

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 25, 2006
 City Council Chambers
 777 Cypress Avenue
 Redding, California 96001

MINUTES

Chairman Randy Memeo called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Jim Chapin, Michele Goedert, Bert Meyer, Randall Smith, and Chris Young present. Absent was Commissioner Gary Brickwood. Also present were Development Services Director Jim Hamilton, Land Development Manager Gary Otremba, Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Senior Planners Terri Thesken and Kent Manuel, Associate Planner Jim Wildauer, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Jim Chapin moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 2, 2006. Commissioner Michele Goedert noted that the motion for the recommendation to the City Council regarding amendments of the Redding Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.11, pertaining to recreational-vehicle storage, should reflect a No vote by Commissioner Randy Memeo. Commissioner Chris Young seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING - TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP S-7-02, RIVERCREST ESTATES SUBDIVISION, granting approval to divide 39 acres to create 94 single-family residential lots and a 3.85-acre park site on property located on the east side of Bechelli Lane, south of Woodacre Drive, in an "RS-3" Residential Single Family District. ***Request by D. R. Horton, Inc., for a three-year extension of the tentative map.*** Environmental Determination: Previously approved Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Approval. S-101-045

Senior Planner Terri Thesken summarized the staff report and responded to questions. She noted that the subdivision was approved on March 11, 2003. She stated that applicant had been dealing with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during the past two years for the wetlands. Ms. Thesken advised that recordation of the final map was imminent, and the improvement plans were recently approved. She advised that the applicant was retaining approximately 560 trees and that the fencing was installed to protect them. She said staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the extension of Tentative Subdivision Map S-7-02, Rivercrest Estates Subdivision, subject to the previously approved conditions of approval. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:13 p.m. Determining that no one wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 4:14 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission approve the three-year extension of Tentative Subdivision Map S-7-02, Rivercrest Estates Subdivision, subject to the previously approved conditions of approval.

Second: Commissioner Randall Smith.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commission Brickwood.

PUBLIC HEARING - TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-23-05, TOWER RIDGE TOWNHOMES, AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPLICATION PD-11-05, by Omni Development, requesting approval to divide 2.59 acres to create 13 lots for development of single-family townhomes on property located at 650 Hilltop Drive in an "RM-9-PD" Residential Multiple Family District with Planned Development Overlay District. Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt. Staff Recommendation: Approval. S-101-107, L-010-211-024

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report and responded to questions. He discussed the planned development, which was designed to provide a more efficient use of land than would be possible through strict application of conventional zoning standards. The storm-drainage system was also discussed by Mr. Manuel. He said staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-23-05 and Planned Development Plan PD-11-05, Tower Ridge Townhomes, subject to the conditions of approval, which he reviewed. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 4:28 p.m. Determining that no one wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 4:29 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Jim Chapin moved that the Planning Commission 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-23-05 and Planned Development Plan PD-11-05, Tower Ridge Townhomes, subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff.

Second: Commissioner Michele Goedert.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Brickwood.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL

- a. ***PUBLIC HEARING - USE PERMIT APPLICATION UP-23-02, by Levenson Development, requesting approval to construct an approximately 302,238-square-foot shopping center in two phases. The overall project includes an approximately 148,663-square-foot large-format retail warehouse store with a 5,200-square-foot tire center and a four-island fueling station and an approximately 153,575-square-foot commercial retail shopping center with satellite, retail, and fast-food pads. The order and location of development within the site may be varied provided the initial development does not trigger the trip-generation thresholds that require reconstruction of the Interstate 5/Oasis Road interchange. The property is located on 34 acres at the northeast corner of Interstate 5 and Oasis Road, west of Salt Creek, in an "RC" Regional Commercial District. An encroachment into the 100-year floodplain of Salt Creek is also requested. L-030-390***
- b. ***GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT GPA-1-06, by the City of Redding, to amend the General Plan Transportation Element to remove Twin View Boulevard from the Circulation Plan within the project boundaries.***

Environmental Determination: Previously certified Environmental Impact Report EIR-2-02. Staff Recommendation: Recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council for approval of the Candidate Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project, and approval of UP-23-02 and GPA-1-06.

Associate Planner Jim Wildauer summarized the staff report. He noted that the environmental document certified for this project, EIR-2-02 (EIR), considered a potential for 320,000 square feet of development on the north side of Oasis Road. Mr. Wildauer advised that Phase 1A was anticipated to occur first on the westerly 15.1 acres and included an approximately 148,663-square-foot discount warehouse that included a 5,200-square-foot tire center and a fueling station with four islands and 16 fueling positions, as well as two 3,500-square-foot fast-food outlets. He added that

Phase 1B was anticipated to occur on the eastern portion of the site and included approximately 163,000 square feet of mixed-use retail commercial uses on 17.8 acres.

Mr. Wildauer explained that the EIR identified the need to reconstruct the Interstate 5 and Oasis Road interchange and roads serving it when vehicle trips generated by the project caused the peak-hour trip-generation thresholds identified in Mitigation Measure 5-5 of the EIR to be exceeded. He said it was important to note that the order and level of development described in the EIR was not necessarily the order of development that would occur with the use permit. He clarified that any order or combination of structures shown on the use permit site plan could be developed with the initial phase of the project and, by this definition, would be referred to as Phase 1A, provided that it did not exceed the identified trip-generation thresholds as confirmed by the City Engineer and Development Services Director; Phase 1B referred to any development that would cause the peak-hour trip-generation thresholds to be exceeded, causing the need for the interchange to be reconstructed.

The elevations of the large-format retail warehouse and the two satellite pads for fast-food uses were discussed by Mr. Wildauer. He commented that the draft conditions of approval incorporated landscape to separate pedestrian areas from the main right-of-ways into the parking lot. He noted that extensive use of pedestrian plaza areas and sidewalks reflected a type of "lifestyle" shopping center.

Grading and tree preservation were mentioned by Mr. Wildauer, who noted that other than the western third of the property, there were few trees on the site. He stated that in order to balance the cut and fill from site grading and provide the desired parking and building footprint, there were few opportunities to save trees on-site. He continued that native oaks along the west boundary of the property and trees adjacent to the parking areas along Oasis Road and the northwest corner of the property were called out to be saved and that removal of the remaining 253 trees was to be offset by the replanting schedule identified in Condition 38.

Mr. Wildauer indicated that during the EIR process, key issues raised included potential for downstream flooding impacts, elimination of Twin View Boulevard and its impacts to residences and businesses north of the project, utility and street infrastructure constraints, traffic flow, adequacy of the environmental document, and appropriate processing of the environmental document. He referred to the Candidate Findings, which reviewed the significant impacts identified with the EIR, as well as measures to mitigate them. Mr. Wildauer advised that after mitigation, impacts remained to air quality, hydrology, and utilities systems (storm water). He said the major areas of concern were circulation and traffic impacts and storm-water runoff. He discussed the circulation improvements, including signalization and interchange improvements at Oasis Road and Interstate 5 (I-5) and the relocation of Twin View Boulevard further east. Mr. Wildauer remarked that the conditions required that the abandonment of Twin View Boulevard through the site be approved prior to issuance of a building permit or prior to issuance of a grading permit; access would then be provided through the construction of Hawley Road.

Regarding drainage, Mr. Wildauer advised that the study indicated that there would be no increase in flooding in Churn Creek. He explained that the question of whether or not to detain was discussed and that the analysis concluded that detention would impact 1.4 acres of property along Salt Creek. Mr. Wildauer also noted that impacted property owners would need to agree to accept additional flows, or the applicant would be required to find an alternative. He said the area of inundation was between Salt Creek and Churn Creek, and he utilized slides to illustrate the area of inundation.

Commissioner Jim Chapin asked if the possibility of eliminating the second entry point on Oasis Road in order to minimize potential back-up problems had been evaluated. Mr. Wildauer reported that the easterly driveway brought a greater margin of comfort for making sure there was additional stacking room. He noted that the traffic analysis also identified the fact that if the lights were synchronized, it could provide the level of service called for in the General Plan.

Commissioner Michele Goedert questioned the increased peak-flood flows and asked why the burden of the flows was being shifted to the adjacent properties. Mr. Wildauer responded that the water would become part of the 100-year floodplain, so the property owners would have to agree to

the flows. He said he was sure there would be compensation to them to allow for nondevelopable land.

In response to questions from the Commissioners, Development Services Director Jim Hamilton discussed the level of traffic improvements that had to be in place with Phase 1A. He mentioned that Condition 4, regarding indemnification, had been revised. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:05 p.m.

Eihnard Diaz, representing Thomason Development, indicated that there were concerns, including, but not limited to, traffic mitigations and drainage and infrastructure impacts. He said staff had stated that future developments consistent with the General Plan must include this project when considering traffic impacts. Mr. Diaz questioned why other developers would have to do a traffic study, if this project's traffic studies took the other projects into account.

Gail Rich, who represented the neighbors of Churn Creek, questioned staff's ability to conduct the mitigation monitoring for the site and monitor the blasting that would be done for the grading. She oppugned the thoroughness of the Statement of Overriding Considerations for hydrology and air quality. She worried that the use of blasting in the City limits would set a precedent. Ms. Rich asked which staff members were qualified to ensure that the blasting plan would be followed. Regarding mitigation monitoring, she cited the common construction practice of excess concrete being dumped, which resulted in debris flowing into the storm drains and silt running into Churn Creek.

Ms. Rich acknowledged that staff was very busy with numerous projects. She said if a portion of the fees that developers paid did not include funds to pay for additional help to ensure adherence to the requirements, she wanted to see an additional condition of approval be added, requiring that the developer contribute to doing so.

The issue of flooding south of the project area was also mentioned by Ms. Rich. She asked what type of assurance would be provided that flooding would not occur and wondered who would be responsible for compensation if it did. Regarding air quality, she said she found it hard to believe that all things had been considered for mitigation. Ms. Rich believed all feasible methods had to be considered, including downsizing of the project, if necessary. She contended that cars idling in line at a fast-food drive-through contributed to air quality impacts.

Ms. Rich remarked that Redding's economy was based on tourism and did not want the tourism endangered because of poor air quality. Ms. Rich worried that another Statement of Overriding Considerations would be adopted to allow for filling in the floodplains.

Phyllis Pollock, a member of Friends of Churn Creek, believed if the project had already been built, flooding would have occurred this past year due to all the rain the City received. She opposed development that destroyed land just for big-box businesses and fast-food restaurants. Ms. Pollock noted that the public had indicated it wanted open space and public trails. She was amused at the "pedestrian-friendly" concept, because people would have to use vehicles to get to the shopping center. She hoped that someday Redding would develop walkable communities. Ms. Pollock also voiced concern about the blasting that would be done and the resultant toxic runoff. She worried that Redding would end up like Sacramento, where all the urban streams were covered up.

William Rodriguez owned property within the proposed development plan and was opposed to the blocking off of Oasis Court. He commented that he wanted to voice his opposition in case the project ended up in court.

Mike Ashby, attorney at law for the applicant, stated that he had not had a chance to thoroughly review the revised Condition 4, but suggested that the Commissioners recommend approval with the revised condition as proposed. He added that if there were issues, they could be resolved at a later date.

Mark Miller, Executive Vice President, Levenson Development Corporation, thanked staff for its help. He felt the issues had been adequately addressed and urged the Commissioners to recommend

approval of the project. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:26 p.m.

Commissioner Chris Young addressed Mr. Rodriguez's concerns regarding the realignment of Twin View Boulevard. Mr. Wildauer explained how the road would be realigned. He indicated that to ensure traffic safety, there would have to be a road closure at Oasis Court, but that access would be provided farther south, off Twin View Boulevard.

Commissioner Bert Meyer mentioned Condition 12e, which required the installation of street barricades. He felt the standard type of barricade was unattractive and asked if the condition could be modified to require a more attractive type. Mr. Hamilton replied that the Commissioners could recommend a revision of the condition to the City Council.

Mr. Chapin inquired about Harrison's Marine's concerns regarding the realignment of the freeway overpass. Mr. Hamilton explained that the currently substandard interchange was going to be significantly widened, which would raise the intersections and raise the ramps several feet in order to accommodate grade at Oasis Road. He observed that Harrison's Marine was worried that its visibility would be blocked from the southbound traffic. Mr. Hamilton responded that there were some things that could be done, but that the physical reality of constructing an interchange would require that the intersections be raised.

Commissioner Randall Smith asked about peripheral access to the complex other than using Interstate 5. He asked who would pay for, or what would trigger the extension of, Hawley Road or other means of travel. Mr. Hamilton explained that the project site was attractive for retail development because of its interstate access. He stated that this project was a small part of the ultimate development in that area. He said the overall Circulation Plan involved several other routes that would need to be substantially improved. Mr. Hamilton stated that ultimately, choices would have to be made about what specific circulation improvements were going to be required.

Ms. Goedert mentioned Ms. Rich's concern about the blasting plan. Mr. Hamilton explained that the Mitigation Monitoring Program included details and specifications for the blasting plan, including requirements for having certified monitors on hand, as well as Engineering and Fire Department staff present.

Ms. Goedert addressed the issue of air quality. She asked if the impacts from fast-food drive-throughs had been considered. Mr. Hamilton noted that the General Plan identified unavoidable impacts if the City developed according to the General Plan. He observed that most people had a misconception about fast-food drive-throughs. He explained that a sit-down restaurant created more of an impact on air quality because of the "cool-down" period of a vehicle. He further explained that when a person re-started a vehicle after the car had cooled down, more air quality impacts were created than idling produced.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay explained why Condition 4 was revised. He advised that the City Council had conducted a closed session regarding threats of litigation due to the current project and the Oasis Road Specific Plan. In considering the issues, Mr. Duvernay felt a condition was needed that shifted the responsibility to the developer if a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document was challenged. Mr. Duvernay noted that the process was common throughout the State. He continued that the condition also included a cap on the staff costs associated with monitoring the litigation. Mr. Duvernay advised that if there was litigation, the developer would retain an attorney and pay all the bills and that City staff would monitor the process. He stated that the last revision dealt with the willful misconduct by City staff and observed that staff and the applicant were close to reaching an agreement. Mr. Duvernay indicated that he would recommend using this condition on other projects on a case-by-case basis.

Motion: Commissioner Jim Chapin moved that the Planning Commission adopt the resolution recommending that the City Council find that the project is within the scope of the project covered by Master Environmental Impact Report EIR-2-02, reviewed by the Planning Commission and certified by the City Council; approve the Candidate Findings; approve the Statement of Overriding Considerations; adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program; and approve Use Permit UP-23-02 and General Plan Amendment GPA-1-06 subject to the conditions of approval, including the revision of Conditions 4 and 12e.

Second: Commissioner Chris Young.

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

Noes: Commissioner Smith.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioner Brickwood.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Bert Meyer commented that he had been impressed with the redevelopment of Burbank while visiting that city. Development Services Director Jim Hamilton noted that he had visited cities in southern California for ideas related to development in the Oasis Road area. He offered to present a slide show in the future that illustrated some of those ideas.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Randy Memeo adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Jim Hamilton, AICP
Acting Secretary

Randy Memeo
Chairman