

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

MINUTES

Chairman Bert Meyer called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Gary Brickwood, Michele Goedert, Randy Memeo, Randall Smith, and Chris Young present. Absent was Commissioner Jim Chapin. Also present were Development Services Director Jim Hamilton, Land Development Manager Gary Otremba, Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Senior Planners Kent Manuel and Jim Wildauer, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion. Mr. Brickwood left the meeting at 6:30 p.m., as hereinafter noted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Gary Brickwood moved approval of the minutes of the meetings of March 14, March 28, and April 11, 2006. Commissioner Randall Smith seconded the motion. Commissioner Michele Goedert abstained. The vote carried with five ayes and one abstention.

PUBLIC HEARING

- a. ***TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION S-13-05, WYNDHAM POINTE SUBDIVISION***, by Frank Coughlin and Tim Greenhood, requesting approval to subdivide 33.93 acres into 78 single-family residential lots, one of which is a potential park site, on property located at 2705 Wyndham Lane, which is immediately east of the Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District canal and north of Canyon Hollow Creek, in an "RS-3.5" Residential Single Family District. *Environmental Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and approval. Continued from the meeting of June 13, 2006.* S-101-097
- b. *Consideration of Neighborhood Traffic Protection Plan (Plan) for Parkview and Wyndham Lane neighborhoods. Staff Recommendation: Referral of Plan to the City Council for consideration.*

Senior Planner Jim Wildauer summarized the staff report and responded to questions. He mentioned that two neighborhood meetings had been held, noting that the residents' main concerns about the subdivision were traffic impacts and the second public-street access required by the General Plan. Mr. Wildauer noted that even though the developer was not required to provide additional amenities, he proposed a decorative block wall at the entrance to the subdivision, wider landscape, a traffic circle at the intersection of Ginny Court and Lagoon Drive, a potential public park, and other features that would enhance the project. Regarding the potential park, Mr. Wildauer stated that the Community Services Director said she would not recommend accepting the land for dedication of a park because the size was under the recommended five acres and would not provide the kinds of amenities necessary to serve the various age groups.

Mr. Wildauer discussed the mitigation measures for protecting the elderberry bushes and noted the follow-up consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine if any additional setbacks were advised. He observed that detention was not required for the subdivision, since it was in close proximity to the Sacramento River.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton addressed the traffic improvements and mitigation measures. He observed that there was remaining property within this area still to be developed. Mr. Hamilton thanked the members of the Wyndham and Parkview neighborhoods who participated in the working group and looked at the various issues in developing the solutions recommended by staff. He mentioned the Neighborhood Traffic Protection Plan (Plan) and those who participated in developing the Plan.

Mr. Hamilton utilized a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the traffic problems and potential solutions for the Wyndham Lane and Parkview neighborhoods. He outlined the basic circulation pattern for the two neighborhoods. Mr. Hamilton noted that while the two neighborhoods were distinct neighborhoods with regard to character and development patterns, they were inextricably linked for transportation purposes. He contended that it was impossible to separate the traffic from these two neighborhoods. Mr. Hamilton discussed the traffic study that was done for Wyndham Lane and the Parkview neighborhood. He mentioned traffic-calming measures for Freebridge Street and efforts to discourage cut-through traffic through the Parkview neighborhood. Both short- and long-term solutions for the area were presented by Mr. Hamilton. He discussed removal of the Valentine Lane barricade, noting that the Wyndham Lane neighborhood needed a second public access, with or without the new subdivision being constructed. Mr. Hamilton referred to a memo from City Engineer Barry Tippin regarding construction of a bridge over the Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District Canal (ACID) that was favored as an alternative access by some residents. In the memo, Mr. Tippin provided Caltrans' cost estimates for the bridge.

Mr. Hamilton said staff recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Tentative Subdivision Map Application S-13-05, Wyndham Pointe Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval, including the revision of Conditions 20 g, i, and j, which he reviewed. He also said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council preparation and adoption of a Wyndham and Parkview Neighborhood Traffic Protection Plan.

Commissioner Randall Smith asked when the barricade at Valentine Lane would be removed should the Planning Commission approve the project. Mr. Hamilton said the need for a second access existed today, but the barricade had been in place for many years. He felt the improvements also needed to be put into place before the barricade was removed, and the appropriate time would be prior to occupancy of the first home in the subdivision.

Commissioner Michele Goedert inquired if Caltrans had commented on the effect the subdivision might have on the intersection of State Route (SR) 273 and Wyndham Lane. Mr. Wildauer said Caltrans did not have any concerns about the project.

Commissioner Bert Meyer asked if the requirement for a water-diversion facility in Condition 14 was a new policy for the City.

Land Development Manager Gary Otremba explained that the City Engineer felt any failure of the ACID system could cause flooding of adjacent lots. He added that the water-diversion facility had not yet been designed.

Mr. Meyer also asked if the power poles would be relocated along Wyndham Lane. Mr. Otremba explained that the poles referred to by Mr. Meyer were actually for cable and that most of the utility power poles were on the other side of the street. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:07 p.m.

Bill Ulch discussed the Parkview neighborhood's concerns about traffic. He disagreed with Mr. Hamilton's comment that the neighborhoods could be successfully linked. Mr. Ulch used overheads to illustrate his point of view regarding the flow of traffic through the Parkview neighborhood and contended that Freebridge Street was already at capacity. Mr. Ulch believed more Wyndham Lane residents would use Valentine Lane to Freebridge Street as a shortcut if the barricade was removed because the distance was less than Wyndham Lane to SR 273. He said he wanted the barricade to stay up, Polk Street closed, and a bridge to Progress Drive constructed. Mr. Ulch also did not want the future Dove Street extension, citing more traffic concerns, and requested that a neighborhood park be considered for the land.

Elin Klaseen submitted cost estimates for a bridge over the ACID canal to Progress Drive. She claimed that the cost was considerably less than Mr. Tippin's cost estimate. She believed the cost of the bridge was justified, because it would be a long-term solution, rather than a short-term fix. Ms. Klaseen believed it would be possible to have the developer, residents, and the City all pay an equal share of the cost.

John Simmons urged the Commissioners to consider the Progress Drive bridge. He suggested realigning Eastside Road so that traffic would actually flow onto SR 273. He liked the idea of a park site instead of the future Dove Street extension. Mr. Simmons requested that the Commissioners also approve the applicant's proposed park site for the subdivision.

Marilyn Traugott observed that the "shortcut" through Valentine Lane to Freebridge Street might save on distance but that it would not save time. She appreciated the Parkview neighborhood's concern about traffic. Ms. Traugott believed it was not an acceptable second access for the Wyndham neighborhood. She recommended not extending Lagoon Drive and constructing a bridge to Progress Drive.

Michael Kussow asked that pedestrian-warning signs and speed signage be posted on Wyndham Lane. In the conditions of approval regarding the waiving of eminent-domain proceedings, Mr. Kussow asked that the City also waive that requirement if an alternative primary access other than Wyndham Lane was proposed by the applicant. He also requested that if the proposed park site was not accepted by the City, that the parcel at least be included in a landscape maintenance district for use by the residents. He voiced concern about traffic stacking up in the left-turn lane from SR 273 to Wyndham Lane.

Richard Johnson commented that the Parkview Neighborhood Association had worked for years to improve the Parkview neighborhood and that at no time did the Wyndham neighborhood participate. He believed there should be a more direct route out of Wyndham Lane and a realignment of Eastside Road and Wyndham Lane.

Loel Yerion said more time was needed to research the possibility of forming an assessment district for bridge construction over the ACID canal.

Sue Lang agreed with Mr. Yerion. She urged staff to plan for the future.

Marietta Sheffield worried that the subdivision would reduce the flow of Laurel Creek. She noted that she had seen wildlife in the area and beaver dams in the creek. She contended that the dams would be eliminated if Lagoon Drive was extended. She said she purchased her home because its location was peaceful and quiet. Ms. Sheffield thought the barricade next to her home had been there to stop vehicles from entering the creek. She mentioned that children had learned to ride their bikes and that teenagers had played basketball in the makeshift court outlined on the pavement. Ms. Sheffield asserted that the new subdivision should have a secondary access over the ACID canal, which would retain the tranquility of her neighborhood.

Darryl Wagner, applicant's attorney, advised that the issues surrounding traffic in the Parkview neighborhood were completely independent of the proposed subdivision. He believed the applicant's contribution to the traffic issues were nominal. He mentioned that if the barricade on Valentine Lane was removed, there would be a 14 percent contribution to traffic on that street from the new subdivision; on Freebridge Street, the contribution of traffic would be 5 percent; on Wyndham Lane, the contribution would be 23 percent. Mr. Wagner asked for reconsideration of the traffic improvements to a more proportionate share.

Regarding Condition 9, Mr. Wagner asked that the lots adjacent to Laurel Creek not have their lot lines through the creek area, because the rear of the lots would be in the floodplain and require flood insurance, which would burden the homeowner. He asked that the remaining portion be placed into a landscape maintenance district. Mr. Wagner requested that Condition 14 (regarding construction of a water-diversion facility) be modified to include the words, "if necessary." And clarification was requested for Conditions 19 and 20, with Mr. Wagner citing the 23 percent traffic contribution to Wyndham Lane. Mr. Wagner noted that the traffic-calming measures would cost around \$100,000; but if the development's contribution to the road was figured in, the cost would only be about \$5,000 (in terms of proportionate share). He indicated that the applicant was proposing a cash contribution of \$40,000 to the City for rehabilitation of Valentine Lane and traffic-calming measures on Freebridge Street and Rivella Vista Drive and Valentine Lane. He maintained that the condition of Valentine Lane was due in large part to having the barricade in place. He asserted that if the barricade not been in place, the pavement would have been maintained to City standards.

Regarding Condition 31 (the public-service easement at the top of bank of Laurel Creek), Mr. Wagner contended that the all-weather-access road would invite vagrants and young children and that there would be potential of a washout. He asked that the all-weather-access requirement be omitted from the condition.

Chairman Bert Meyer inquired if the conditions of approval had been available at the previous meeting. Mr. Wagner explained that the traffic issues had not been determined by staff at the time, which was why the working group was formed. Mr. Meyer asked if Mr. Wagner was negotiating with staff or wanted a continuance of the item to the next meeting. Mr. Wagner said he was asking for modifications to the conditions of approval and approval of the project at today's meeting.

Duane Miller, applicant's engineer, addressed Condition 20. He noted that Wyndham Lane was narrow, which was traffic-calming in itself. He felt leaving the street in its current configuration could be advantageous.

Mr. Meyer asked what the share would be for the applicant if the bridge were to be built. Mr. Miller replied that one should look at the applicant's contribution to the impacts for any off-site improvements.

Commissioner Randy Memeo questioned that if the applicant's contribution to the impacts on Wyndham Lane should only be 23 percent, where would the rest of the money come from for the improvements. Mr. Miller responded that the applicant was proposing to leave it in its existing condition.

Frank Coughlin, applicant, submitted a letter to staff detailing his opposition to several of the conditions of approval, including Conditions 9, 14, 19, 20, 31, and 41. He commented that Condition 20 required an asphalt-concrete dike, which he asserted would cause problems with drainage and possibly cause cars to hydroplane during a heavy rain. Mr. Coughlin mentioned the amount of time that had been spent in processing the tentative map. He noted that he had met with concerned neighbors and had also agreed to form the working group. Mr. Coughlin felt enough time had been spent in working to resolve the issues and requested that the Planning Commission approve his project.

Mr. Otremba stated that he did not have enough design information on the dike, but that it could be a concern. He advised that the City would not allow a design that would increase flooding. Mr. Coughlin observed that staff did not have enough information but yet still required the condition that he was forced to accept.

Commissioner Chris Young asked Mr. Coughlin if he wanted the Planning Commissioners to continue the meeting to a later date so that they could discuss the conditions he objected to. Mr. Coughlin replied that the application had gone on long enough and that they were qualified to make a decision. He added that if he did not like the decision, it could always be appealed.

Ms. Goedert asked if Mr. Coughlin was interested in an assessment district. Mr. Coughlin answered that an assessment district had been proposed in 1984 for Dove Street but that it fell on deaf ears. He agreed that his subdivision could join in the assessment district for the bridge but that the only contribution he would make would be donation of the land through Parcel "C." He said he would also stipulate that he be allowed to proceed with his project.

Mr. Brickwood left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Wagner advised that to condition this project on construction of the bridge would not pass muster because there was inability to deliver right-of-way. He noted that presently, right-of-way for the bridge was unavailable. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

Mr. Memeo stated that he was not comfortable in discussing modification of the conditions of approval because there was not enough time to review them.

Mr. Young questioned Condition 9, noting that some insurers would not insure those who were in a floodplain. Mr. Hamilton replied that the property was already encumbered by floodplain, so the

City was not creating the situation. He said it was common practice to require that these areas be retained within the floodplain boundaries on individual property if they were encumbered with such prior to their subdivision.

Mr. Smith was in favor of the requirement for the water-diversion facility, noting that the pipes were almost 100 years old and that something catastrophic could occur.

Ms. Goedert asked how long it would take to organize an assessment district. Mr. Hamilton responded that it could take about 180 days but that there were a lot of "what ifs." He added that unless Wyndham Lane was closed off, it would be a very expensive endeavor with little ultimate benefit from a traffic-circulation standpoint. Ms. Goedert also disclosed that she had met with Elin Klaseen and Jerry Coughlin regarding the subdivision.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay advised that 100 percent of the cost associated with the need for the second access (the barricade) could be charged to the applicant but that none of the bridge costs could be charged to the applicant. He explained that the matter before the Commissioners today was the applicant's proposal and that the City did not have the power to force the applicant to redesign the project.

Mr. Young was comfortable with removal of the barricade and widening of Wyndham Lane.

Mr. Memeo said he was uncomfortable with the project itself and voiced concern about the cut-through traffic on Freebridge Street. He stated that what had been presented satisfied the impact of the project.

Mr. Smith acknowledged that errors had been made in the past and that it was time for the barricade to be removed.

Ms. Goedert remarked that the plan was a defensible solution for traffic problems. She stated that the Commissioners had inherited some poor planning and bad decisions from the past and would have to make the best of the situation.

Mr. Meyer observed that he had followed a car that had cut through Freebridge Street. He asked the driver why he cut through the neighborhood. He said the driver explained that sometimes his daughter liked to take the "pretty way" to school. Mr. Meyer believed it would be best to close Polk Street to eliminate a lot of the cut-through traffic.

Motion: Commissioner Randy Memeo 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-13-05, Wyndham Pointe Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval as recommended by staff, including the revision of Conditions 20g, i, and j.

Second: Commissioner Randall Smith.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioners Chapin and Brickwood.

Motion: Commissioner Randy Memeo moved that the Planning Commission recommend preparation of a Neighborhood Traffic Protection Plan for presentation to the City Council.

Second: Commissioner Michele Goedert.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioners Chapin and Brickwood.

The Chairman called a 15-minute recess at 7 p.m. The Planning Commission reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING - RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - OASIS ROAD SPECIFIC PLAN (ORSP), GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION GPA-8-06, AND REZONING APPLICATION RZ-11-06, by the City of Redding, regarding adoption of the ORSP and related changes in the General Plan classifications and zoning designations of certain properties within the ORSP area. The project includes amendments to the Circulation Plan of the General Plan to eliminate the northerly extension of Hawley Road from State Route 299 to Oasis Road and a planned, unnamed collector-street connection to Gold Hills Drive. The Master Environmental Impact Report MEIR-1-02 for these actions was adopted by the City Council on June 6, 2006. Environmental Determination: MEIR-1-02. Staff Recommendation: Recommend adoption to the City Council. Continued from the meeting of June 27, 2006. L-010-075, G-030-010, and L-010-230

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report and responded to questions. He recalled that the City Council had chosen Development Scenario 2 from the Final Master Environmental Impact Report (FMEIR) as the basis for the ORSP and directed staff to initiate a General Plan amendment to remove the extension of Hawley Road from the Circulation Plan of the General Plan. Mr. Manuel advised that he had met with representatives from Thomason Development on July 10, with most of the discussion focusing on the financing plan currently being prepared. Mr. Manuel stated that if the Commission decided to move ahead with a recommendation, clean-up measures would need to be addressed, including minor cross-referencing, reformatting of traffic-mitigation measures, and elimination of some maps to eliminate Hawley Road. He said staff recommended 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-1-02 and approve the Oasis Road Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment GPA-8-06, and Rezoning RZ-11-06.

Commissioner Randy Memeo asked if the Commissioners should wait for the financing analysis. He worried that some of the items mentioned in the ORSP would not be financially feasible and then would not be implemented.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton responded that the financing component of the ORSP was identified with methodology available to address the financing. He stated that the improvements identified within the ORSP were essentially the same improvements necessary to build out under the current General Plan and that the costs would be similar whether or not the ORSP was adopted. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:31 p.m.

Gail Rich supported staff's recommendation for the ORSP. She urged the Commissioners to consider whether an enclosed mall was appropriate for the area, since she believed people wanted to get out into the open air. Ms. Rich felt there were too many "shoulds" in the document that would be better as "shalls." She hoped that the color schemes would not be similar to those at the Mt. Shasta Mall.

Eihnard Diaz, representative for Thomason Development, opposed the proposal of an architectural design review committee. He felt the costs of infrastructure, coupled with the various standards and design criteria for landscape, etc., might be economically burdensome and render development infeasible. He also suggested that it was not prudent to approve the ORSP without the complete funding program in place. Mr. Diaz felt the interchange to the north should have been evaluated. Mr. Hamilton reiterated that there was no reason to hold off on adoption of the Plan, since the costs would be there, regardless of when the funding mechanism was established. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Mr. Memeo did not think a design review committee was necessary.

Ms. Goedert observed that the equivalent of a small city would be created in the area and felt a community park, not just walking trails, was needed. She contended that the best park sites would get "eaten up" by development. She said she was not persuaded that the high-density, multiple-family residential development in the northwest quadrant would enhance the community.

Mr. Smith said he could not vote for adoption of the ORSP because he did not agree with the City Council's elimination of the Hawley Road extension.

Mr. Meyer believed a number of decisions were made for the ORSP that had to do more with politics rather than planning, which bothered him. He indicated that his job as a Planning Commissioner was to determine how a project would work for the City. He believed the ORSP was an aggressive plan and agreed with Mr. Diaz in wondering how anyone was going to be able to commercially afford this project.

Motion: Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the Oasis Road Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment GPA-8-06, and Rezoning Application RZ-11-06.

There was no second. Motion failed.

Motion: Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the Oasis Road Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment GPA-8-06, and Rezoning Application RZ-11-06, not to include provisions for a design review committee and to remove the RV-parking requirement from the Design Criteria.

Second: Commissioner Randy Memeo.

Ayes: Commissioners Memeo, Meyer, and Young.

Noes: Commissioners Goedert and Smith.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioners Chapin and Brickwood.

Motion failed.

Mr. Hamilton advised the Commissioners that all their comments would be incorporated into the minutes and provided to the City Council. He stated that the item could be continued to the next meeting if the Commissioners could not get a quorum for the motion.

Mr. Smith was concerned about the overwhelming intensity, as well as questionable hydrology and lack of parks, and could not vote for the item in good conscience. Ms. Goedert concurred.

Mr. Meyer announced that the item would be continued to the meeting of July 25, 2006.

COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

Consideration of procedural guidelines for public hearings. Continued from the meeting of June 27, 2006.

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie summarized the staff report. He stated that staff felt the public hearing guidelines would assist the Commission's effort toward a well-informed decision by providing structure and an efficient use of time, while also providing a fair opportunity for all points of view to be expressed.

Motion: Commissioner Randall Smith moved that the Planning Commission adopt the Public Hearing Procedural Guidelines.

Second: Commissioner Randy Memeo.

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

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Commissioners Chapin and Brickwood.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton announced that there would be no Planning Commission meeting on August 22, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Bert Meyer adjourned the meeting at 8 p.m.

Jim Hamilton, AICP
Acting Secretary

Bert Meyer
Chairman