

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, April 11, 2006
 City Council Chambers
 777 Cypress Avenue
 Redding, California 96001

MINUTES

Vice Chairman Bert Meyer called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Gary Brickwood, Jim Chapin, Michele Goedert, Randall Smith, and Chris Young present. Absent was Commissioner Randy Memeo. Also present were Development Services Director Jim Hamilton, Land Development Manager Gary Otremba, Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Environmental Compliance Manager Jon Oldham, Assistant City Manager Randy Bachman, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chairman Bert Meyer advised that approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 2, 2006, would be continued to the next meeting, since the Commissioners had not had enough time to review them.

PUBLIC HEARING - RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTEIS/EIR-1-00 (EIS/EIR), prepared for the Stillwater Business Park. The approximately 700-acre business park (Park) would consist of 349 acres of developable land for professional offices and industrial uses, with approximately 295 acres of the Park to be protected as open space to conserve vernal-pool and wetland features in the area. The proposal consists of sites ranging from 3 acres to 100 acres in size and a backbone road and infrastructure connecting Rancho Road through the Park to Fig Tree Lane. Recommendation: Recommend certification of the EIS/EIR to the City Council. L-010-075 and E-050-500

Environmental Compliance Manager Jon Oldham summarized the staff report. He noted that the project encompassed the development of a medium- to large-scale business park (Park) capable of accommodating a broad range of industries near the Redding Municipal Airport. He said the proposal would result in an approximate 700-acre business park, consisting of 349 acres of developable land for professional and industrial uses. Mr. Oldham stated that approximately 295 acres would be protected as open space to conserve vernal pool and wetland features in the area, which was meant to mitigate and compensate for the wetlands and endangered species impacts that were a result of the project. He pointed out that the impacts associated with this project were very minimal, considering this was a 700-acre parcel. Mr. Oldham indicated that the preserve area would have a conservation easement, which would ensure that the species and habitat were protected in perpetuity.

Mr. Oldham continued that there was a backbone road that connected to Airport Road at Rancho Road and ran east across Stillwater Creek and south through the site along the western edge of the property. He explained that the documents for the EIS/EIR demonstrated that the impacts resulting from the project could be mitigated. Mr. Oldham stated that staff was asking for approval of the Alternative 2 location but that there were three alternatives considered in the environmental document. He mentioned the alternatives within Alternative 2, one of which was the routing of the transmission line in the northern portion of the area.

Mr. Oldham discussed some of the issues associated with the project. He mentioned the 300-foot bridge that crossed Stillwater Creek at the Rancho Road crossing, which would have impacts to the surface flood elevation. He said consent from the upstream landowner would be needed to have the change in the higher water elevation. Mr. Oldham indicated that the southern bridge would also have a change in the water surface elevation; however, the City would own that property. He stated that the change to the water surface elevation at the 300-foot bridge was estimated to be no more than

0.6-foot of impact at the immediate upstream site. Mr. Oldham said staff recommended that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution recommending that the City Council: (1) certify and approve the Stillwater Business Park Final Environmental Impact report, adopt the Mitigation and Monitoring Program, make Findings of Significant Effects, and prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and (2) adopt the Final Environmental Impact Statement and prepare a Record of Decision pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Commissioner Randall Smith asked how staff could determine traffic impacts when the tenants for the Park were unknown. Mr. Oldham explained that without knowing the type of tenants, it was difficult to assess the impacts at this point and that subsequent actions might be subject to further analysis to determine the environmental impacts. He added that some of the air quality modeling was difficult also because the tenants were unknown and that most of the significant impacts would be a result of temporary construction activities.

Mr. Smith mentioned the section on endangered species but lamented that a Class 1 weed, *Arrundo donax*, was not discussed. He said he knew the weed was in the Stillwater area and that if it was disturbed during construction, the damage could be a lot worse. He requested that the subject be addressed. Mr. Oldham observed that one way staff could address the problem would be in the restoration and planting documents that would be written soon. He said staff proposed to mitigate those impacts in the creek within the City's right-of-way and would work with the agencies to improve the corridors.

Commissioner Jim Chapin questioned the difference between the open-space area and the open-space preserve area. Mr. Oldham responded that the open-space preserve area would be protected in perpetuity by the conservation easement; the open-space areas would be those areas that most would think of as open space (i.e., landscaped areas and undeveloped areas).

Mr. Chapin mentioned that he had not seen where the Oak Woodland Conservation Act was addressed. Mr. Oldham replied that staff was still working on the restoration plan. He said there were a substantial number of upland acres within the preserve area which staff would be using as mitigation for upland impacts. He added that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was requiring the City to mitigate for upland impacts and that there were oak woodlands contained in that area. Mr. Chapin maintained that an oak woodland mitigation plan should be part of the approval of the project and part of the EIS/EIR. He asserted that there were probably 200 to 250 acres of oak woodland that would be taken out and that there should have been something in the document that mentioned the removal of the trees. He voiced concern that he did not see any discussion about what would happen with storm runoff and hazardous waste. Mr. Oldham countered that the document addressed surface runoff at the site and that staff was looking to incorporate bio-swales within the project site to try to help treat these surface waters after they ran off the road. He stated that the developer of each parcel would have to address water quality issues and that two detention basins were discussed in the document.

Mr. Chapin asked about the possibility of a regional park site, similar to the Clover Creek Preserve. Mr. Oldham noted that the intent was to have trails throughout the site but not a regional park.

Commissioner Michele Goedert mentioned a letter received from Caltrans in April 2005, which dealt with traffic at the Bonnyview Road/Churn Creek Road interchange. She questioned if there was mitigation for that interchange. Mr. Oldham noted that the traffic analysis discussed the corridor all the way from the Park along Rancho Road to Interstate 5 and made the assumption that the improvements would be made as a result of other developments, such as the Shastina Ranch Subdivision.

Ms. Goedert observed that the document discussed mitigations "to the extent possible." She asked who determined when the mitigations were considered possible. Mr. Oldham said a lot of the conditions would be tightened up during the permit processing. He indicated that when staff started consulting with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service, the biological opinions would dictate specific actions to implement. He pointed out that there would also be environmental monitors on-site during construction.

Vice Chairman Bert Meyer asked if the land had already been acquired from the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA).

Randy Bachman, Assistant City Manager and Lead Person for the project, advised that staff had met recently with the regional manager of the FAA on-site. He said the FAA was going to do an environmental assessment that would tier off the City's document. Mr. Bachman stated that the regional manager was waiting for the City's document to be certified, and then the land would be released.

Mr. Meyer mentioned a letter from Attorney Jeff Swanson that was received after the close of the public comment period, in which Mr. Swanson had relayed concerns regarding his client's belief that the City proposed to isolate his property for the purpose of precluding future development.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay explained that the contents of the letter was not unusual and that it was mainly an objection to the design of the Park. The Vice Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:30 p.m.

Jim Zauher, President, Economic Development Corporation of Shasta County (EDC), stated that the EDC had been involved directly with the project since the late 1990s. He asserted that Shasta County needed to have ready sites for companies seeking to relocate. Mr. Zauher mentioned that the EDC had had to turn away projects and were noncompetitive for numerous projects because the area did not have ready sites. He urged the Commissioners to recommend certification to the City Council. He indicated that there was a major void of ready sites in the western states.

Frank Strazzarino, President, Greater Redding Chamber of Commerce, also spoke in favor of the Park. He said the Chamber of Commerce was convinced that the Park was the top priority for Redding.

Mike Goodyear contended that the Park would have a major impact on his property. He claimed that the City was leaving him "high and dry" without a road to his property. He stated that he owned approximately 350 acres and that his land would become worthless because he would not be able to develop it. Mr. Oldham countered that the Park should not affect the surrounding properties. He said the City would not prevent access to any parcels bordering the site to the north or the east. Mr. Oldham continued that the Park was a stand-alone business park with its own access and infrastructure. He reiterated that the Park would not affect access or development rights on the parcels surrounding it.

Mr. Meyer asked if the landowners had attempted to discuss access during the previous seven years that the Park was being considered. Mr. Goodyear noted that his father-in-law had been talking with staff for years about the mitigation measures concerning his property. Mr. Bachman indicated that the landowners had been notified of the process. He repeated that the Park was a stand-alone project. He continued that the City would not be able to move forward with plans for the Park if the City showed that the Park would promote additional growth beyond the Park itself, but that the City was not preventing that from happening. Mr. Goodyear noted that the regulatory agencies did not like the project because of the impacts to the Stillwater drainage.

Ms. Goedert asked Mr. Goodyear how he had hoped to gain access to his property. Mr. Goodyear said his family had bought the property, believing Rancho Road would eventually go all the way to Anderson, and now that access would be totally eliminated with development of the project. He said he had no other access to the property, other than crossing Stillwater Creek.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton discussed the Circulation Plan and the Rancho Road extension. He explained that there was no intent in the current General Plan to extend Rancho Road to Palo Cedro. Mr. Goodyear charged that the whole plan had changed during the past seven years and that it was no longer a benefit to him.

Kevin Mitchell said Bill Mitchell was his father and that it was killing him the way that the City was stealing his property. He disagreed with Mr. Oldham, contending that building the bridge would flood the property.

Rick Lester said Mr. Mitchell had been in contact with City staff during the past several years, asking if they needed an easement across his property, even granting the use of the property to help put a bridge across Rancho Road. He was willing to give the wetlands not only in the project area but also wetlands he had in Lassen County to help with this project. He continued that it was ludicrous that the City believed there would be no impacts to other property owners. Mr. Lester requested a written guarantee that this project would have absolutely no impact on the adjacent and nearby properties. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Vice Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:04 p.m.

Mr. Meyer asked for clarification of Mr. Sanders' letter in which he advised that he no longer wanted to sell his property. Mr. Duvernay explained that the Economic Development Corporation (EDC) had entered into an option agreement with Mr. Sanders in 1999, to acquire approximately 300 acres in anticipation of development of the business park. He continued that the EDC was currently in litigation with Mr. Sanders. He further explained that the EDC had exercised the option to acquire the property and that Mr. Sanders failed to permit and did not deliver the property. Mr. Duvernay said he expected a trial date no later than August 2006. He understood that the Mitchells and surrounding property owners were fearful at this point and worried that they might be stopped from future development. He noted that any property owner who wanted to develop in the area would have a hard task ahead of him or her in dealing with the environmental agencies.

Mr. Oldham interjected that staff was continuing to work on the floodplain modeling, hoping to reduce the effects to the floodplain to the extent possible.

Ms. Goedert wondered why staff did not elect to extend the road to the Mitchell property. She asked if it was because the City did not get environmental approval. Mr. Bachman replied affirmatively, noting that the process for approval had been extremely difficult and excluded the area around Stillwater Creek.

Mr. Brickwood inquired if the open-space easement limited the other property owners on developing their properties. Mr. Oldham replied that the conservation easement did not put any constraint on neighboring properties, it only dictated the type of land use within the City's project site. He added that the conservation easement would protect the lands the City was using for mitigation. Mr. Oldham continued that the easement restriction would be along the northern and eastern portions. More discussion ensued regarding the easement and development of the properties.

Motion: Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council certify and approve the Stillwater Business Park Final Environmental Impact Report, adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program, make Findings of Significant Effects, and prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and adopt the Final Environmental Impact Statement and prepare a Record of Decision pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.

Second: Commissioner Randall Smith.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Memeo.

STILLWATER BUSINESS PARK (PROJECT), by the City of Redding, on property generally located north and south of Rancho Road, east of Stillwater Creek. Environmental Determination: Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report EIS/EIR-1-00 (EIS/EIR). Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval of the Project to the City Council. The Project consists of the following applications:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION GPA-2-01, to change the land use classification of the site from "General Industry"; "Park"; "Residential, 5 acres"; and "Greenway" to "General Industry" (384 acres) and "Greenway" (337 acres). The General Plan Amendment would also eliminate a future extension of Rancho Road east of the project site as shown on the General Plan Land Use Diagram. G-030-010

REZONING APPLICATION RZ-1-01, to change the zoning district designations of the portion of the Project site within the existing City limits from "OS" Open Space District and **pre-zone** the portion of the site proposed for annexation to "GI-PD" General Industry District with Planned Development Overlay District (384 acres), "OS-PD" Open Space District with Planned Development Overlay District (337 acres), "OS" Open Space District (39 acres), "RE" Residential Estate District (9 acres), and "HI" Heavy Industry District (15 acres). L-010-230

AN AMENDMENT to the Redding Municipal Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

ANNEXATION APPLICATION AN-1-01, concerning annexation of approximately 564 acres of the Project site into the City of Redding. A-150-265

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie advised that just prior to this meeting, letters had been received from two property owners regarding the annexation and rezoning. He stated that although the initial entitlements for development of the project were being discussed, the actual applications for the physical development of the business park were not contained in the General Plan and rezoning application before the Commissioners today.

Regarding Annexation Application AN-1-01, Mr. DeMallie noted that it included several smaller parcels south of the Park that were necessary for supporting street access and utility infrastructure. He commented that the letter received from Mr. Sanders indicated that he was now rescinding his request for annexation, although he was requesting that the annexation agreement be placed on hold.

The General Plan amendment request and rezoning application were also discussed by Mr. DeMallie. He stated that the General Plan amendment included a proposal to eliminate a future extension of Rancho Road east of the project site as shown on the General Plan Land Use Diagram. In addition, Mr. DeMallie mentioned that the rezoning application included a prezone of the portion of the site proposed for annexation to "GI-PD" General Industry District with Planned Development Overlay District and "OS-PD" Open Space District with Planned Development Overlay District. Mr. DeMallie advised that the property was also within the Redding Municipal Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP), which was an area plan providing land use and safety policies addressing the impacts of airport operations and anticipating expansion of the airport. He continued that the CLUP amendment was subject to review and approval by the Shasta County Airports Land Use Commission (ALUC).

According to Mr. DeMallie, another letter received from a nearby property owner expressed opposition to the "OS" Open Space zoning designation on his property. He explained that the property needed to be prezoned as part of the annexation process. He said the property owner pointed out that there was an existing home and construction business on the property. Mr. DeMallie explained that the "OS" Open Space District would not preclude the existing use of the property; as a pre-existing, legal nonconforming use, it would be allowed to continue. He said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment GPA-2-01 and Rezoning Application RZ-1-01, forward a recommendation to the Shasta County Airports Land Use Commission for an amendment to the Redding Municipal Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan to apply land use designations consistent with GPA-2-01, and forward Annexation Application AN-1-01 to the Shasta County Local Agency Formation Commission with a request for approval.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton noted that an annexation required consent of the property owners. He explained that if a majority of landowners were in opposition, the annexation would not move forward. The Vice Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:47 p.m.

Mike Goodyear voiced concern about the elimination of Rancho Road. He worried about emergency access in the event of a fire or other catastrophe. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Vice Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:49 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Jim Chapin moved that the Planning Commissioners recommend that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment GPA-2-01 and Rezoning Application RZ-1-01, forward a recommendation to the Shasta County Airports Land Use Commission for an amendment to the Redding Municipal Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan to apply land use designations consistent with GPA-2-01, and forward Annexation Application AN-1-01 to the Shasta County Local Agency Formation Commission with a request for approval.

Second: Commissioner Gary Brickwood.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Memeo.

***COMMISSION CONSIDERATION** - Review General Plan Consistency Determination and review of Project Study Report for Churn Creek/Victor/Rancho Road Intersections and Rancho Road/Alta Mesa Drive Alternatives.*

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton summarized the staff report. He noted that in early 2005, the Redding City Council approved the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Shastina Ranch development located south of Rancho Road and west of Airport Road. He explained that the EIR recognized the need to mitigate the traffic impacts of future development along the Rancho Road and Churn Creek Road corridors at the Churn Creek/Victor, Churn Creek/Rancho, and Rancho/Alta Mesa intersections. Mr. Hamilton stated that the conditions of approval for the Shastina Ranch project limited the number of building permits that could be issued for the project pending resolution of funding for the improvements at the Churn Creek/Rancho/Victor intersection and establishment of a program to ensure construction of the intersection improvements in a timely manner. He continued that to respond to this direction, the City hired Omni-Means to complete a study of the improvement needs and develop related cost estimates. Mr. Hamilton discussed the alternatives for the intersection improvements. He said the Roundabout Alternative was the preferred alternative for the Churn Creek Road/Rancho Road/Victor Avenue intersection, because when compared to the traditional signal alternative, it resulted in substantially less traffic delay, substantial reserve capacity, and slightly less cost. He said staff recommended that the North Side Widening Alternative be selected as the preferred alternative for the Alta Mesa/Rancho Road intersection, because when compared to the Symmetrical Widening alternative, it resulted in substantially fewer right-of-way impacts.

Commissioner Randall Smith favored the roundabouts.

Commissioner Jim Chapin concurred.

Commissioner Chris Young mentioned the north side widening and asked if the home on the northwest corner would have to be purchased. Mr. Hamilton replied affirmatively, if the road was widened. Mr. Young observed that the home had just been sold and advised that it would have been prudent for the City to already have purchased the property. Mr. Hamilton responded that the City was not in a position to do that at this time. Mr. Young discussed the roundabouts, voicing concern that drivers would be confused with the multiple lanes. He noted that he had received some phone calls from citizens who felt roundabouts were confusing. He suggested postponing a decision on a recommendation to the City Council until the Commissioners had more time for review. Mr. Hamilton advised that the intent was to hold public meetings about the circulation improvements based on an alternative that meets General Plan policy, not necessarily to select the one that would be constructed; that had to be done by the City Council.

Mr. Smith spoke in favor of the roundabouts, noting that the City of Monterey utilized them and that the citizens favored them. He added that Great Britain used them also with great success.

Mr. Brickwood understood that the public would have several public meetings and open houses before the item went to the City Council.

Mr. Meyer said he also felt uncomfortable recommending approval at today's meeting without speaking to the property owners affected.

Motion: Commissioner Jim Chapin moved that the Planning Commission determine that the proposed projects and alternatives for the Churn Creek/Victor, Churn Creek/Rancho, and Rancho/Alta Mesa intersections were consistent with the General Plan.

Second: Commissioner Randall Smith.

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

Noes: Commissioners Meyer and Young.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Memeo.

Mr. Hamilton assured the Commissioners that legal notices would be placed in the newspaper regarding the item and that those immediately abutting the right-of-ways that would be affected would also receive public notices.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Bert Meyer commented on the size of the Environmental Impact Report for the Stillwater Business Park. He understood that the document was needed, but lamented on the number of pages.

Commissioner Chris Young observed that the City had some major projects it planned on undertaking, but pointed out that maintenance of existing roads also needed attention.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Randy Memeo adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Jim Hamilton, AICP
Acting Secretary

Randy Memeo
Chairman