Woodland City Council Minutes Council Chambers 300 First Street Woodland, California

December 21, 2000

# CITY COUNCIL ADJOURNED SPECIAL SESSION

Mayor Borchard opened the adjourned special Council meeting at 7:32 p.m.

#### **ROLL CALL:**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Borchard, Dote, Flory (arrived at 7:40 p.m.),

Monroe, Peart

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Richard Kirkwood, Phil Marler, Ed Quinn, Henry

Agonia, Charlie Wilts, Ann Siprelle, Loren

Polete, Sue Vannucci

ALSO PRESENT: Contract Engineer Nick Ponticello, Contract

Planner Heidi Tschudin, Consultant Asa

Utterback

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Council Member Monroe said a recent article in the <u>Sacramento Bee</u> stated the median price for homes in the area has risen from \$136,000 to \$185,000. One of the reasons stated is supply of homes is low.

Council Member Dote read an article in the <u>Sacramento Business Journal</u> for the potential of a power center South of the County Fair Mall. She also referred to an article in the <u>Daily Democrat</u> whereby it states the Council is stuck on the Olive trees. The article did not capture the spirit of the article and the conclusion, including the progress made on the issue.

#### **REPORTS OF THE CITY MANAGER:**

#### FIRE DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND MASTER PLAN

This item will be continued to the first meeting in January 2001.

# HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION AND FUNDS RELEASE - RESOLUTION 4248

City Manager Kirkwood stated funding opportunities have been identified and obtained for this project. It is recommended the balance of the funds be forwarded to the Woodland Economic Renaissance Program for economic development activities except for \$10,000. The \$10,000 would be utilized as a match for a \$100,000 grant for a Strategy Action Plan. Community Development Director Harris briefly summarized the Plan for the Jobs and Housing Balancing Improvement Program. The City's jobs-per-household qualify for these funds through this grant. The maximum is \$100,000 and the State needs a local 10% match. The funds would be to update our 1994 Strategy Action Plan. Many of the objectives within the Plan have been met. The funds can also be utilized to implement the Plan. As part of this project, an outreach program is planned to attain and retain businesses to the City.

# Vice Mayor Flory arrived at the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

There is a second grant program for capital expenditures. Statewide funding amount totals \$4.8 million. The City qualifies for this portion of the grant funds also. Council Member Peart stated these applications had been discussed with the WERC Board and favorable comments received. Council Member Monroe said he would like to see the budget increased as it does act as an economic engine for the City.

On a motion by Council Member Monroe, seconded by Council Member Peart and carried by a unanimous vote, the Council approved Resolution 4248 authorizing 10% local match for HCD Jobs/Housing Balance Improvement Program Grant application, authorized the City Manager to release the remaining \$30,250 to WERC for support of general economic development activities.

#### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT (FEMA) UPDATE

This item was received as a Consent Item Calendar item.

#### SPRING LAKE SPECIFIC PLAN FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Council Member Peart presented thirteen issues regarding the project which have, in his opinion, been of concern since the project began and feels this has been a developer-led project, rather than City-led. Because of these issues, he proposed the Council: (a) not take action this evening, but receive input; (b) require the property owners to commit participation to the plan; (c) form a Council sub-committee to work with staff and the applicant and report back to the Council as a whole; (d) conduct a Council workshop to address details and set policies to keep the project moving forward. He said Council needs to take a leadership role in the process. Council Members discussed the concept of a sub-committee and determined to move forward to receive input on this issue, while looking at addressing the policy issues. Council Member Peart asked for some determination how many of the property owners would participate in the project. He is not sure all nine property owners are interested in selling their property and we should have some commitment, as the land must be the collateral for the bond.

City Manager Kirkwood agreed there are policy issues the Council would have the authority to change. A Council sub-committee would be one vehicle to author those policies. The financial feasibility is an important aspect of determination of the project. One of the issues is of the fees and how they will be structured. He asked the Council to provide any and all input and comments to the staff this evening so staff will have clear direction on Council desire for this project.

Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner summarized the timeline of the project. In August 2000 the Council tentatively approved the Plan and directed that financial feasibility be examined. There have been some feasibility test runs and adjustments made to determine whether modifications to the Plan would make the financial climate more controlled. Should the applicant's suggestions for modification to the plan be approved, the Plan would be financially feasible. The problems with feasibility from the outset were: (1) there are no substantial commercial land uses; (2) large acres are identified for public uses which do not generate fees; (3) there are comparatively high school fees, high parkland requirements, and high affordable housing requirements. We do not control these issues. This area can not support large additional commercial uses.

Existing planned commercial cannot begin without the development of housing The college, County and school properties will not generate any houses and to obtain more housing, the plan boundaries must be changed or the densities increased. The City has no control over school fees. We can make adjustment to the parkland requirement and some recommended changes are included in the report. The affordable housing can be adjusted; however, there is a contingency, which would strongly object to adjustments in this realm. The applicant has indicated they wish to add other issues, such as: (1) a fee credit rather than a reimbursement for improvements advanced into the Master Plan remainder area; (2) a forced main sewer rather than gravity flow; (3) a number of changes to street design and reductions to right-of-way; and (4) other aspects of the Plan. In some areas of discussion, agreement has been reached. However, there are many which are still unresolved of which the Council will receive input and direction will be requested. Planner Tschudin stated the applicant believes information she has provided is not entirely correct. She has been working diligently on the various issues, as well as receiving input from the TOC Financial Consultant on the project, Economic and Planning Systems (EPS). She feels that an expert in this field should become part of the City team. There are no recommendations to Council this evening as she feels it is premature to make such recommendations without validation of the numbers and direction from Council.

Council Member Dote asked for clarification on another type of expert and Planner Tschudin said this would be a person who would review the financial analyses, as there have been three or four "runs". Susan Goodwin at David Taussig and Associates has been available has been identified as our consultant, but not moved forward as the City did not have a feasible run prepared. As the discussions and negotiations have taken a different turn, it would be advisable to have a financial expert address the issue.

Council Member Monroe commended Planner Tschudin for her outstanding work thus far.

Tom Lumbrazo of Turn of the Century LLC said the draft Specific Plan as presented by the Planning Commission is economically unfeasible as determined by EPS and will remain so unless significant adjustments are made to the Plan. He asked Council to give direction on the six major issues which they feel can be adjusted to bring feasibility to the Plan. As requested by the Council, the landowners were brought together and the three represented agree on the six issues. There is confusion about the feasibility and profitability. One is how residual land value and profits are defined. Katherine James, Senior Associate with EPS, said the company was hired to conduct feasibility tests of the Plan.

EPS used three required indicators to determine feasibility for the project. One is comparison of total costs to provide backbone infrastructure and all necessary public facilities to the area as a percentage of the home price. EPS uses 15% to 20%, the range within which developers would be willing to finance projects and the project could be constructed to a level of quality at this percentage. The second is the residual land value test, which determines the viability of financing the unit. This value represents the amount a builder would pay after all costs and maintain a profit margin. The cost of land, entitlement and loan costs, business overhead costs would be subtracted out of the total. The third is of taxes and assessments, including property tax, would be less than 2% of the home price. The Plan presented in October failed two of these tests for feasibility.

Ms. James presented the results of changes agreed to by the City and other changes as the developer wished. The factors affecting the results are sale of the home price, development cost and allocation of the spread of cost. The high development costs as identified were school fees, affordable housing requirements, parks and recreation requirements, and roadway landscaping and maintenance. EPS was directed to identify areas were they could increase density or convert some of the right-of-way areas to gain higher yields and to change some of the affordable housing requirements and multi-family off site requirements. All of these helped to reduce the cost of the backbone infrastructure included in the fee program on a per unit basis. These reductions in cost were in the Specific Plan area. The addition of units from the Master Plan area will not create enough difference in the per unit burden and does not change the cost burden for the first units to develop. Even with additional units, it is unlikely they will significantly offset the infrastructure costs of those additional units.

After the modifications are taken into account, the Plan is close to feasibility. Lowering the total development costs through further negotiations will make the project possible.

Council Member Monroe said that if the issues listed are adopted, it would be close to feasibility and what additional steps would be needed. There are further negotiations which are needed on the development costs. Council Member Peart asked for the percentage range and Ms. James stated it is 18% to 20%, but other competing developments are at 15% to 16% for an R-5 unit. We also want to be in the cost burden range of \$29,000 and \$33,000.

Council Member Peart left the meeting at 8:28 and returned at 8:29.

Council Member Dote asked if total taxes and assessments including Mello-Roos financing, need to be less than 2%. Ms. James stated it included property taxes, Mello-Roos taxes, assessments for the landscaping and lighting.

Council Member Monroe left the meeting at 8:30 and returned at 8:31.

Vice Major Flory stated Ms James had said it was the amount most developers are willing to finance and part of the question is if we hired an independent firm would they have the same figures. Ms. James felt the figures would be the same. He said the issue is where is the level of compromise where developers are willing to cut their profit to make the project work and where that profit level lies. Ms. James stated her analysis is based upon the risks the developers are willing to take in similar projects of this magnitude. That compromise must come when Council determines the type of project and the developer agrees to the associated costs for that level of quality.

Council Member Dote said the Planning Commission was given this plan with constraints on land use, and densities. The fiscal analysis would remain with the Council.

Tom Lumbrazo said the Planning Commission version was \$44,000 per lot in fees and charges. Staff changes brought the figure down to \$38,000, not including additional fee increases for sewer, drainage and County-wide fee increases at \$2,975 per unit. That brought the staff figure back up to \$41,000. The developer is targeting \$34,000 to \$35,000, which they feel are on the high end, but they can make the project work at that level.

Vice Major Flory asked, if based on the achievable figure, the return would then be appropriate for the investment. Mr. Lumbrazo said the landscaping and lighting would be at \$464 per unit per year. In Sycamore Ranch it is \$132 per year. They are trying to get that figure to between \$150 and \$200 per year for this project. They support more landscaping in this project, but the burden will be on the homeowners.

Mr. Lumbrazo said no developer could give a specific answer to the profit margin as each project has variables. The standards, which we have set forth, are above other communities and they are competing with other communities who have lower fees and lower standards. They want to have a quality project within the fees assessed. The absorption rate in Woodland is much lower. These fees can be a deterrent to developers as they are taking a chance when

the fees are driving the cost of the home up. The homebuyer will purchase elsewhere with lesser fees, thus lower home cost for the same type of home. In their view, the Planning Commission Plan must be adapted for this project to be successful. Council Member Dote asked if the costs are prior to adding the school fees. Mr. Lumbrazo said these fees would be included but they are contesting, as the fees are the highest in the region and the formula is incorrect.

The developer does not advocate a larger project. Should the entire Master Plan be developed, which is 16,000 total people, there would not be an appreciable difference. The adjustments proposed for consideration are designed to maintain the spirit, vision, components and quality of the plan. They will also meet economic feasibility in terms of fees, bond burden and landscaping/lighting district charge and keep the housing affordable to buyers. The developer believes the adjustments proposed enhance the Plan. The points recommended are as follows:

- 1. Master Plan Fee Credit The share of cost would be placed on the Master Plan, not the Specific Plan at a total of \$6.127 million or \$1,425 per unit. This issue would be on hold until further discussions with the Finance Director could be held. City Manager Kirkwood stated the \$6 million is in improvements, which would only occur if the Master Plan remainders were developed. Spring Lake would have no obligation to cover this up front cost. The \$1,400 would then be shifted.
- 2. Gravity Feed v. Forced Main Sewer To adhere to the gravity feed standard, a trench would be dug from County Road 102 to the Waste Water Treatment Plant, 20 feet deep. In the geotechical analysis, the ground water levels are at six feet below surface and there are several sand pockets. The trench would need to be dewatered and shore the trenches due to the soil instability. The gravity method would be \$2.5 million more in cost. The cost saving per unit is \$370.
- 3. Street Sections The grid network for arterials and collectors was approved by the Planning Commission. The neotraditional type of plan requires smaller streets as traffic is slower, the tree canopy is enhanced, less pavement for ambient heat generation and less maintenance. He also proposed the elimination of the Farmers' Central Road, which would run along the edge of the college. This road, in their estimation, is unnecessary as there are more than adequate roads in the project. They also would like the grid, curved and cul de sac designs in the local street network. In the modified grid pattern or cul de sac street, they would like the collector streets to range from 57 to 68 feet of

right-of-way. In the local streets, they would like a 52 foot right-of-way. This would reduce the current standard from 35 feet of pavement to 30 feet. The cul de sac would be 41 feet of right-of-way and 30 feet of pavement and would be hammerhead style.

David Wade, Representative of the Merritt Ranch group stated these proposed refinements are more characteristic of those which are seen in the fine grained, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods. The proposed streets will work with the pedestrian walkways in the Plan.

4. Parks and Open Space - The greenbelt acreage is nearly 8 acres in total which is same size as a park. The landscaping along the streets is of concern and they are committed to incorporate this portion in the early phases of the project. The quality of the landscaping is more of concern rather than width. He cited several samples of landscaping in the area. He encouraged more of a grassy appearance, which is more in conformance with neotraditional values. They propose 20½ feet of landscaping on arterials. Sycamore Ranch is around 12 feet. The neighborhood design would include a strip of landscaping between the street and the sidewalk with an abundance of trees. The overall maintenance charges for the landscaping would be reduced if the area was reduced. At present the plan is \$320 per year, but with the changes the threshold would be \$200. The landscaping and lighting district would maintain the parks, as well as, the landscaping along the streets. Mr. Wade reminded the Council that the wider the streets, the faster the traffic.

Mayor Borchard said on the staff report, there were more than 25 compromises made and some items not agreed upon. Mr. Lumbrazo mentioned reducing width to accommodate slower speeds as one that staff could not agree to and further reduction of the landscaping buffer along County Road 102 from 35 feet to 25 feet. Originally this buffer was 50 feet to 35 feet. County Road 102 is a major road and should not be made narrower. Mr. Wade said this road does have a different character than interior streets. Mayor Borchard also mentioned County Road 25A and that this Road would be at 35 feet as agreed. Vice Mayor Flory said he had spoken with Mr. Lumbrazo about reduction of County Road 25A landscaping and adding it into the County Road 102 width.

# Council recessed from 9:10 to 9:23 p.m.

Mr. Lumbrazo is asking for a credit, not in the form of a fee credit, for the space which is included in the greenbelts as they are open space which could be

considered as park space. Parks are costly to construct and maintain. Staff and the developer agree to a reduction of parks from 10 acres per 1,000 to 5 acres per 1,000. The central park size is suggested as 4 acres rather than 8. The request to reduce the number from 8 to 6 neighborhood parks was withdrawn by the developer.

5. Affordable Housing - The current ordinance states attached units are allowed to meet the requirement for detached single family units. They would like to have the same treatment in the single family home requirement, 10% affordable, would be allowed to be either attached or detached. If they are attached, they become more affordable in terms of construction. The ordinance also allows for a fee waiver and the City would become a partner with the developer to reduce the cost burden. They asked that the building permit processing fee be waived, which is between \$1,500 to \$1,600 for the City plan review.

Vice Mayor Flory asked if a builder was constructing a 100 unit project with all the same style, floor plan and elevations, do we charge for plan review on each unit. Mr. Lumbrazo stated typically each unit has a fee. Council Member Dote asked if multi-family would have a fee waiver as well. Mr. Lumbrazo said Council could consider a waiver. City Manager Kirkwood stated that each home still must be inspected.

Infrastructure Contingency - This began at 45% and was reduced to 40%. They believe the numbers are very secure and want to reduce to between 30% and 35%. Council Member Dote said a contingency is not expended unless costs increase so how can there be a benefit? Mr. Lumbrazo said if cost projections are at \$1 million for a sewer line with a contingency of 45%, it adds to the basic cost and the fees are derived from the total cost figure. With a lower contingency, the total cost would conversely diminish as well, which directly affects the fees. Council Member Dote asked how this would relate to the homeowner. He said home prices go up and fees will be absorbed by the new homeowners. Mr. Wade said the overall cost, including the contingency must be included into the long-term financing with interest cost and the bond. They are then borrowing more money than they may actually need for the project. These fairly high costs included in the request for funds also affect the ability to secure the loan as it could be considered as a risk factor for the project.

Council Member Peart asked if we lower to 30% and the cost elevates beyond the 30%, what would be the effect at that time. The risk would be to the developer.

7. Design Issues - A process is needed to resolve each of these issues. Clarification is needed in the Specific Plan document on interpretation. In a meeting with the City Manager, it was discussed that perhaps a focused two-day session with the developer and the staff would enable them to reach resolution. Perhaps here is where a Council sub-committee could become involved as well. City Manager Kirkwood feels that having all of the necessary staff together for a few days will resolve most or all of those issues which are in question. The results could then be placed in document form. He suggested that David Taussig and Associates be included on the financials.

Vice Mayor Flory asked the purpose in addressing the financials. City Manager Kirkwood stated this would validate costs. Due to major policy issues not in place to provide direction and a Plan which has morphed itself, peer review would not have been of benefit prior to this point. Mayor Borchard asked if we should have cost factors on aspects of the project prior to approval. Cost may be a deciding factor. City Manager Kirkwood suggested moving forward with the policy issues. Council Member Monroe said the language, "unless City staff shows that it is infeasible or too costly" is built into the action taken. Council Member Dote indicated a concern regarding the forced main in that long-term cost of pumps and possibility of pump failure should be included.

#### Forced Main Discussion and Motion:

Council Member Peart feels if we start changing City Standards, he would need staff input and advice to achieve a comfort level with the unknowns prior to making any decisions. City Manager Kirkwood suggested the two-day meeting would be a good means for a Council sub-committee to be involved in the entire process and soundness of the discussions.

Council Member Monroe feels the forced main would save a great deal of money. With the action as stated, it if is infeasible or too costly we can revert to gravity feed. He said the gravity flow is unstable as it absorbs 30% of the ground water, there is infiltration and water seeps into the ground water, and places an unnecessary demand on the Waste Water Treatment Plant. Planner Tschudin said staff has indicated there is no opposition to the forced main, it is simply not the current standard. To use an alternate standard, an applicant would typically bring forward a technical analysis to allow the City to look at the operational cost and balance them against the capital costs. That has not happened as yet. Mr. Lumbrazo said he feels the study would point to gravity and that it would not give them a chance to prove their case. They have done a study in this area and do not feel the City staff would look at it objectively.

Council Member Peart is bothered by infiltration of 30%. He feels that the forced main is the method, which should be utilized, but there is a great deal of maintenance with that type of system. He wants staff to give input on whether this method would be effective. Council Member Peart said Mr. Lumbrazo made a statement the City would not pass a forced main system and he asked him to clarify that statement. Mr. Lumbrazo said the City's assumptions would indicate a predetermined result and those assumptions are not fairly put together. Due to this predetermined mode of thought, the best system to be put in place would not be determined. The City has a long standing policy they would like to have gravity sewer. There is no question it is the best design because of the least maintenance, but there are disadvantages as well.

Contract Engineer Ponticello said the statement made about the infiltration at 30% of the flows is not a true statement. They have a projected 2020 build out for a treatment of 13 million gallons per day (MGD). Of that, 1 to 1.6 MGD is determined to be ground water infiltration and that is from systems that exist today. In the study the developer provided to the City with regard to forced versus gravity system, the factor of cost on infiltration was fairly insignificant overall with regard to the actual capital, operations and maintenance costs. There would be little factors based on those rates. With regard to leaking water, a closed system with a forced main would work. The gravity pipe in guestion takes into a account a system that is not tied into a group of laterals and will be isolated from service laterals. Seventy percent of the infiltration is from lateral leakage, not from the main line, as was the case in Sycamore Ranch. In the report provided by TOC, the staff had asked for clarification on some points made in the report. As yet they have not responded and have not discussed specific objections they may have to the clarifications requested.

On motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Dote and carried by a unanimous vote, the Council extended the meeting until 11:30.

Vice Mayor Flory said the bottom line is that staff needs direction on this and other issues before them this evening. We have standards in place which we can adhere to and require the developer to remain with the fees. This could possibly shut down growth. Mayor Borchard proposed that we agree in principle with the forced main, to be examined by staff, and received input on why it differs from City standard. Council Member Peart said if we deviate from present standards and the policies on the gravity versus forced, we need to look

at all of the standards. Mayor Borchard said the General Plan was approved in 1996 and set standards for the City. We can deviate from the General Plan with valid reasons. Council Member Monroe said perhaps the standards need to be reexamined. Open space is evident in the parks, which is not utilized but must be maintained. Mayor Borchard stated that even though space in parks cannot be utilized for playing area, it is still a viable and needed aspect of the open space. Council Member Dote suggested the 10 acres per 1,000 is a Citywide standard and we are not meeting that standard now. The regional parks make up the difference. Without the savings on the forced main, the operations and maintenance becomes a moot point as there will be no project.

On a motion by Vice Major Flory, seconded by Council Member Monroe and carried, the Council directed the staff to move forward in looking at the forced main sanitary sewer trunk issue. This will include a feasibility study and should return to the Council with cost factors included.

#### Parks Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Lumbrazo stated the General Plan says "strive to meet 10 acres per 1,000". As existing today within the City, we are at 3 acres per 1,000. Staff proposes 5 acres per 1,000 but the acreage would be slightly higher by decreasing the Central Park by 4 acres and credit for the 8 acres of greenbelt. Council Member Dote asked if the 8 acres for the neighborhood parks includes the 2 acre commercial pre-zoned. The parks would be 8 acres, but if the commercial did not happen, the other 2 acres would become parkland. Mayor Borchard asked about the difference between a greenbelt and a linear park. Mr. Lumbrazo stated the Plan had wanted to connectivity between the schools, parks and the other focal points. He feels this is an asset to the Plan. Mr. Wade said Davis has 10% of the land for parks. Roseville is at 9 acres per 1,000, with 3 for community park, 3 for neighborhood park and 3 as open space. Council Member Peart suggested the acreage be dropped to 7 or 8 per 1,000. Planner Tschudin said Mr. Lumbrazo is making the assumption that 5 acres is on the table and is asking for an additional reduction to the central park and credit for the greenbelt. Parks, Recreation and Community Services Director Henry Agonia said the only reduction in the park acreage is a 4 acre reduction in the Central Park. Deferring this to the sub-committee would be the appropriate venue and he would also take to the Commission for input. Council Member Peart said this is the first big project since the Master Plan has been instituted. Sycamore is 2.5 acres per 1,000. His concern is we might have too large of an area for parks in the Plan. Director Agonia said the value of the park is high. Council Member Dote stated and Director Agonia agreed that the Commission supports the 10 acre piece with a 2 acre overlay and an 8 acre park, an 8 acre central park, but would agree to a 4 acre central park if the neighborhood parks are left in tact. Director Agonia said the central park development could be very creative. On a motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Monroe, and carried, the Council agreed to call for a vote on the parks issues as presented. Council Member Peart voted no.

On a motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Monroe and carried, the Council directed staff to assume the Central Park be reduced to 4 acres and allow 7.6 acres credit from the greenbelts. Council Member Peart voted no.

Colette Stewart feels that any reduction in the streets increases the density and feels the size of the parks and greenbelt areas should be kept at the standard.

Planner Tschudin asked for clarification on the final determination of acres per 1,000. The project did not include its share to the regional and sports parks so the 5 acres was in neighborhood parks and 5 acres in the form of dollars to the other parks. The General Plan says we should strive for 10. The assumptions since then have been 5. Director Agonia mentioned that everything was back on the table except the central park, which would then mean 10 acres per 1,000. The motion was to make it at 5 acres per 1,000. There will be no contribution to the regional, none to the central park, 66% to the sports park, and all of the neighborhood parks. Director Agonia said his assumption was the only reduction was the size of the central park by 4 acres and everything else was as in the original Plan. The fees with the reduction to 5 acres are then lost to the sports park, regional park and community park. Planner Tschudin reiterated the original report said reducing from 10 to 5 acres. Director Agonia was aware of that assumption and Mr. Lumbrazo moved with that Plan. The neighborhood parks, central park, 66% of the sports would be put in with no contribution to regional or community. This came to 5 acres per 1,000. Then, today's version, the central park drops from 8 to 4, there would be credit for greenbelts at 7.6. There are three versions. Staff position and the assumption of 5 acres per 1,000 with the scenario of all the neighborhood, 66% of the sports park. Still on the table is the 5 acres per 1,000. Mayor Borchard asked that if we are at the 10 acre per 1,000, what does that mean as far Spring Lake development contributing to the community park, the sports park and the regional park. Planner Tschudin said it would mean they are funding all of the sports park, all the neighborhood parks and central park, and the remainder would be calculated into a proportional contribution to the regional

park and the community park. This would be a proportion of what they had not met yet in acres per thousand, you translate backwards. Council Member Peart asked how staff could change policy and said if Council approves what is proposed, the General Plan would need modification. Planner Tschudin stated there is no proposal to change policy, but she needed to test the various proposals. She said there are some legal implications to changing the General Plan, but believes there is some discretion to establish a specific park requirement within a Specific Plan area while retaining the goal of 10 acres per thousand as a goal in the General Plan. City Manager Kirkwood said there is no way possible to strive to attain 10 acres per thousand in the growth area. The Council would have to say it is not attainable, strike from the Plan, give direction to the Parks and Recreation Commission and move forward. There would be no further growth in the City and no way to raise fees for the other parks.

On a motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Monroe and carried, the Council instructed staff to follow the guidelines presented to the Council reducing the acreage to five acres per thousand. Mayor Borchard asked if we needed to frame a motion like the above and could we not just accept the 7.6 allowance and the 8 to 4 reduction. Council Member Dote said we are then creating a specific goal for the Specific Plan and asking for an amendment to Mayor Borchard the Specific Plan could have different the General Plan. guidelines than the General Plan. City Attorney Siprelle said this could be done because the General Plan goal is not mandatory and would not require a General Plan amendment. The General Plan could be amended at some point in the future. Council Member Dote would like this in a motion format. Mayor Borchard asked if we could address the General Plan issue at another meeting. The increased fees collected for the extra 5 acres per thousand is part of the Reducing the central park to four acres and given credit on the greenbelt does not accomplish it.

Mayor Borchard asked the motion be restated. On a motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Monroe and carried, the Council directed staff to assume a review in the reduction of 5 acres per 1,000 in the Specific Plan. Council Members Dote and Peart voted against the motion.

Mayor Borchard said the outstanding items are part of the design and should go to the subcommittee. Planner Tschudin said the items listed were to provide the Council with information on what is still discussible. The applicant is most concerned about the issue of the streets. Direction of whether we should narrow the streets would be valuable. Council Member Peart does not want to make the streets narrower without discussion on the pros and cons with staff.

Council Member Monroe said nothing is to happen until the financials return and Council approves.

On a motion by Council Member Monroe, seconded by Council Member Flory and carried, the Council moved to approve the recommendation to narrow the streets. Council Member Dote would like to have comments returned from Fire and Police on this proposal. Mayor Borchard asked if this included the cul de sac bulb configuration and it was the consensus it does. Planner Tschudin asked for clarification on whether this is generic direction to narrow the streets or if there are specific pieces. She said there are a host of issues not addressed because they did not feel comfortable they had direction. Vice Mayor Flory said this would include directions on cul de sacs, some might curve, some be hammerhead, with easements in back to greenbelts. Council Member Monroe agreed that would be part of the motion. The street pattern would be a modified grid. There is a request to allow all cul de sacs and any configuration. There are also some competing interests which Public Works, Fire and Police may need to address. Mr. Lumbrazo said they are requesting within the basic grid, major streets, the developer would have the choice to do anything, all grid, curved streets, cul de sac, modified grids. This adds variety to the overall neighborhoods. The Planning Commission would have input on the design of the streets and this is part of the tentative map. Staff does have a concern about the number of cul de sacs. Planner Tschudin said there is some staff concern on the part of Fire and Police in not adhering to a grid pattern. There would be more support for narrower streets if the grid pattern was adhered to and there are multiple access points to homes. With a large number of cul de sacs and narrower streets there becomes a concern about access for emergencies. The design at present are at the minimum to allow Fire vehicles to move around. To narrow the streets, they will be less than what the Fire staff is comfortable with.

Engineer Ponticello cited an example for the local streets in that the Fire Chief feels a twenty foot clearance is needed. The collector street minimum would stay at 40 feet to allow parking on both sides. The request is to reduce to 35 feet and call it a local collector. The street use and where it would provide access must be considered. Housing that fronts on collectors should be provided with parking on both sides of the streets. On Class 2 street bike lanes on collectors should be considered prior to narrowing.

On a motion by Council Member Monroe, seconded by Vice Mayor Flory and carried, the Council approve the assumption to narrow the streets, allow curve and hammerhead cul de sacs, and have Public Works and Fire Department staff look at the proposal for adherence to code. Council Member CITY COUNCIL MINUTES DECEMBER 21, 2000 PAGE 16

Peart voted no.

On a motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Dote and carried by a unanimous vote, the Council extended the meeting until 12:00.

## Affordable Housing Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Lumbrazo said the two issues on affordable housing are: (1) allow on the single family detached home requirement, they would be allowed to add attached homes, (2) waive the building permit processing fees of approximately \$1,500 per unit for affordable single family homes.

Council Member Peart left the meeting at 11:24 and returned at 11:25 p.m.

Mr. Lumbrazo stated the remaining issues had been discussed and were in agreement. Council Member Dote asked if the proposal has been reviewed with the affordable housing advocates and partnership representatives. Planner Tschudin said the items under the staff recommendations have been discussed at great length with the affordable housing representatives and they generally support them but have submitted modifications they wish to have considered. To her knowledge, these two added items have not been reviewed and it unclear on how their position. There will be another meeting scheduled with them at some point. Council Member Dote would like to have their feedback. Mr. Lumbrazo said he has had contact with John Gianola and he is in agreement. Mayor Borchard asked how the fee waiver helps the project and it was stated it lowers the costs as the developer would not have to pay the fee. The General Fund would not receive those funds. Director Harris said our Code allows for financial incentive waivers and/or deferral of development fees or other financial incentives for affordable housing. City Manager Kirkwood said at 800 affordable units, with only the "for sale" units at 280, it would be a \$420,000 loss to the General Fund. Vice Mayor Flory said we could direct the staff to review the cost and waiver and determine an appropriate fee rather than eliminating the entire fee.

On a motion by Vice Mayor Flory, seconded by Council Member Dote and carried, the Council approved the assumption that the use of attached for sale housing to fulfill the affordable housing requirement for both attached and

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES DECEMBER 21, 2000 PAGE 17

detached market rate units and review the fee waiver on the for sale affordable housing units. Planner Tschudin asked if that included the rest of the staff package previously been agreed to on the affordable units and the Council responded to the affirmative. Council Member Peart voted no.

## Subcommittee Formation and Motion:

Mayor Borchard asked if the Subcommittee should be devoted to the outstanding items, i.e. vertical curbs. City Manager Kirkwood would not recommend a rotating Council Member format on the committee. Borchard feels addressing the individual items and returning to Council as a whole with solutions is the purpose of the subcommittee. Analysis will return from staff as well. If there is no financial impact they may be addressed immediately or at staff level. Planner Tschudin said some of these issues have not been thoroughly addressed, as other issues have precluded that discussion. The study process will move forward on each of these items even if the Council determines they do not want to assign Council Members to the subcommittee. Council Member Dote asked if the subcommittee is to function as a mediator or represent what they think is the entire Council would like to see for the project. City Manager Kirkwood stated that Council sees a broad view, where staff sometimes sees a more narrow technical part. If two Council members can hear the technical details and economics of the process, they can better understand the whole picture and present that view back to the entire Council, more as facilitators.

On a motion by Council Member Dote, seconded by Vice Mayor Flory and carried by a unanimous vote, the Council approved the appointment of a subcommittee of two members to participate in the joint meeting of City staff, developers, contract staff and landowners to work out these remaining issues. Council Members Dote and Monroe volunteered to serve on this subcommittee.

#### ADJOURNMENT:

At 11:40 p.m. the regular meeting was adjourned.

City Clerk of the City of Woodland	