road by 2010, and six residences and five businesses would be displaced. He asked for more information at the next meeting. Mr. Aukland responded that the traffic model was based on the Countywide traffic model, which really looked at population and employment estimates and included fairly conservative numbers.

Commissioner Emmett Burroughs asked how the City and County would share the costs. Mr. DeMallie noted that there was quite a bit of County jurisdiction in the area. He explained that the City would work with the County where the City felt the need to widen the road.

Commissioner Randall Smith was pleased to see that the City was planning consistently with the General Plan in the area.

Motion: Commissioner Bert Meyer moved that the Planning Commission continue the Review of the Project Study Report and General Plan Consistency Determination regarding Airport Road Widening Alternatives.

Second: Commissioner Jim Chapin.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Chris Young recalled that he had chaired the Board of Administrative Review when James Theimer's site development permit for a project on Pine Street was approved. He recalled that Mr. Theimer gave a very detailed presentation of his project, but Mr. Young could not recall the chain-link fencing as a design feature on the front of the building. He thought the project had included various artistic features, including lighted screens and shadow boxes.

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie advised that he would check into the matter.

Commissioner Randall Smith discussed the willow removal along Canyon Hollow Creek that was transported by the City and Moss Lumber Company to the west entrance of Turtle Bay for a sculpture project. He encouraged residents and visitors to view the feature and see the work of world-renowned sculptor of sticks, Patrick Dorey.

Commissioner Bert Meyer mentioned that the proposed auto mall was not included in the Project Study Report for the Airport Road Widening, and the Stillwater Business Park was only slightly discussed.

Mr. DeMallie discussed the Shasta Forward Blueprint Planning Effort. He advised that the model for what Shasta County might look like in the year 2050 was finished and was now in an outreach phase to facilitate discussion. He said Development Services Director Jim Hamilton believed it would be worthwhile for the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) to have input from the Planning Commission. Mr. DeMallie provided some suggested dates that the RTPA would be available to present the scenario planning effort: April 17, 18, or 24. After discussion from the Commissioners, the date of April 24 at 3 p.m., was chosen as the preferred date.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Michele Goedert adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

Jim Hamilton, AICP
Acting Secretary

Michele Goedert
Chairman