# CITY OF CALISTOGA PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 15, 2008 5:30 PM Calistoga Community Center 1307 Washington St., Calistoga, CA Chairman Jeff Manfredi Vice- Chairman Clayton Creager Commissioner Carol Bush Commissioner Paul Coates Commissioner Nicholas Kite

## "California Courts have consistently upheld that development is a privilege, not a right."

Among the most cited cases for this proposition are Associated Home Builders, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek, 4 Cal.3d633 (1971) (no right to subdivide), and Trent Meredith, Inc. v. City of Oxnard, 114 Cal. App. 3d 317 (1981) (development is a privilege).

Chairman Manfredi called the meeting to order at 5:36 PM.

A. ROLL CALL

1 2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19 20

21 22

2324

25

2627

28 29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

**Present:** Chairman Jeff Manfredi, Vice-Chairman Clayton Creager, Commissioners Carol Bush, Nicholas Kite and Paul Coates. **Staff Present**: Jim McCann, City Manager, Charlene Gallina, Planning and Building Director, Ken MacNab, Senior Planner and Kathleen Guill, Planning Commission Secretary. **Absent**: Erik Lundquist, Assistant Planner.

**B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** 

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

D. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA

There was motion by **Commissioner Coates**, seconded by **Chairman Manfredi** to approve the agenda as submitted. **Motion carried:** 5-0-0-0.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR

F. TOUR OF INSPECTION

G. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE

H. PUBLIC HEARING

**1. Draft Urban Design Plan.** Initial presentation of the Draft Urban Design Plan (Urban Design Plan) and consideration of public comments received to date. The Urban Design Plan is required by the General Plan and is intended to articulate community.

**City Manager McCann** thanked those taking the time to come to the meetings, going over the documents and providing comments, stating it was much appreciated. He reported receipt of an additional six to seven comment letters. He advised certain discussion topics may include items where a conflict of interest may occur due to the proximity of a Commissioners home or business, and a Commissioner may need to abstain from those portions of the discussion; however they may participate in the larger conversation.

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 2 of 11

- City Manager McCann summarized that previous activities included two previous public meetings and additional meetings through Chamber of Commerce. He proceeded to address possible misconceptions of what an Urban Design Plan is as follows:
- It is not a new General Plan:

42

45

46

47

48

49

5051

52

53 54

55

58

59

60

61

62

65

66

67 68

69 70

71

72

73

74 75

76

77 78

79

80

- It does not replace our General Plan;
  - In most regards it does not present any change to the current General Plan;
- Specific to the Community Identity Element the intent is to refine ideas obtained from the directions of the current General Plan through focused discussion.
  - The current General Plan has a wide range of land use designations, establishes policies and goals, with a wide range of land use available, we need to look at key locations, examine and recommend refinement for clarity of policies.
  - Community identity. The UDP introduction identifies its' purpose is to insure the special character of Calistoga, it includes a photographic survey to provide a guide for redevelopment efforts, it provides five character areas that are the basis of recommendations. Each character area has consistent elements, existing conditions, and provides anticipated character for those character areas.

**City Manager McCann** noted many suggestions and expressed concerns as follows:

- Concern we may invite too much development to the community;
- development that might occur could do damage to that "special character" that defines our town;
  - concern we should not allow the downtown core to be dissipated and/or allow another area to compete with the downtown;
  - concern for the role that redevelopment of the glider port could play, and how it will affect the downtown and the commercial area in general;
  - a concerned with the recommendations for the Foothill corridor:
- concern there is too much emphasis on round-a-bouts as preferred, especially at Petrified Forest Road;
  - a plan line indicating at some point there is a desire to have a road established between Foothill and Grant Street:
  - a general agreement to work with CalTrans to have Highway 29 rerouted, providing several alternatives
  - any road extension from Washington Street to Dunaweal and/or to Silverado Trail, needs to be a road that reflects rural character and small street sections, and shouldn't encroach on agricultural land;
  - there are a lot of things we don't know and we should study before we suggest refinement to the General Plan.

**City Manager McCann** reported the UDP Committee has met on a couple of occasions to sift through the recommendations and directed attention to the points outlined in Staff Report, page 5 to 15. He noted it was suggested the Urban Design Plan is a development plan and agreed it was correct to a certain extent, and it is fair to say the General Plan and Urban Design Plan is a form of a development plan. However, the idea is to refine land uses and range of activity, to allow new development and redevelopment to enhance the small town character.

**City Manager McCann** provided an overview of recommendations for change within the Staff Report:

81 82 Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 3 of 11

#### 85 <u>Circulation, Page 6 of 15</u>

86

87

88

91 92

93 94

95 96

97 98

99

100

101

102

103

104

108

109

110

120

121

125

- Add more language to the Circulation Systems chapter stating we need to find traffic solutions and, noting there will be much analysis that needs to occur to come to a determination and that will need lots of public input.
- Delete and amend language to state there is a desire to relocate Highway 29 from Downtown to Foothill, perhaps considering Dunaweal Lane, Larkmead Lane or even Deer Park Road.
  - Delete reference to a round-a-bout as specific design consideration, replace with more general language, need to study and evaluate different alternatives at specific intersections.
    - Clarify the extension of Washington needs to respect agricultural land and be designed appropriately.

He noted the Committee heard the reaction from residents regarding the establishment of a "plan line" for the future extension of local serving roadway from Foothill to Grant Street and the committee still believes that such a road will aid circulation in that stretch of town and should be considered and wants land owners to be aware of that thought.

#### Downtown Area, Page 7 of 15

- Character concerns with historic downtown and sub areas. Fairway/Stevenson and Wilkinson/Gliderport. Delete and combine them into the downtown character area.
- Delete the land use recommendation, basically fill the gap, due to concern of practicality;
- Concern about generally prohibiting non-retail noting it could make downtown less attractive, drop the language to make it clear those uses are presently allowed and office uses would certainly stay.
  - Cal Mart site suggest modifying the language, because the language is too strong and we do
    not want Cal Mart to leave, but we should look at enhancing the parking and circulation for the
    whole area.
- Modify boundaries, noting we should include Calistoga Spa and Hot Springs and Roman Spa within the historic downtown.
- As redevelopment occurs thought should be given to parking needs on site or within reasonable distance.
- Fairway Stevenson, Lincoln frontage in historic downtown area. All different components would be added to downtown.
- Balance of Gliderport, maybe the central portion should become its own separate character area, perhaps it's too large of an area, but it did not fit well in historic downtown, and the land use connectivity carried into that.
  - Suggestion to delete the recommendations to allow three story construction within the Highway 29/Foothill corridor, delete the design character recommending two story apartments
- Identify appropriate locations for cross walks on Highway29/Foothill and determine scope of enhancing pedestrian traffic in the Foothill corridor.
- Take out the solid fencing restriction on Highway 29/Foothill.

#### 126 Resort Area, page 9

- Referencing development and new development potential, he noted additional language recommending small scale low rise design, and deletion of a number of properties from inclusion in the Resort Area as follows.
- Delete the designation of the City owned Mt. Washington parcel, the adjacent two acre piece, as well as the vineyard glen that is to the east from the Resort area and retain their current

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 4 of 11

General Plan designations as well as the Luvisi, Fredianni, and the properties on Brannan Street. Existing designations will continue to guide development of those properties.

• Retain the balance of the boundaries of the Resort Area but modify the land use designations of those areas to the westerly side of Lincoln Avenue from Wappo Drive to Silverado Trail identifying only residential development should occur at the densities presently allowed in the existing Community Commercial, resort character area allows residential development. Limited office and commercial could be considered.

• Recognize Calistoga Beverage Company as a long-standing and very positive member of the Calistoga community and indicate the use as fully compliant, no question of non conformity. Also recognize expansion or improvement of the facility is possible within the area already developed, and further redevelopment could occur suggesting new land use language for the undeveloped portion to the rear as available for residential development. A small portion fronts Lincoln and should be developed complimentary to active use for that area.

**City Manager McCann** acknowledged there is not perfect spelling, and typographic errors as well as improper identification of road names or directional reference may be present.

City Manager McCann reported there has been a lot of discussion regarding plaza's within the plan. The current draft recommends two plaza's, the thought regarding the Sharpsteen/Police Station area is to keep the area as an active parking lot, but look at a redesign for a more attractive event plaza. The other plaza would be part of any redevelopment of the gliderport area, smaller in scale and located at the Lincoln frontage. The Fire Station parking lot will remain as a parking lot, with the river frontage improved as a part of the proposed River Promenade, no plaza suggested there.

Regarding the Community Center City Manager McCann stated it is suggested when this area redevelops at some point in the future the Community Center building could be removed, one option could be to include it as an element of the former gliderport, and similarly it might be housed in new municipal facilities in the lower Washington Character Area; some recreation functions which presently occur at the Community Center will occur in the planned recreation facilities at Logvy Park, including events and activities. Ultimately the UDP suggests reserving land in the lower Washington area, reminding it is just a reservation.

City Manager McCann reported it is important to identify and prioritize with an implementation plan, creating a list of things that would logically flow during implementation. Actions include amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, initiating the evaluation of designs including street scape, river trail, event plaza, etc. There is a need to continue to amend the Municipal Code to reflect and implement language and policies in the General Plan.

It has been suggested we need more information gathered, however he disagreed it is needed now as the General Plan is built on much data. in addition he noted the City participates in a lot of evaluation within the city both locally and regionally related to water and infrastructure, etc. The City is looking out over a 20 year horizon for guidance for our infrastructure planning to determine the adequacy of water and wastewater to accommodate growth and the history of infrastructure deficiencies and we have adequate resources for the build out of the General Plan. The use is guided through the Growth Management policies.

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 5 of 11

**City Manager McCann** noted there has been reasonable concern related to a River Trail system and how it might adversely impact neighbors and that is why the system must be studied to evaluate a reasonable alignment, but he wanted to make it clear there will be a public process and part of the thinking is it should not encroach or affect existing private property.

The last suggestion was related to design guidelines and discussion on the benefit of specific detailed guidelines verses the advantage of something other than that. The desire is to secure/retain "funky" and it would better if not formulaic and specific, it would rely on the language of the UDP and the General Plan to establish flexibility.

**Chairman Manfredi** opened the public discussion at 6:25 PM.

Kristin Casey, 1132 Denise Drive presented and read aloud her letter dated September 15, 2008 (Attachment A) and thanked the oversight committee for responding to concerns. She identified the changes and noted her appreciation, but also identified a list of continued concerns including issue with brining the Zoning Ordinance into compliance with the 2003 General Plan prior to adopting the UDP. Ms. Casey provided specific sections and pages of inconsistencies and suggested the UDP was an end run around the General Plan and the General Plan should not be forced into a secondary position. She stated the UDP would be invalid if inconsistent with the General Plan. Her letter includes further comment regarding the potential for an EIR, the size of resort accommodations, the Calistoga character, high density, infill affordable housing, street networks and enhancing open space especially at the entry corridors.

**Norma Tofanelli** stated she was privileged to read aloud for the record, a letter from Catherine Lerner, dated September 15, 2008 (Attachment B).stating Ms. Lerner was a pioneer of community. The letter included her views on several of the proposed changes, and noted limited funds are available and stressed we should do the most important things first, i.e. water, sewer, roads and drainage.

Chris Canning, Calistoga Beverage Company, formerly Calistoga Mineral Water, provided a brief history of the company's existence since 1924, moving from behind the current CalMart. He highlighted their positive contributions to Calistoga and acknowledged their appreciation for the recommended changes to the draft Urban Design Plan especially that their current operation is no longer considered non conforming. However, the biggest concern is the five acres of vacant property affronting Lincoln Avenue. He reported ownership of this property for 27 years and noted they have always inferred their intent for expansion and development. Changing business climates and the cost and development also gives pause to consider alternate uses. The original Urban Design Plan Draft identified no expansion, and designated high density; now the revisions say no expansion, still allows high density, but states it should not be used for visitor accommodation. He stated he would be remiss if he did not defend their opportunity to consider use for visitor accommodations, and he requested that it be looked into. As far as the topic of circulation/round-a-bouts he requested whatever we consider that it be large enough to accommodate tractor trailers.

**Diane Barrett** thanked the Committee for recommending the change to delete the land use recommendation on the Lincoln Avenue parking lot/Ace Hardware property, and the land use generally prohibiting non retail on ground floor space. She further appreciated the modification of boundaries to the downtown character area to include Gerard and the Calistoga Spa and Hot

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 6 of 11

Springs properties. Ms. Barrett stated there was still one issue @ page 74, first bullet stating: "Encourage property owners to improve and intensify the several privately owned parking lots on Gerard Street between West America Bank and Ace Hardware by appropriate reconfiguration, possibly in conjunction with comprehensive redevelopment, which includes the Fire Station and its parking lot." Asking does that mean intensifying capability or greater building density, both lots in question are in the rear of Magnolia Building and in front of the Calistoga Spa, and it includes Calistoga Spa required parking. Secondly, since the Gerard to Franklin block is to be included in the downtown area, is the East side of Gerard a transition area, or is the East side of Franklin now a transition area.

**Diane Barrett** continued referencing the objectives for lower Washington, recommending second floor residential and a complimentary use of local serving needs and asked is there really a need to have commercial, stating she doesn't think the area can support that much commercial development. Also the lower Washington area calls for development of affordable nature, and yet describes high quality materials are called for. Ms. Barrett wondered if perhaps calling for high quality was a bit much, noting there was no mention of stucco.

John Merchant, Indian Springs mentioned it was the 20<sup>th</sup> year Indian Springs has been in operation, noting 20 years and four million dollars in hotel taxes. Referencing the forty-four fellow acres downtown, he stated they planned to see a hotel in front to anchor. He reported unfortunately at no time had they been invited into the UDP process or asked to meet with committee's or staff, until six weeks ago they received a letter and were invited to a stake holders meeting, this followed the preparation of the entire plan, which he notes always referred to their property as the "gliderport". He stated he would appreciate it be identified as the Merchant property. Mr. Merchant identified some of the proposed items the City apparently will be asking them to provide, stating they border on eminent domain: City parking on Fairway, extension of Fairway, bike paths, City access, City town plaza, City town hall, noting this easily adds to Forty million dollars. Calistoga has very high taxes estimated at Two million per acre. He stated this cannot happen because it will make development infeasible. In closing Mr. Merchant stated they were hopeful and they have tried to open dialogue.

**Bob Fiddaman**, 1700 Mora encouraged people to keep in mind this is a grass roots effort, not a dream of outside consultants. It has been prepared by real Calistogans with lots of stake holders and an opportunity for input. He stated he was pleased with the responsiveness to recommendations for change, with very few exceptions. He recommended that Calistoga give this plan a life and reminded the General Plan calls for an update every 5 - 10 years, and the same provisions can be made for the Urban Design Plan. He acknowledged we should be careful regarding CEQA, and need to assure we do things in the in right order. Mr. Fiddaman then provided the following comments:

- Reference of the property behind Riverlea Square and it's designation as high density, in his opinion high density was the appropriate designation and it would be more feasible to develop.
  - Language prohibiting non retail downtown, he stated we should leave some form of the language in because some non-retail is alright, but we could say we discourage non retail to limit how much.
- He agreed we need flexibility to allow Calistoga Water to expand,
- He stated Diane Barrett's comments made sense, and we should provide as much flexibility as we can in lower Washington, to not be too dictatorial.

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 7 of 11

- He thought we should raise up the Planning initiative priority of street-scape improvements; he stated it is a scary topic and needs to be addressed very carefully, but our downtown is old and tired. If we spruced it up it would encourage re-investments from property owners
  - Just a few tweaks and we have a plan that looks good.

**Jean Kapolchok**, representing the Bounsal Family, pg 64 – 66, advised submittal of a letter provided in packet and stated the reason behind their requested language changes was to better describe the property.

- Development Character & Objectives, she stated the language is broad, appropriate, and open to significant interpretation, but we provide a little more detail to balance the ability to develop with consideration for the agricultural character and surroundings,
- Land Use section, balance the agricultural property with land development uses, broadening the uses within the property, include bicycle/pedestrian access, but support modification of the trail more on public lands not private lands, reminding the need for a balance of takings.

**Chairman Manfredi** called for a recess at 7:10 PM.

**Chairman Manfredi** reconvened the meeting at 7:28 PM.

**Norma Tofanelli**, 1001 Dunaweal Lane, stated she was impressed with the common sense comments by citizens, stating they were more reality based than the original Urban Design Plan Draft. She stated the citizens recognize as proposed the UDP would be a rural destruction plan, and totally wrong and contrary to the General Plan. Ms. Tofanelli suggested renaming the Urban Design Plan because it suggests we are urbanizing, but the UDP states over and over we want to protect small town qualities. She stated the entire approach is in conflict with the General Plan. Noting many are impacted and people are not fairly represented. She stated it would seem farmers are the step child in the process. Ms. Tofanelli hoped the Commission will continue the item to the October meeting for more discussion and perhaps be more focused.

Norma Tofanelli provided review of the potential road from Washington to Dunaweal as a truck route, noting it should be allowed in the City right of way only. She reminded the City had stated this bike path would not be a prelude to a truck route, and the City is going back on its word. Ms. Tofanelli pointed out there is not enough city land available without expensive redesign of what is in place and it won't fit into the public right-of- way unless we abandon the bike path and make it only a truck route. Her questions included how wide will it be, how many feet is required for the turn/entrance onto Dunaweal, has any consideration been given that it will come out right across from Sterling Winery. She stated we do have a problem with the Crystal Geyser tank trucks, and no water is actually from Calistoga any more, so that means they have doubled their trucks, but the City did not sunset or limit the truck trips, so it is not their problem. Ms. Tofanelli noted points of support for earlier comments, agreeing there is concern with boron in City water; and the reference to CEQA environmental review, maybe it does necessitate an EIR. She stated she is glad we withdrew a mandate for no local serving businesses downtown, because local serving business is what Calistoga is about.

Clarence Luvisi, Rosedale Road, hoped to get a copy of Kristin Casey's statements, noting he did not hear the vast majority of comments, but could hear there were clarifications of certain things that are not in conformity with the General Plan, and points of legality and process. So with that in mind we should take a serious look at two processes going on. Divide the plan, clarify the ideas that are part of Urban Design Plan concept refinement and do not need a change to the

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 8 of 11

General Plan, and those ideas that do require a General Plan amendment. Create a committee to establish a communication element on how the process should work in a small rural town. Take two or three topics in an evening. Have a dialogue about solutions, we have valid but competing principles and we will need to have creative solutions to balance those. Go back over the list to determine is it real.

331 332

333

334

335

**Dana Hemberger**, 1226 Washington Street, shared his concerns about affective down zoning of the acres at 1800 Lincoln, taking away the option for visitor accommodations and adjusting it to high density residential. The project in mind for this property has been presented and discussed prior to the UDP and is worthy of further discussion, and consideration to redirect the designation to residential is not a good idea for him or for the community.

336337

338

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

- Chris Ciriak, 1801 Foothill, shared concerns and comments as follows:
- She was happy to see that the rerouting of Highway 29 to the overburdened Foothill and was deleted as a recommendation.
- the pedestrian walk paths are a good idea but asked the City does not consider taking property by imminent domain.
  - Suggested we be careful pursuing paths on CalTrans right of way and consider what the cost for maintenance may be for the 2.7 miles of Highway.
  - questioned the proposed designation of the Merchant property stating clearly only the front should be designated Downtown; and we should consider a town square there and allow outdoor dining.
  - Stated she is not sure why we would want to create more shops in the down town area.
  - She does not want to see the parking lots at CalMart moved.
  - Quoted a guide book from out of country tourists that stated "Calistoga is the only real town in area where you can actually talk with the locals."
  - Noted she did not see a recommendation for a bus station, more bathrooms, or a taxi stand.
  - Look for opportunities other than spas.
  - She disagreed there is plenty of water.

354 355 356

**Mary Sue Fredianni**, requested please don't change Calistoga, we are the least changed in the City in the valley, let's remain Calistoga, charming and quaint.

357358359

360

361 362

363

364

365

366367

368

**Pam Kinzie** stated she was really heartened by the staff report and the types of recommended changes, she followed with the following comments and questions:

- Requested clarification of which parcels would be removed from the Resort designation.
- Suggested we need further analysis regarding water/waste water with relation to the amount of land that is changed from their General Plan designation to a Resort designation, however if we are reducing the Resort designation dramatically then an analysis may not be necessary.
- Regarding the Stevenson/Grant she asked what character designation would be proposed because in general the character designations seem to be land use areas.
- Referencing the Gliderport, she reiterated her concern, stating something more than a general statement should be included about the protection of the view.
- Community Center she asked if the event center on the Merchant property would be a private facility, because we may not be able to host a majority of activities in the lower Washington area. Plus she had a strong opinion about small town public facilities being located in the core of downtown.

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 9 of 11

- Highway 29/Bounsal property, stated it provides an identity in our corridor, and should be subdivided into two areas, one from the view corridor, and the bulk of the land within the city as a significant part of our town.
  - Housing component the focus is on hospitality as the core business, and that is dependent
    on the extent of new business. She stated this plan has no specifics to housing and the lower
    wages for the type of jobs generated within that industry.
  - She requested an item by item list be prepared identifying what is different from the General Plan and that will tell if their is adequate analysis pertaining to the CEQA process.
  - Design Guidelines she stated it is called an Urban Design Plan; it should set the framework for some certainty. What are the expectations? She stated it doesn't have to be rigid but there are many levels of standards and she urged some assortment of those. There is no certainty, language on either side. Ms. Kinzie reminded our boards are not necessarily staffed with design background, decision bodies are basically subjective. She asked for a timeline of no more than 6-9 months and was hopeful for continued dialogue

Daniel Peralta, 809 Coombs Street, representing Jim O'Connell, Silverado Trail, stated he opposed the draft Urban Design Plan proposed amendment of the Resort designation that would limit development to residential uses in the area West of Lincoln Avenue. He stated this is contrary to the General Plan. He noted during preparation of the General Plan it was determined there would be a seamless integration that would compliment the downtown with high end accommodations. He stated his client was insured through discussion he could propose a hotel. He urged the Commission not to eliminate the visitor accommodation language. He stated the purpose of the Urban Design Plan is to implement the directives of the General Plan, it is not a tool to amend the General Plan, and it is not allowed under State Law, nor in accordance with the General Plan.

**Sonny Thielbar** stated he appreciated the Staff and Committee had listened, but we need to address a big problem if it usurps around the General Plan. He noted the core premise of the UDP seems to be one dimensional and driven strictly by spas. The key should be protection of the people who live here and that is what will make us economically viable. What we need is locals. Referencing Housing he stated we want the spectrum of housing to include low and moderate housing and there are ways to encourage growth.

**David Moon Wainwright** noted what he did not see addressed is there were no provisions for camp grounds; people would come with their children. The amount of camping facilities is limited. Related to biking he didn't agree bicycles should have special status, they should try to ride with traffic, unless it is an area with speeds over 30 miles an hour, then maybe provide bike lanes. Mr. Moon-Wainwright asked what we have done about the people that cannot read this report. Something this big needs to at least have an executive summary in Spanish so half the community can participate. Referencing Retail and downtown he suggested we need a computer service store, or a child care center, even guest do show with their children and they could drop their children off.

**Chairman Manfredi** noted that the focus of the UDP does not dictate what kind of business we want.

**David Moon-Wainwright** stated his response was because he was hearing we were focused on limiting retail. In conclusion he wanted to talk about process and asked how meetings have been held on the UDP at the Community Center where it has been occupied over capacity. Maybe we

Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 10 of 11

should work on getting the Crop Building wired up to have meetings in a larger space, because if we continue to have packed meetings in this location we will not get the level of participation desired. He asked if the UDP will be rewritten before it goes to council or before it goes to a vote. When will there be a final formal document.

**Norma Tofanelli** reported that workers cannot afford to live here and they are an essential part of our community, and critical to what we revere, they are neglected. The median income, \$86,000. looking at housing to be at \$120,000 median. This is why we have part of the traffic we have. Do not neglect those that live down Washington.

Clarence Luvisi stated he felt embarrassed, and that we as a modern community had no excuse not to hold this meeting in another facility and provide translators, stating there are citizens who work in the community that do not speak English. He stated it is not a nice, not moral and unethical.

Chairman Manfredi closed the public portion of comment at 8:30 PM.

**Commissioner Kite** stated he heard the emotion this evening and there had been extremely specific suggestions. He suggested consideration for taking several steps backwards, establish the common ground of the Urban Design Plan and there are a lot of elements we agree on. We should evaluate the good or bad suggestions. The UDP is to be the guide for the future of the City. . Go back to the common elements that specifically affect peoples properties.

**Paul Coates** suggested the way the UDP has been presented is creating more problems than it is solving. It is hard to get your arms around this. Why not work more with our existing businesses and think about ourselves and not the tourists all the time. We could direct more dollars to benefit those that have been here. We cannot expand without fixing the existing problems. He believes we do need environmental review because this is a project. He concluded noting people want us to be dragged into the 21 Century and he does not want to be, he loves this community.

**Commissioner Bush** stated the revisions have covered many concerns and she did not agree we have to start over again. She recommended we just continue to take in more information from the public and continue to integrate it.

**Commissioner Kite** acknowledged there is some good content, but we should regress to a common ground.

**Vice-Chairman Creager** stated he does think this document is a good start. This is a living document, and he liked that it doesn't have specific guidelines. However there is an element of urban that is here ie. homelessness, infrastructure, and we can create a relationship that could be beneficial to both. He stated we are trying to achieve a balance but we are not there yet. There have been a lot of citizens involved and a good attempt has been made. He stated our intention is to listen, but there needs to be a lot of give on both sides. Lets keep moving forward and having dialogue, no final recommendations.

**Commissioner Bush** stated she thought it was a good idea to provide an executive summary in Spanish and provide a translator if needed.

 Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes September 15, 2008 Page 11 of 11

Vice-Chairman Creager stated there are a lot of important issues coming before the Planning Commission, and this is meant to reflect diversity, he recommended that people become well informed about projects so they can participate in a positive way.

473 474

475

476

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

**Chairman Manfredi** identified key words he heard as "common ground, issues, answers" and commented as follows:

- He shared concern for potential issues with General Plan inconsistencies.
- Washington Street extension he understands Ms. Toffanelli's concerns and the City needs to figure out what can happen in the 70 ft right of way, we do not want to take land. So we need a determination of what can be done within the right –of-way.
  - Get a brief response on the boron issue that seems to come up frequently;
  - Water and sewer the Growth Management Program provides a good layer of protection.
     Projects are not given an allocation and cannot proceed without an allocation.
  - He shared concern that the Hemberger and O'Connel property designations were potentially a taken.
  - Do think bilingual this is worth considering
  - Housing Element/Lower Washington Placido asked a good question last week, where do these people go. We need to keep in range of low income.

487 488 489

490

491

**Director Gallina** reported staff has reviewed availability on the Community Center calendar, noting we continue to hold meetings in the Community Center to enable televising the meetings, and there are woo possible dates, October, 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup>, and their was consensus Monday October 13<sup>th</sup>, would be agreeable.

492 493 494

There was motion by **Commissioner Kite**, seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to continue the Public Hearing on the Draft Urban Design Plan to a Special Meeting to be held October 13, 2008. **Motion carried: 5-0-0-0.** 

496 497 498

495

#### I. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS/PROJECT STATUS

499 500 501

502

### J. ADJOURNMENT

503504

There was motion by **Chairman Manfredi** seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to adjourn the meeting. **Motion carried:** 5-0-0-0.

505506507

The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, September 24, 2008 at 5:30 PM.

509

510 511

508

Kathleen Guill,

513 Secretary to the Planning Commission

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 PM.

514

515 Attachments