

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, September 28, 2010  
 City Council Chambers  
 777 Cypress Avenue  
 Redding, California 96001

## MINUTES

Chairman Emmett Burroughs called the meeting to order at 4 p.m., with Commissioners Michele Goedert, Bert Meyer, Cameron Middleton, Randall Smith, Lynne Wonacott, and Chris Young present. Also present were Development Services Director Jim Hamilton, Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie, City Attorney Rick Duvernay, Project Coordinator Gary Otremba, Senior Planner Kent Manuel, and Executive Assistant II Anita Felion.

***PUBLIC HEARING - AMENDMENT TO USE PERMIT UP-20-94***, by Turtle Bay Exploration Park, requesting approval to construct a 130-room hotel and an 80-seat restaurant and to relocate the Turtle Bay Museum entrance that will encroach into the 100-year floodplain. The property is located at 840 Sundial Bridge Drive in a "PF-SP-FP" Public Facilities with Specific Plan and Floodplain Overlay Districts. Environmental Determination: Addendum to a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Recommendation: Adoption of the Addendum and approval. ***Continued from the meeting of September 14, 2010.*** L-010-390

Due to a conflict of interest, Commissioner Bert Meyer recused himself and left the dais.

Senior Planner Kent Manuel summarized the staff report. He noted that at its meeting of September 14, 2010, the Planning Commission (Commission) continued consideration of the item, directing that the applicant provide additional project details generally related to the planned relocation of the museum entry and overall nonvehicle circulation issues. Mr. Manuel stated that in addition to the issues noted above, a question of consistency with the second-access policies of the General Plan was also expressed.

Mr. Manuel continued that the applicant's representative, James Theimer of Trilogy Architecture, had been working with staff to provide clarification and refinements to the existing site plan to illustrate how the concerns expressed by the Commission were addressed. He added that Commissioner Lynne Wonacott was also involved in those discussions.

Mr. Manuel said since the primary museum entry was being relocated to what was now a secondary entry, it would not be directly visible from the parking lots. He recalled that the Commission questioned how Turtle Bay Exploration Park (TBEP) would direct patrons to the new entrance and voiced concern about the distance between the parking lots and the new museum entry and the ability of some patrons to reasonably navigate that distance. Mr. Manuel stated that to improve access to the new primary museum entrance, particularly for those who might be disabled or find it difficult to walk from the parking lot to the entrance, the existing museum access driveway would be modified to provide additional drop-off spaces. He observed that accessible parking spaces would be located in the main parking lots as required by the California Building Code. He mentioned that public access to the museum would also be available from the hotel lobby (current Visitor Center) where patrons would be able to purchase tickets and use the existing boardwalk to enter the facility. He continued that an entry kiosk or similar identifier would be constructed at the museum's driveway entrance near the main parking lot. Mr. Manuel noted that TBEP would also develop a wayfinding system, including signage and other visual cues, to direct the public to the museum's two entrances.

Another issue discussed by Mr. Manuel was access to the Paul Bunyan Forest Camp. He noted that a new pedestrian entrance gate for schools and other groups would be added next to the existing service gate located between the Monolith and the hotel. He added that a new bus turnout would be provided just south of the Monolith. Mr. Manuel stated that the Paul Bunyan Forest Camp would still be accessible to TBEP patrons by entering either through the hotel lobby or from the museum via the existing boardwalk. He mentioned the letter submitted by Nadine Bailey, Committee Chair

of the Paul Bunyan Camp Master Plan, in which she noted the committee's support for TBEP's hotel project.

Regarding the bike and pedestrian path, Mr. Manuel advised that changes in texture and color would be used where pedestrian paths crossed driveways as an added safety measure and to better delineate the access route. He added that the conditions of approval required that these connections be constructed. Mr. Manuel advised that hotel patrons would be directed from the porte cochere to the hotel entrance with construction of an entry feature which led to the hotel's outdoor plaza.

Mr. Manuel advised that primary public-street access to the Convention Center area and TBEP was limited to Sundial Bridge Drive. He pointed out that an emergency-access point to State Route 44 (SR 44) existed behind the KRCC television station. Mr. Manuel noted that adding a formal second public-street access had been discussed on numerous occasions over the years, with options ranging from construction of a vehicle bridge over the Sacramento River to connect with North Market Street and/or providing a connection to Continental Street through the Rodeo Grounds and the Redding Cemetery. He mentioned that a bridge crossing was indicated on the General Plan Diagram and was discussed in the Redding Riverfront Specific Plan. According to Mr. Manuel, neither of these alternatives had been pursued due to costs, environmental impacts, and potential eminent-domain issues. He continued that while the City attempted to provide second-access streets to development projects, it was not always feasible to do so. He noted that the City had approved a number of projects where a second-access street was not provided, but alternative methods of providing for public safety were instituted. Mr. Manuel advised that such methods included allowing a single-access street to be widened with an additional lane to better accommodate traffic in the event of an emergency and allowing emergency-access-only connections to exterior streets. He mentioned that these accommodations were not unlike the situation at the Convention Center area, given the recent expansion of the SR 44 overcrossing and the direct emergency-access route to SR 44. Mr. Manuel said staff recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Use Permit UP-20-94 Amendment subject to the previously approved conditions of approval and the addition of Conditions 30 through 47.

Commissioner Randall Smith mentioned that someone from the Garden Tract Subdivision believed there would be no access to the Sundial Bridge from the subdivision during construction of the hotel. He said he told the claimant that the accessory loop to the east would always be open during construction. Mr. Manuel confirmed that a route would always be open to the Sundial Bridge. He said the Sacramento River Trail would not be affected by construction of the hotel, and there would always be circulation options for bicyclists as well who preferred to remain on the street. Mr. Smith also observed that the Sundial Bridge could be used for an emergency exit in addition to the other emergency exits mentioned earlier.

Chairman Emmett Burroughs recalled the motion at the previous meeting to not reopen the public-hearing portion of the continued item. He inquired if the Commissioners still desired to keep the matter closed or if they wanted to reopen the public hearing. He stated that if the public hearing was reopened, he would enforce the 3-minute limit for each speaker, with a 30-minute total.

Commissioner Chris Young favored reopening the public hearing. Mr. Burroughs reminded the Commissioners that the item was continued to discuss the previously mentioned items and not new issues that might be brought up at today's meeting.

Commissioner Lynne Wonacott noted that she had participated in meetings with staff and the project's developers and believed the issues had been dealt with satisfactorily. She saw no reason to reopen the public hearing.

Commissioners Cameron Middleton, Michele Goedert, and Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Young and supported Mr. Burroughs' time limits.

- Motion:** Commissioner Chris Young moved that the Planning Commission reopen the public hearing.
- Second:** Commissioner Randall Smith.
- Ayes:** Commissioners Burroughs, Goedert, Middleton, Smith, Wonacott, and Young.
- Noes:** None.
- Abstain:** Commissioner Meyer.
- Absent:** None.

The Chairman reopened the public hearing at 4:28 p.m.

Archer Pugh, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of TBEP, explained that TBEP was forming a for-profit corporation in order to operate the proposed hotel. He said this corporation would be the sole owner and that the Sheraton Corporation would be the franchisor and would not have any ownership interests or rights to the hotel. Mr. Pugh said the Sheraton Corporation merely granted the rights to use its name and reservation system. He stated that financing was coming from two private foundations that were loaning money to the corporation; the corporation would also be seeking funding from a bank for the balance. Mr. Pugh indicated that the stock in the corporation would be owned by TBEP. He said the corporation would hire a manager to oversee the operations of the hotel. Mr. Pugh advised that all fees and impounds would have to be paid, the same as any other developer would have to pay.

Maggie Redmond, Chief Operating Officer, TBEP, indicated that the access driveway to the new museum entrance would be widened so that more than one car at a time could drop off passengers. She noted that TBEP was also considering the installation of benches for the comfort of individuals waiting for their families to pick them up. She said TBEP desired to have the hotel lobby also be an access point for the park itself. Ms. Redmond noted that the Paul Bunyan Forest Camp was also part of the park and that TBEP wanted to ensure access to it for members and guests. She pointed out that the new area for field-trip and school-bus drop-offs was in a safer location.

James Theimer, the applicant's architect, Trilogy Architecture, discussed the inner connectivity of the park. He believed the promenade would provide an amenity for the whole community. He noted that there was an additional bicycle path for those who were not comfortable with riding a bicycle on the street. Mr. Theimer pointed out that many hotels in larger cities had the entrances open directly onto the sidewalk; however, he was working to create a separation so that a hotel guest would not have to mill around on the promenade while others were walking past. Mr. Theimer noted that his staff was also working on signage to create a wayfinding system.

Mr. Young asked where Pacific Gas and Electric Company's main gas line was located. Mr. Theimer responded that the location would have to be determined through a USA (Underground Service Alert) survey, which would occur before construction of the building.

Joe Machado asked for further clarification of the for-profit arrangement with The McConnell Foundation. He voiced concern that the City was leasing land that was paid for with taxpayer money to The McConnell Foundation. He said some economists had predicted that it could take more than ten years to recover from the recession. Mr. Machado inquired if the City could become liable for the loan should the hotel project fail.

Mr. Burroughs pointed out that some of the questions regarding the leased land had been addressed at the previous meeting. He said the Commissioners did not have authority to discuss the costs or lease, and they were only going to address the amendment and the issues that were previously discussed.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay stated that it would be necessary to review all the documents in order to respond to Mr. Machado's questions. He advised that there was nothing in the current 99-year lease the City had with TBEP, however, to indicate that the City had an interest in who was financing the museum. He further advised that these same issues could have been brought up at the City Council meeting during discussion of the lease, but they were not. Mr. Duvernay said the City's agreement granted TBEP a 99-year lease in return for building millions of dollars worth of improvements. He pointed out that if the hotel venture did not succeed, TBEP would still have a

99-year lease. He confirmed that the City was not liable if the project failed. Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Burroughs thanked Ms. Wonacott for getting into the details with staff and the developer and for taking the time to work with them to make sure the questions were answered.

**Motion:** Commissioner Lynne Wonacott moved that the Planning Commission adopt the Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve Use Permit UP-20-94 Amendment subject to the previously approved conditions of approval and the addition of Conditions 30 through 47.

**Second:** Commissioner Michele Goedert.

**Discussion:** Mr. Young was satisfied that most of his questions had been answered.

**Ayes:** Commissioners Burroughs, Goedert, Smith, Wonacott, and Young.

**Noes:** Commissioner Middleton.

**Abstain:** Commissioner Meyer.

**Absent:** None.

Commissioner Bert Meyer returned to the dais.

***PUBLIC HEARING - RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO REDDING MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 17, SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE***, by the City of Redding, along with related amendments to Title 18, Zoning Ordinance, supporting residential condominium development and Chapter 2.55, Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC), clarifying the role of CSAC in reviewing subdivisions and consideration of proposed standard conditions of approval applicable to all tentative subdivision maps. *Environmental Determination: General Rule Exemption. Staff Recommendation: Recommend adoption to the City Council. L-010-500-050*

Planning Manager Douglas DeMallie summarized the staff report. He noted that with adoption of the City's new General Plan in November 2000 and new Zoning Ordinance in December 2002, and along with evolving subdivision design trends, certain sections of the current Subdivision Ordinance (Ordinance) warranted refreshing. He said the General Plan Implementation Program prioritized an update of the Ordinance to ensure consistency with its goals and policies. Mr. DeMallie continued that the existing Ordinance was also lacking organization and contained areas of redundant language. He explained that the main objectives of the update included:

- Reorganizing, condensing, and simplifying the Ordinance where appropriate.
- Removing provisions that were dated, redundant, and/or unnecessary.
- Addressing current General Plan goals and policies as needed.
- Incorporating new Zoning Ordinance nomenclature, references, and requirements.
- Recognizing current administrative procedures and requirements.
- Addressing any recent changes in the Map Act as needed.

Mr. DeMallie advised that one of the accomplishments of the Ordinance update was a major chapter reorganization, providing a logical order of topics that followed the typical subdivision process, greatly improving ease of use by staff and the land development community. He emphasized that the update consisted mostly of reorganization; there were not many new procedures or standards. Mr. DeMallie explained that Chapter 17.60, *Subdivision Design*, was where much of the General Plan policy focus was addressed in the updated Ordinance. He stated that the main area of General Plan policy direction and support included: Neighborhood Design; Lot Design; Environmental and Safety; Fire Safety; Streets and Circulation; Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Accommodations; Connections with the Natural Environment; River and Stream Setbacks; and Utilities and Storm Drains.

Mr. DeMallie noted that beginning in 1989, the City had applied standard conditions of approval to all major subdivision projects based on City Council Policy 1701. He said these standard subdivision conditions were meant to help shorten the list of project-specific conditions by applying

by reference a separate list of established "boilerplate" conditions that were common to all subdivisions. He pointed out that over the years, the standard conditions had become somewhat antiquated and were in need of updating. Mr. DeMallie explained that under the current City Council (Council) policy, all amendments for standard conditions needed to be taken back to the Council for adoption by resolution. He stated that considering the discretionary land use "planning agency" authority granted to the Planning Commission, Section 17.04.070.C of the updated Ordinance reassigned authority to the Planning Commission to establish and maintain standard subdivision conditions.

Mr. DeMallie continued that Chapter 17.54 of the updated Ordinance contained the City's requirements related to park and recreational land dedications and in-lieu fees based on the state Quimby Act. He observed that overall, there were relatively minor changes between the existing Ordinance and the language included in the draft. He noted that Chapter 18.10.030 of the Redding Municipal Code (RMC) currently accorded full authority over all elements of subdivision review and approval to the Planning Commission (unless appealed to the Council). Mr. DeMallie said one change of note involved confirmation of the role of the Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC) in the matter of subdivision review. He stated that the language in the current Ordinance was silent on CSAC's role in reviewing subdivision projects for recommendation on parkland dedications and/or in-lieu fees and other park, trail, and recreation matters. He pointed out that Chapter 2.55 of the RMC, which established the duties of CSAC, was also vague on this responsibility.

According to Mr. DeMallie, regardless of the lack of direct acknowledgment in the existing RMC, it was the current practice that all subdivision projects be routed to the Community Services Department for review and comment. He advised that the Community Services Director then scheduled the matter for review by CSAC, when determined necessary, to establish a formal recommendation to the Planning Commission. Mr. DeMallie noted that in its review of the administrative version of the updated Ordinance, CSAC had supported Ordinance language that would require CSAC recommendations to be implemented unless specific findings were made by the Planning Commission that a deviation was *"necessary to resolve conflicting land use and/or environmental factors affecting the total project."* He noted that the Commission's action would then be reported to CSAC. Mr. DeMallie stated that the language recommended by staff did not include the stipulation for findings when deviating from a CSAC recommendation but did include direction for a report back to CSAC. He continued that CSAC and the Community Services Director had asked that the Planning Commission support the alternate language in its recommendation to the Council on the updated Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. DeMallie clarified that the language that staff was recommending was found in Chapter 17.54.060.B. He said staff felt the language that CSAC was recommending blurred the lines over who had authority for tentative map approval.

Mr. DeMallie advised that the draft Ordinance and draft standard conditions had been forwarded to local engineers and development consultants for comments and that an open house and workshop had been conducted as well. He noted that there were no comments or requests to change language in the draft. He complimented Associate Planner Ron Adams for his efforts in updating the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. DeMallie also thanked City Surveyor Bruce Watkins for his support on the technical aspect of mapping requirements. Mr. DeMallie said staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the update to Redding Municipal Code, Title 17, Subdivision Ordinance, along with related amendments to Title 18, Zoning Ordinance, supporting residential condominium development, and Chapter 2.55, Community Services Advisory Commission, clarifying the role of CSAC in reviewing subdivisions, and proposed standards conditions of approval applicable to all tentative subdivision maps.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Adams and other staff members as well for the revised Ordinance.

Mr. DeMallie responded to comments and questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Cameron Middleton questioned staff's proposal to transfer authority for final subdivision map approval to the City Engineer. He felt the approval should stay with the Council.

Mr. DeMallie explained the process, noting that the City Engineer had the authority to determine if the subdivision had satisfied all the requirements and conditions that the Planning Commission imposed on the tentative map and if all the improvements (streets, utility infrastructure, fire consideration) had been constructed in accordance with City standards. He said the current process required setting the item on the agenda as a consent item for Council approval, which would often slow the development process for the developer.

City Attorney Rick Duvernay advised that when the final map approval went to Council, there was no discretion to be exercised or ability to deny it. He said it was a routine item on the consent agenda, and since the Council met twice a month, there could be a three-week difference, which could be important to an applicant when trying to move a project forward. Mr. Duvernay pointed out that a prerequisite to the Subdivision Map Act was that the City Engineer had to determine and make certification that the tentative map was in compliance. He noted that the Subdivision Map Act had been changed approximately ten years earlier to allow the final approval to be delegated to the City Engineer. He stated that there were very few cities left in California that had this item go to their council.

Commissioner Chris Young asked if there were any engineers on CSAC. He wondered who determined the layout regarding terrain for a park and trees. He questioned how the members of CSAC had the authority to make decisions when an applicant had to have a licensed engineer draw the plans for a project.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton responded that CSAC received its powers from the Council, the same as the Planning Commission. He remarked that parks and recreation were important issues in the City's General Plan. He explained that authority was granted to CSAC to review the operations of the City's parks and recreation facilities and that Chapter 2.55 also gave them clear direction to participate in long-range planning and identification of park and recreation needs. He continued that park and recreation issues had risen significantly over the previous ten years and that CSAC believed it had a right to be more closely involved in the process.

Commissioner Randall Smith believed streamlining made the process more fair and practical. He asked if items such as bioswales, broadleaf shade trees, Best Management Practices for the Clean Water Act, and solar and renewal energy practices could be included in the Ordinance. He mentioned storm-drain labeling and noted that the City removed approximately 4,500 storm-drain labels with the intent of replacing them; however, replacement had never occurred in any of the subdivisions. Mr. Smith asserted that CSAC should be included in the process and that whatever could be done to make the General Plan and Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan stronger should occur. He favored CSAC's regulatory authority to the extent possible.

Mr. Hamilton explained that the Planning Commission's authority to approve or deny a tentative map was granted by the City Council through the Subdivision Ordinance. He said planning commissions were recognized specifically in state planning law as an advisory agency that the Council could delegate authority to.

Commissioner Lynne Wonacott agreed that information obtained from CSAC was valuable, but she believed CSAC should remain in an advisory position. The Chairman opened the public hearing at 5:42 p.m.

Kim Niemer, Community Services Director, advised that CSAC had been the City's lead agency on a number of plans, including the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan and Bikeway Action Plan. She then introduced the Chair of CSAC, Susan Hinz.

Susan Hinz, Chair, Community Services Advisory Commission, stated that CSAC was not trying to take over the job of the Commissioners, but rather, wanted to be of assistance to them. She noted that CSAC received the draft packet of the Ordinance in June or July for review. Ms. Hinz continued that CSAC was the keeper of trails, open space, and parks and had the responsibility to do its best to see that the plans were implemented.

Ms. Hinz said CSAC members took their job seriously and that part of their job was to review one small portion of the Subdivision Map Act process. She said CSAC would review the requirements of park and trail locations and pursue funding for them. She stated that the members of CSAC were very passionate about their role of implementing plans or recommending policies and procedures to implement those plans. Ms. Hinz asked for the opportunity to revise the language that was proposed by CSAC, since she had only heard about the lack of consensus one day prior to today's meeting. She hoped that CSAC could work with the City Attorney to come up with more acceptable language. She reiterated that CSAC was not trying to usurp the Commissioners' power; CSAC's desire was to furnish them with facts and information and to provide the best advice possible. She said CSAC had also been appointed by the Council and would like recognition for that, but CSAC was not asking for approval authority.

Ms. Goedert asked why CSAC objected to staff's language. Ms. Goedert believed it codified CSAC's responsibility and that the only difference was that the Commissioners were not *required* to apply CSAC's recommendations. Ms. Hinz said CSAC would like more specificity. She stated that if the Commissioners did not agree with a recommendation from CSAC, the group would like to be informed of that. Ms. Goedert pointed out, and Mr. DeMallie confirmed, that this was part of staff's language and recommendation. Ms. Goedert expressed appreciation for CSAC's involvement but preferred staff's recommendation. Ms. Hinz again requested that CSAC be allowed to clarify the language. She believed CSAC could produce a more satisfactory version for staff and the Commissioners.

Mr. Smith recalled the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Council concerning the Oasis Road Specific Plan and how the Council overruled it. He noted that the Council members never provided the Commissioners with a reason why they overruled them. Mr. Smith felt the Commissioners would be obliged to explain to CSAC if, and why, they did not follow a recommendation from CSAC. He asserted that the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan was only a shelf document unless it had an advocate.

Mr. Meyer suggested asking Community Services Department staff to provide an update to the Commissioners on the City's parks and trails at a future Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Middleton concurred with Mr. Smith. He believed recommendations coming from CSAC to the Planning Commission deserved to be considered. He encouraged increased communication between the two commissions. Mr. Middleton agreed that CSAC should be informed if the Commissioners had a particular issue with CSAC's recommendation.

Mr. Young concurred with Mr. Middleton and Mr. Smith that CSAC had a role; however, he wanted that role clearly defined. He mentioned the discussions that had dealt with the layout and planning of the park in the Highland Park Subdivision. Mr. Young also mentioned that he did not want to see another level of bureaucracy increase. He was comfortable with the status quo and how parks and trails were discussed and planned. Mr. Young believed providing CSAC with more authority would only slow down the process. He also asked why CSAC received its information in June or July but the Commissioners only received the Ordinance two weeks ago.

Mr. Hamilton replied that CSAC received the portion related to parks so that it could provide input; it did not receive the entire Ordinance. He advised the Commissioners that they could continue the item to the next Planning Commission meeting if they so desired.

Mr. Young observed that he had been a Commissioner for six years. He wondered why the Commissioners did not receive their regular staff-report packets earlier than the Friday before the Tuesday meetings.

Mr. DeMallie responded that staff had been in dialogue with CSAC in June or July to discuss what language should be included in the Ordinance; at the same time, staff was also working with Redding Electric Utility and the Redding Fire Department as well as other departments, but none of the departments received the whole document at that time. He continued that two engineers expressed concern at a workshop about the CSAC language "*shall apply*" and that they wondered who would have the authority for parkland dedication. He said staff felt the term "*shall apply*" blurred those

lines. Mr. DeMallie noted that the Commissioners received the draft Ordinance 17 days prior to today's meeting and that this was the only item at issue discussed in the staff report.

Mr. Young preferred to keep the language as is, with the Commissioners having the final authority and not having to accept CSAC's final determination on parks and subdivision layout.

Mr. Middleton inquired if it would be possible to permit CSAC more time to revise the language. He asked if the Commission could recommend adoption of the Ordinance at tonight's meeting and then allow CSAC to come back for an amendment if the language could be agreed upon. Mr. Middleton preferred staff's recommendation for the language but said he would also be agreeable to having CSAC come back at a later time with a revised version for an amendment to the Ordinance.

Charles Alexander felt allowing the use of "*shall apply*" would blur the lines and give CSAC authority that it did not currently have. He favored the words "*shall consider*." Determining that no one else wished to comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing at 6:07 p.m.

Mr. Middleton suggested keeping staff's recommendation and allow CSAC to return at a later date with a revised version for consideration. Regarding the recommendation to have the City Engineer grant final approval for recordation of final maps and to accept offers of dedication, Mr. Middleton preferred to leave the authority with the Council.

**Motion:** Commissioner Cameron Middleton moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the update to Redding Municipal Code, Title 17, Subdivision Ordinance, along with related amendments to Title 18, Zoning Ordinance, supporting residential condominium development, and Chapter 2.55, Community Services Advisory Commission, clarifying the role of the CSAC in reviewing subdivisions, and proposed standards conditions of approval applicable to all tentative subdivision maps, with the condition that approval and certification of final maps stay as they are with the City Council.

**Second:** Commissioner Chris Young.

**Discussion:** Ms. Wonacott objected to the motion. She recalled Mr. Duvernay's statements on the uselessness of sending maps to the Council, and she felt the Council members did not need to look at an item that they could not deny anyway. She mentioned that developers sometimes experienced delays of more than one month just waiting for the item to appear on the Council's agenda.

Mr. Young was more concerned with allowing one man the authority for denial than he was with the possible delay of approval.

Mr. Smith agreed with Ms. Wonacott, noting that Mr. Duvernay had stated that most cities in the state were no longer having the City Council grant final approval. Mr. Smith maintained that the Ordinance did not address the environmental issues sufficiently. He noted that he had attempted unsuccessfully to find Best Management Practices addressed regarding storm-drain language.

Ms. Goedert supported staff's recommendation regarding final map approval by the City Engineer. She agreed with Mr. Smith's requests to incorporate language about energy efficiency, solar power, broadleaf shade trees, and storm labeling.

Mr. Hamilton acknowledged that those items mentioned were appropriate and necessary. He explained, however, that storm drainage, water quality, environmental requirements, etc., were addressed through construction standards. He pointed out that the City had a much larger set of standards related to construction of subdivisions. He felt it was not appropriate for the Subdivision Ordinance to address storm-drain labeling. Mr. Smith said he was referring to the standard conditions, and he maintained that the document should at least refer to those issues.

Ms. Goedert agreed with Mr. Smith's concerns regarding the standard conditions of approval. She wondered why the City could designate where someone was allowed to park a recreational vehicle but could not require a developer to install storm-drain labels. Mr. Hamilton said staff tried to

remove standards from an ordinance because standards changed all the time, and the City would be required to initiate an Ordinance-provision process in order to change standards. He repeated that the Ordinance required compliance with standards. As an example, Mr. Hamilton noted that energy efficiency was currently in the Building Code. He advised that in January 2011, a new "green" Building Code would be in effect in California with substantially higher standards.

**Ayes:** Commissioners Middleton and Young.  
**Noes:** Burroughs, Goedert, Meyer, Smith, and Wonacott,  
**Abstain:** None.  
**Absent:** None.

**Motion died.**

**Motion:** Commissioner Lynne Wonacott moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council adopt the update to Redding Municipal Code, Title 17, Subdivision Ordinance, along with related amendments to Title 18, Zoning Ordinance, supporting residential condominium development, and Chapter 2.55, Community Services Advisory Commission, clarifying the role of the CSAC in reviewing subdivisions, and proposed standards conditions of approval applicable to all tentative subdivision maps (**staff's recommendation**).

**Second:** Commissioner Bert Meyer.

**Discussion:** Mr. Smith asked how the Commissioners could ensure that the items of concern would be included in the forthcoming standards. Mr. Burroughs confirmed that the concerns were storm-drain labeling, energy-efficiency standards, broadleaf shade trees, and bioswales.

Mr. Hamilton explained that staff would report on those topics and how they would be addressed. He said staff could return with a comprehensive report at the second meeting in November.

**Ayes:** Commissioners Burroughs, Goedert, Meyer, Middleton, Smith, Wonacott, and Young.  
**Noes:** None.  
**Abstain:** None.  
**Absent:** None.

The Commissioners expressed their appreciation to Mr. Adams and other staff members who participated in the Subdivision Ordinance update.

***PUBLIC PARTICIPATION***

None.

***COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS***

Commissioner Bert Meyer advised that he had been attempting to reconstruct the parking lot at his hotel in the City of Redding but had experienced repeated changes and delays in the planning process. He said he had hoped to begin the renovation during the summer but had just received approval for his plans. Mr. Meyer voiced displeasure that he was now going to be forced to work on the project during the winter.

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton noted that the City had a Dispute Resolution Policy in place if an applicant was dissatisfied with the process or service received.

Commissioner Michele Goedert recalled the public-safety and second-access discussion during the public hearing on Turtle Bay Exploration Park. She believed use of the area for large-scale events needed to be reexamined. She questioned the adequacy of signage posted for pedestrian emergency access.

Commissioner Randall Smith reminded everyone that the Community Creek Cleanup was scheduled for Saturday, October 2. He expressed his appreciation to those who had already registered and to the various City departments for their support.

Commissioner Chris Young asked Mr. Hamilton if there were problems with the Landscape Maintenance Districts in the City of Redding. Mr. Hamilton confirmed that there were funding issues, noting that the older districts that were established in the 1990s did not include inflationary increases like the newer districts did. He said the assessments had remained the same in the older districts, yet the costs had risen and there was not enough money in those districts to maintain the landscape. He said one of the options for dealing with the issue could be asking the residents in the older subdivisions to vote for an increase in their assessments, since landscape maintenance added to the value of their property.

Mr. Young also inquired as to when the new computer tracking system (ILMS) for the City would be implemented. Mr. Hamilton advised that the system was not yet fully operational. He said staff was expecting to "go live" in January 2011, with full implementation expected to occur in April 2011.

***DIRECTOR'S REPORT - State Route 273 Transportation Concept Report.***

Development Services Director Jim Hamilton announced that he had attended a workshop that was held by Caltrans to receive public input on transportation issues on State Route 273. He said he would ask a representative from Caltrans to present a report to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hamilton also asked the Commissioners if they desired to conduct a field trip on October 12 to review some of the projects that were either fully developed or under construction in Redding. The Commissioners responded affirmatively.

***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chairman Emmett Burroughs adjourned the meeting at 6:44 p.m.

---

Jim Hamilton, AICP  
Acting Secretary

---

Emmett Burroughs  
Chairman