

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 22, 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, Randy Memeo, Bert Meyer, Randall Smith, and Chris Young present. Also present were Development Services Director Jim Hamilton, Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Land Development Manager Marty Wayne, Associate Planner Ron Adams, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion. Commissioner Jim Chapin left the meeting at 7:15 p.m., as hereinafter noted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Due to some of the Commissioners not receiving the minutes of March 25, 2008, in their packets, Approval of Minutes was continued to the meeting of May 13, 2008.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton announced that this would be the last Planning Commission meeting for Commissioner Randy Memeo, who was completing his eighth year on the Commission. He noted that Mr. Memeo had been involved in the General Plan Update, the Oasis Road and Downtown Redding Specific Plans, and the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Hamilton thanked Mr. Memeo for his service and advised that the City Council would be recognizing his service to the community at its next meeting of May 6, 2008.

AMENDMENT TO USE PERMIT UP-57-93, by Living Hope Compassion Ministries, requesting approval for a 1,920-square-foot addition and internal/external remodel of an existing community social-service facility on property located at 1043 State Street in an "HC" Heavy Commercial District. Continued from the meeting of March 25, 2008. Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt. Staff Recommendation: Approval. L-010-390

Chairman Michele Goedert advised that Commissioners Burroughs and Smith were not present at the meeting of March 25, 2008, but that both had listened to audio recordings of the meeting in order to participate in tonight's public hearing.

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie summarized the staff report. He recalled that at the meeting of March 25, the Planning Commission considered a request by Living Hope Compassion Ministries (Living Hope) to expand and remodel its building at 1043 State Street to improve services provided by the existing church/community social-service facility. He noted that staff had recommended denial based upon an opinion that one of the four necessary findings for approval, pertaining to effects upon the immediate neighborhood, could not be made. Mr. DeMallie observed that after considering staff's presentation and information contained in the staff report and listening to testimony, the Commission voted four to one to determine that the necessary findings for approval could be made. He said the Commission then directed staff to continue the item and draft necessary findings and conditions for approval for today's meeting.

Mr. DeMallie described the request for the addition and remodel, noting that Living Hope was not a nighttime operation nor an emergency residential facility. He discussed the draft conditions of approval, noting that Conditions 10 through 18 were performance-based requirements. Mr. DeMallie said they addressed issues, such as placing limitations on the capacity of the facility, limiting the hours of operation from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., prohibiting overnight stays, and requiring that outside monitoring of client activity be provided by the applicant. He added that staff was proposing revisions to Conditions 13 and 23, as attached to the staff report, to allow a smoking area and to

redirect the placement of the trash enclosure due to a request from the Solid Waste Division, respectively.

Mr. DeMallie noted that just prior to today's meeting, the applicant submitted a letter requesting revision of Conditions 11, 13, 14, and 15, which staff had not had time to review, and would be addressed by the applicant during the public hearing. He said staff recommended that the Planning Commission make the necessary findings for approval and approve Use Permit UP-57-93 Amendment subject to the recommended conditions of approval, which he reviewed, by adoption of the resolution attached to the staff report.

Commissioner Randall Smith observed that at the previous meeting, Mr. DeMallie had made comparisons between the neighborhood surrounding Living Hope and another area. He asked for clarification of the crime statistics quoted. Mr. DeMallie indicated that the neighbors had voiced their concern for safety, so staff was trying to assess the nature of the neighborhood impacts associated not only with Living Hope, but also with the other services nearby that catered to this population. He indicated that staff contacted the Redding Police Department (RPD) and asked for statistics within the two-block area of State Street, east of Living Hope. He said there were 225 calls during 2007. Mr. DeMallie advised that staff looked at a comparable neighborhood, the area around Butte and Sequoia Streets, and found there were 74 calls. He said staff did not draw any specific conclusions from that, but it did lend some credence to the neighbors' concerns.

Mr. Smith mentioned Bill Ulch's suggestion that the City find another location to help the homeless. He inquired if staff had addressed that possibility and wondered where other suitable locations would be.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton stated that a community social-service facility could be allowed in any Heavy Commercial zoning district with approval of a use permit. He discussed the criteria used when considering other locations, such as proximity to the nearest population that would use these services, transportation needs, etc. He explained that the matter before the Commissioners today was the expansion request of Living Hope and that relocation was beyond the scope of today's item.

Commissioner Bert Meyer felt the comparison between the two neighborhoods by Capt. Pete Hansen of RPD at the previous meeting was an unfair comparison.

Commissioner Emmett Burroughs observed that there were a number of limitations and requirements in the conditions of approval and asked who would enforce the monitoring of those conditions. Mr. DeMallie explained that the process for monitoring would be the same as for any other use permit. He acknowledged that the City did not have a systematic protocol for checking to see that conditions were enforced on a daily basis; however, he believed staff would be notified by the neighborhood if the requirements were not being met. Mr. DeMallie pointed out that the use permit would be subject to revocation if found to be out of compliance.

Commissioner Chris Young asked if Living Hope also operated during evening hours. He noted that Living Hope's original use permit referred to the establishment of a church with support services. Mr. DeMallie responded that the use was being redefined with this amendment. He remarked that, in his opinion, the Redding Zoning Ordinance assumed the traditional church, with main activity on Sundays and possibly evening services; and in that case, the support services would be subordinate to church services. He commented that Living Hope could still be defined as a church; however, in this case, the main Sunday assembly would be subordinate to it being a service provider. Mr. Young mentioned Condition 13 and asked for a definition of "immediate vicinity." Mr. DeMallie believed it would include the property, adjacent sidewalks, and the two-block area of State Street.

Commissioner Randy Memeo requested an explanation of the proposed revisions to the conditions as requested in the applicant's letter. Mr. DeMallie reiterated that staff received the letter immediately prior to the hearing and had not had time to review it and noted that the applicant would address those during the comment period.

Chairman Michele Goedert referred to Condition 13 and asked who would be monitoring in the immediate vicinity and if a monitor would be stationed outdoors full-time. Mr. DeMallie answered

that staff expected someone associated with Living Hope to be in the area full-time to monitor between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.

Ms. Goedert mentioned Condition 25 and the removal of the barbed wire from the fence, but she did not see a requirement for maintenance of the fence. Mr. DeMallie stated that Condition 26 required a six-foot-tall masonry wall on the east property line, but did not require any other fencing. He said the applicant wished to keep the existing fence on the north and south property lines, which was why Condition 25 required removal of the barbed wire. He said the Commissioners could require fencing around the parking lot, if they so desired. Ms. Goedert suggested adding a condition to require additional fencing. In response to questioning about irrigation for the street trees on Favretto Street, Mr. DeMallie said the applicant had offered to plant the trees as part of its request for the project; and, given the extent of the building addition and remodel, provision of irrigation to those trees would not be difficult. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:30 p.m. She announced that the Planning Commission-adopted guidelines for time allotments in the context of a public hearing would be used, as necessary.

Danyett Cloward, applicant's representative, explained Living Hope's request for revision of the conditions of approval. Regarding Condition 11, she noted that Narcotics Anonymous (NA) used the building for its meetings in the evenings, from 7 to 9 p.m. She maintained that those meetings were vital to the services provided by Living Hope. She advised that Living Hope eventually planned to offer bible study in the evenings. Ms. Cloward stated that the hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. were fine for the other services being offered, such as meals, grocery and food distribution, laundry facilities, and health services. Concerning Condition 13, Ms. Cloward said Living Hope would be more than willing to monitor the area; it was done now, but not on a full-time basis. She added that someone would also monitor the use of foul language and fighting. Ms. Cloward continued that Living Hope also had a basketball area that was utilized, so she believed a total of 21 people should be allowed in the area at one time. She contended that the requirement for absolutely no assembly or gathering outside the building was unreasonable.

Ms. Cloward mentioned Condition 14, which addressed services by other agencies. She cited the HOPE Van as one of the providers and confirmed that it could park on the west side of the building on Favretto Street. She felt five people waiting outside the van for services would be appropriate and advised that security would be provided by personnel from the HOPE Van.

Regarding Condition 15, Ms. Cloward said Living Hope was willing to limit the amount of clothing and bedding being distributed at one time, but believed limiting the distribution to an exchange basis was degrading to people. She pointed out that Living Hope did not just serve the homeless but also the working poor.

Mr. Meyer asked Ms. Cloward if she desired that the nighttime hours be allowed seven days per week. She pointed out that she had asked for the hours to be no later than 9 p.m., both weekdays and weekends.

Mr. Smith addressed the clothing and bedding distribution. He acknowledged that no one knew who actually was contributing to the problem but that there was an inordinate amount of bedding that got dumped into the river. He believed the bedding was being treated as disposable and suggested revising the condition to distinguish between bedding and clothing. Mr. Smith felt there was nothing degrading about bringing in a torn blanket or sleeping bag to exchange for another one. Ms. Cloward responded that sometimes the bedding was reported as stolen or confiscated by the police. Mr. Smith countered that if there was a system of monitoring in place, she would know who was getting the bedding and clothing and who was littering the environment.

Commissioner Jim Chapin thought that the hours of operation had initially been stated as from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Ms. Cloward stated that there were a few occasions, such as wedding services, when the hours would not be during the 8-to-4 window. She did not want to restrict the hours and limit the services being provided. Mr. Chapin asked if it was acceptable to her to limit the activities after 5 p.m. to indoor activities only. She felt the indoor restriction might work, as long as the smoking area was still allowed to be used.

Mr. DeMallie mentioned that the services being provided at night usually involved more people driving their cars and that there were only seven parking spaces.

Mr. Young asked if the clientele and volunteers of Living Hope would be willing to pick up the trash and debris around a larger area as a gesture of goodwill. Ms. Cloward responded affirmatively.

Mr. Young asked if Ms. Cloward had credentials in the management of this type of facility. She said she did not have an educational background in social service, but she was supervised by Pastor Denham, and they both were accountable to the Board of Directors. She added that a variety of churches helped in the support of Living Hope.

Mr. Smith asked how the Continuum of Care (COC) was affiliated with Living Hope. Ms. Cloward responded that the COC, which was comprised of approximately 32 to 35 social-service agencies, had previously assessed the needs of the homeless and determined that a day drop-in center was a priority, so Living Hope was asked if it would be interested in providing more services.

Mr. Meyer questioned the plans for the trash enclosure and the fencing. Mr. DeMallie explained that the Solid Waste Division had requested that the Dumpster be located outside the fence and that the fence location could be modified to accommodate this request.

Elin Klaseen, Parkview Neighborhood Association (Association) Chair, apologized to Pastor Denham for comments made at the previous meeting by another speaker who used the analogy of a lack of control of animals in the neighborhood to the actions of the homeless population. She acknowledged that those comments were hurtful but were caused by frustration due to violations on private property in the Parkview neighborhood. She continued that the neighborhood was primarily low-income, mixed-age, mixed-race, and mixed-use. Ms. Klaseen noted that some residents of State Street were afraid to speak up and were concerned about how they would be perceived by the church.

Ms. Klaseen addressed Finding 1, that the proposed use would not be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood. She remarked that a crime study was done by the Association and presented the 2007 crime statistics from RPD to the Commissioners, which illustrated the higher number of calls by officers to the area at, and around, Living Hope, including a call for a sexual assault and brandishing a weapon, as compared to a nearby area on Lanning Street. Ms. Klaseen felt the Commissioners did not really understand the magnitude of the crime problem on State Street.

Ms. Klaseen disagreed that Living Hope was just trying to improve its services. She asserted that expansion of services had been going on for years, with no review from the neighborhood. She noted that Living Hope was the only location where a security guard accompanied the HOPE Van.

Finding 2, that the proposed use will not be injurious or detrimental to the general welfare of the City, was also addressed by Ms. Klaseen. She believed residents needed to help the poor and homeless in the community, but priorities needed to be assessed. She maintained that unless the Commissioners understood the bigger problem of homelessness, they were not qualified to determine the findings. She also doubted that the City Council was qualified.

The Parkview Neighborhood Revitalization Plan was mentioned by Ms. Klaseen, who noted that there was no mention of homeless services in the document; however, the staff report referenced this document in the findings as a justification for its existence in the neighborhood. She said the intent of the establishment of a center that was addressed in the document was for the residents of the neighborhood, not a resource center for the homeless.

Ms. Klaseen asserted that the volunteers and staff of Living Hope could not self-police the area as required in the conditions of approval. She also felt Living Hope should have a "no-service" list for chronic offenders. She was proud of the achievements the residents had made for the neighborhood but remarked that it was difficult to sustain the efforts with just a few volunteers.

Pastor Bob Denham, Living Hope Ministries Director, stated that Living Hope met the needs of people who were not able to help themselves. He observed that the success rate was not as high as the failure rate because of the deep needs of the clientele. Pastor Denham said nearby residents had told him that Living Hope was important to the neighborhood. He wanted to be a good neighbor and not create conflict.

Mr. Meyer inquired about the clothing and bedding distribution. Pastor Denham stated that if it was required, he would institute an exchange program.

Mr. Young observed that even if this amendment request was denied, the services of Living Hope would continue. He wondered if it would be possible to mark the clothing and bedding being distributed so that it could be identified if it was dumped in the river or left on the ground somewhere. Pastor Denham said it took a tremendous amount of volunteer help just to get the donated clothing sorted. He believed it would be possible to mark the bedding but noted that Living Hope distributed approximately 2,500 garments per month.

Mr. Smith mentioned that he had attended a meeting with Melinda Brown from People of Progress, who agreed to an identification method for the clothing and bedding her organization distributed. He felt some type of identification method should be tried by Living Hope.

Daniel Belknap stated that he was 81 years old, was a licensed clinical social worker with three college degrees, and had studied how communities had dealt with similar problems. Mr. Belknap believed there was a solution, but the leadership would have to come from the group that was being helped by Living Hope. He noted that he frequently visited the new library where the clientele congregated and suggested that they become part of the solution, which could be initiated by doing something as simple as picking up cigarette butts. Mr. Belknap supported the project.

Kelly Shackleford lived across the street from Living Hope in one of the infill homes that the City of Redding helped to build. She said she and her husband took a chance on the neighborhood and bought their home because they liked the area. She voiced concern about the expansion. Ms. Shackleford felt Living Hope did a wonderful job in serving the homeless and knew Living Hope served a lot of people daily. She did not let her children play in the front of her home because of the surrounding activities. She noted that their home had been for sale because of a job relocation and believed they were having difficulty selling because of the surrounding activities. Ms. Shackleford did not believe the Living Hope expansion would contribute to the revitalization of the neighborhood.

Dennis Mihalka appreciated the care and passion that Living Hope had for the community. He pointed out that Living Hope served meals, distributed clothes, then closed at 5 p.m., and had the clientele go somewhere else to sleep. He remarked that the homeless usually slept in the yard in front of his dental office on Smile Place, on the riverbank, or in the park. Mr. Mihalka added that in addition to sleeping, they would leave refuse and defecate. He commented that he had worked with a church group in Carson City, who had tried to help the homeless by refurbishing two buildings and providing services. He said most of the guidelines were disregarded and the services were shut down after two years because the situation had gotten out of hand. Mr. Mihalka asserted that the Planning Commission needed to look at the overall picture. He maintained that if food and care were going to be provided, facilities for sleeping should also be offered. Mr. Mihalka noted that he was Chairman of the Board of New Directions to Hope, which dealt with sex offenders, and that he was familiar with what was happening in the area. Mr. Mihalka asked how many of those served by Living Hope were sex offenders, drug addicts, and/or emotionally disturbed. He said Redding was reaching its capacity, based on occurrences he was seeing around town and near the river.

Mr. Mihalka believed it was not right to ignore the problem of homelessness, but it was also not right for Redding to take care of the out-of-state homeless population. He suggested that caregivers, social-service agencies, the City Attorney, and RPD get together and address the issues, including determining the capacity of Redding for handling the homeless and transients; deciding who was eligible for this care (local or nonlocal, sex offenders, felons, etc.); listing acceptable behavior; and establishing a move-on policy to effectively and legally move them on when they fail to follow the guidelines. Mr. Mihalka asked if the Commissioners would be willing to let their children or grandchildren visit the nearby library or ballparks alone. He encouraged the Planning Commission to deny the expansion, but look at a way to solve the problem for the whole community.

Bradley Galusha, who owned property next door to Living Hope, appreciated the services being offered by Living Hope but asked that screening be placed between the two property lines. He requested increasing the height of the block wall along his property to eight feet. Mr. Galusha believed his concerns about the outdoor common area and having the HOPE Van park on Favretto

Street had been addressed. He felt Living Hope did a good job in trying to keep a safe environment while providing for the needs of its clientele.

Mark Cram, applicant's representative, The² Engineering Company, advised that he had proposed to fence just from the trash enclosure to the building itself and not along the alley.

Don Meek, Program Coordinator, Continuum of Care Council, supported the expansion of Living Hope. Regarding the clothing exchange, he felt the matter should be left up to Living Hope to manage. He acknowledged that congregating could lead to lack of control and felt moving the HOPE Van to the Favretto Street side would help alleviate part of the problem. He explained that the HOPE Van, run by Shasta Community Health Center, provided medical and dental services on an outreach basis to Living Hope, Empire Recovery, and other agencies around town. Mr. Meek understood that control and management of the clientele were needed, but felt the requirements should be reasonable. He believed stopping the clientele from going outside was not a sensible solution. Mr. Meek commented on Ms. Klaseen's report of a sexual assault at Living Hope and noted that a sexual assault had happened in his neighborhood as well.

Fran Jenkins mentioned the problems of trespassing and camping on her property and the adjacent properties. She opposed any expansion and maintained that the neighborhood had experienced more than its share of problems. She contended that it was time for other neighborhoods to take part in caring for the homeless and transients.

Michael Mojan, a volunteer and Board Member of Living Hope, said Living Hope could monitor how much bedding and clothing would be given out to the clientele. He felt the solution was simple by knowing who was receiving the items and how often. He could not give exact figures because some families also received the items, but he believed the numbers could be tracked.

Ms. Cloward added that Living Hope did not serve only the homeless, but also families in low-income apartments. She said sometimes people had to wait for months to obtain a sleeping bag, and sheets and comforters were not given to people who did not have a home. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 6:19 p.m.

Mr. Meyer said he would like to have the whole back-alley area fenced. Mr. Chapin agreed.

Mr. DeMallie explained that the vote at the previous meeting was not an action for approval but was a consensus that the findings could be made; staff was then directed to support the findings and draft the conditions of approval. Mr. Chapin thought the Planning Commission had already voted that the findings could be met. He believed tonight's meeting was not to determine if findings could be made but to agree on the conditions of approval.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay advised the Commissioners that they should make one motion to either approve or not approve both the findings and conditions of approval.

Mr. Chapin recollected from the previous meeting that the permit was for a daytime use and that conditions would be drafted around daytime hours. He did not remember discussing church or wedding activities. He believed a new site plan and conditions would be needed if the hours were going to be changed.

Mr. Hamilton explained that the use permit addressed the activities that presently were occurring, including other activities that occurred in the evening. He said conditions were being recognized as they existed today, which included the chapel and church activities. He continued that the expansion of overall use of the facilities was being considered at today's meeting; the chapel would still be there and the activities would not change. Regarding the hours, Mr. Hamilton advised that the church activities were activities that typically occurred within a church.

Mr. Chapin felt the conditions that Living Hope wanted to revise were major changes, particularly the hours of operation and use. He suggested staff and the applicant get together to discuss the project and return with satisfactory conditions of approval. More discussion ensued regarding today's action.

Mr. Meyer addressed Condition 17 and asked what type of security lighting would be around the building. Mr. DeMallie advised that there would probably be building-mounted lighting. Mr. DeMallie discussed the request for an eight-foot-high wall. He advised that the maximum fence height on a residential property line was six feet. He said noise walls could be higher than six feet, if necessary.

Ms. Goedert voiced surprise at the other evening activities that were occurring and at the applicant's request for the later hours of operation.

Mr. Smith supported the hours of operation requested in the applicant's letter. He said a clear distinction had been made between the services offered to the homeless and those for others who might use the property in another way. He believed it was egregious to require that the applicant be out of its own building at 5 p.m. Mr. Smith did not see the neighborhood as being "underparked." He pointed out that "smart growth" indicated that people needed to walk and that having to walk should not kill a project.

Mr. Memeo agreed with Mr. Chapin. He felt the uses currently in place exceeded what was intended in the original use permit. He believed staff should stay with the existing hours. Mr. DeMallie pointed out that the existing use permit did not have a limitation on hours of operation.

Mr. Meyer stated that the facility should be utilized for the betterment of the community, and he was satisfied with the evening meetings running from 7 to 9 p.m.

The applicant's request for a recreation area (where the clientele could play basketball) in addition to the smoking area was discussed. Mr. Memeo felt the people should be able to go outside as long as it was sufficiently monitored. Mr. Meyer and Mr. Smith agreed. Mr. Young agreed, but wanted the smoking area at the south end of the parking lot so that the neighbors would not be bothered by the smoke.

Regarding the number of residents waiting for services and the location of the HOPE Van, Mr. Young agreed with staff that people waiting for services should be sifted through the building and not down the block. Ms. Goedert agreed with the applicant's suggestion that five people should be allowed to wait on the street.

On the clothing and bedding issue, Mr. Memeo, Mr. Meyer, and Ms. Goedert believed trying to implement rules would be micro-managing.

The definition of "immediate area" was discussed. Mr. Young hoped the applicant would be a good neighbor and not only monitor and pick up trash in the immediate area but also help throughout the neighborhood. He recalled that the term "immediate area" had referred to a block in each direction from the subject property.

Regarding Mr. Galusha's request for screening the property to the east, Mr. DeMallie advised that there were specific requirements for trees and large shrubs, in addition to the wall.

Ms. Goedert addressed the issue of the wall height. Mr. Meyer supported Mr. Galusha's request for an eight-foot-high wall.

The back wall by the trash enclosure was discussed. It was agreed that a chain-link fence was desirable so that the monitor could observe the activities in the area.

The types of activities and hours of operation that were allowed were discussed. Mr. Chapin disagreed with allowing the activities to run until 9 p.m. Mr. Smith did not want to restrict the applicant's hours to 5 p.m.

Mr. Meyer was supportive of people who were so dedicated to help those who were destitute. He supported Living Hope's amendment request.

Mr. Burroughs disagreed and believed the proposed use would be detrimental to the health and safety of the neighborhood.

Mr. Young said he was "on the fence" but was leaning toward voting in favor of the amendment request. He also challenged Ms. Klaseen's assertion that the Planning Commission was not qualified to make a decision on this project. He noted that the Commissioners brought a wide range of experience to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Memeo did not agree that Finding 1 could be made. He mentioned the letters received from the surrounding businesses and neighbors opposed to the facility expansion. He acknowledged that Living Hope provided a valuable service and should not be closed down or relocated. Mr. Memeo felt the applicant could remodel the facility but did not need to dramatically increase the types of uses and hours of operation.

Mr. Smith believed the applicant was trying to increase the efficiency of its services. He contended that men and women should not have to share a common shower room and that people should be able to sit down and dine together in an improved facility. He remarked that some people were trying to reach out and help those in need and believed they should be supported.

Mr. Chapin noted that he had voted in support of the findings at the previous meeting; however, he was not aware of the extended hours of operation and types of uses. He did not think the later hours were good for the community and opposed the amendment request.

Ms. Goedert concurred with Mr. Smith.

Mr. Hamilton addressed the proposed revised conditions of approval. After discussion, the revisions were as follows:

4. Functions and their respective hours of operation allowed at the facility generally include the following:
 - a. Chapel services—8 a.m. to 8 p.m.
 - b. Daytime meals—8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 - c. Laundry facilities—8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 - d. Shower facilities—8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 - e. Clothing distribution—8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 - f. Counseling and training services—8 a.m. to 8 p.m.
 - g. Emergency food and grocery distribution—8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 - h. Health services—8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 - i. Administrative offices—Unlimited.
11. Deleted.
13. The applicant shall monitor client loitering within the parking area and shall establish a designated smoking area at the south end of the parking lot. The final location of this area is to be approved as part of the final plan review approval (Condition 5). Staff shall be provided to monitor the parking lot, smoking area, and other outside areas within 1 block in all directions of the site during business hours with the purpose of preventing excessive loudness, littering, and loitering by clients of the facility.
14. Provision of services shall occur within the building or, if a mobile unit is utilized to provide a service, the unit shall be located on the west (Favretto Street) side of the building with no more than 5 users assembled on the street; all others waiting for service shall wait within the building.
15. The applicant shall develop a procedure to monitor client clothing and bedding distribution.
23. The trash enclosure shall be angled to allow for access by Solid Waste Division trucks from the alley in accordance with the requirements of the Solid Waste Division.
26. a. An 8-foot-tall masonry wall shall be constructed along the east property line. Modifications to wall material or design in order to preserve established trees and substantial vegetation may be approved during final plan review.

- b. A 6-foot-high chain-link fence shall be constructed at the south end of the property between the east property line and the southeast corner of the building.

Mr. Chapin disagreed with the late hours and did not want them to go later than 6 or 7 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Randall Smith 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 18.14.070 of the Redding Municipal Code are in evidence. He further moved that the use permit amendment be granted subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Conditions 4, 13, 14, 15, 23, and 26 and the deletion of Condition 11.

Second: Commissioner Bert Meyer.

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

Noes: Commissioners Burroughs, Chapin, and Memeo.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

The Chairman called a five-minute recess at 7:15 p.m. Commissioner Jim Chapin left the meeting at 7:15 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:20 p.m.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-7-07, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPLICATION PD-6-07, AND REZONING APPLICATION RZ-1-07, LAKERIDGE OAKS SUBDIVISION, by Thomas Martin and Associates, requesting approval to develop a 79-unit single-family residential planned development subdivision in three phases on 21.9 acres located in north Redding at 11050 and 11106 Campers Court. The rezone would add the "PD" Planned Development Overlay District to the base "RM-9" District zoning over the entire site and allow construction of single-family units in the "RM" District and use of reduced lot sizes and variable building setbacks. Environmental Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Recommend to the City Council adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval. S-101-127, L-010-211-039, L-010-230

Associate Planner Ron Adams summarized the staff report. He noted that the project site consisted of two undeveloped parcels—one being 16.23 acres and holding the pond and the other at 4.92 acres located at the end of Campers Court. Mr. Adams advised that the smaller 4.92-acre lot was approved in June 2007 for a different subdivision project known as Lakeridge Cottages, which supported a 45-unit small-lot single-family development with clustered two-story homes. He continued that the applicant was now seeking approval of the current subdivision as a replacement to Lakeridge Cottages.

General Plan and zoning consistency were discussed by Mr. Adams. He explained that the project site was primarily zoned "RM-9" Residential Multiple Family District. He continued that the far west parcel also had a "PD" Planned Development Overlay District from prior approval of the Lakeridge Cottages project. Mr. Adams noted that the General Plan designation was primarily "Residential, 6 to 10 units per acre." He said there was a small area along the south edge of the site adjacent to the neighboring Woodcliff Estates Subdivision that could generally be interpreted as being "Residential, 2 to 3.5 units per acre," but the exact boundary of this designation was not clear and could reasonably be interpreted as being coterminous with the developed Woodcliff Estates.

Mr. Adams mentioned that no comments had been received from the public, other than the nearby residents' earlier concerns with the potential for existing views looking north out their backyards being blocked by development (which was addressed by the use of one-story floor plans and tiered grading on "boundary" lots) and the potential for trespass over the private open-space area located just west of Interstate 5, southeast of the proposed subdivision. He said some residents had recently stated that they preferred the current single-family subdivision design over the higher-density clustered single-family units approved for the Lakeridge Cottages project. Mr. Adams said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval of Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-7-07,

Planned Development Plan Application PD-6-07, and Rezoning Application RZ-1-07, Lakeridge Oaks Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval, which he reviewed.

Commissioner Bert Meyer asked about approval for use of the private road to access Black Marble Way. Mr. Adams explained that the co-applicant, Gary Bauer, also owned the Paradise View Mobile Home Park and agreed to the road being looped around to Black Marble Way. He mentioned that Condition 11 addressed the recordation of appropriate private easements with recordation of the final map for the first phase. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:29 p.m.

Erick Carlson, applicant's representative, Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc., agreed with the conditions of approval.

Mr. Meyer inquired if staff had considered another access point from a parcel in the subdivision to the south, since fire danger was a real concern. Mr. Adams explained that the owner of the parcel, which included a house at the end of the cul-de-sac, was adamantly opposed to any concept of bringing in a public-street access to tie into Woodcliff Drive.

In response to questioning from the Commissioners, Mr. Adams explained the grading conditions and those requiring mitigation for direct and indirect impacts to seasonal wetlands and other jurisdictional waters through the purchase of mitigation credits from a valid wetland mitigation bank or alternate means of securing equal off-site mitigation credits. He also discussed the conditions requiring maintenance of, and improvements to, the dam.

Gene Kalbaugh advised that he and his brother, Terry, owned property at Boulder Creek Drive and Campers Court. He stated that staff had assured him that the zoning would remain Commercial on their property, that there would be no acquisition of their property, and that they would not lose their entrance or exit to their property. He believed the proposal was an excellent project.

Terry Kalbaugh agreed with his brother, Gene, also noting the reassurances from staff. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:42 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Randy Memeo moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council 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 Application S-7-07, Planned Development Plan Application PD-6-07, and Rezoning Application RZ-1-07, Lakeridge Oaks Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff.

Second: Commissioner Chris Young.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Chapin.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Chairman Michele Goedert and Commissioners Chris Young and Randall Smith thanked Commissioner Randy Memeo for his excellent service.

Ms. Goedert and Mr. Smith also expressed appreciation to City staff for sending them to the Planners Institute in Sacramento.

Mr. Memeo applauded staff for their excellent presentations on their projects and thanked the other Commissioners for their contributions.

Commissioner Bert Meyer referred to the City Council's denial of Mayor Mary Stegall's appointment of Gail Rich to the Planning Commission. He did not like the politics involved in the denial and hoped the City Council treated the next candidate better than the way Ms. Rich was treated.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT - *Conference on Sustainable Development and Green Building Practices.*

Due to the length of tonight's meeting, Development Services Director Jim Hamilton announced that the Director's Report would be continued to the next meeting.

Mr. Hamilton did note that at the last City Council meeting, the City Council approved the permanent closure of Polk Street.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Michele Goedert adjourned the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Jim Hamilton, AICP
Acting Secretary

Michele Goedert
Chairman