

**APPROVED ACTION MINUTES  
CITY OF WOODLAND  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2008**

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Wurzel; Dote; Murray; Sanders; Gonzalez

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Barzo; Spesert

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: MacNicholl; Hanson; Sokolow;  
Siprelle (City Attorney)

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 PM.

1. Director's Report:

- Robert MacNicholl, Planning Manager: He said that tonight he provided to the Commissioners the monthly project status report that was promised at the last meeting. In the future, this report will be included in the mailed packets.
- Robert MacNicholl: He noted that the Planners Conference is scheduled for next week, March 26th through March 28th, at the Sacramento Convention Center. He confirmed that the following Commissioners are pre-registered: Dote, Wurzel, Sanders and Murray.
- Commissioner Sanders: He stated that he has been called to jury duty the same days as the conference and should know by Monday if he will still be able to attend.

2. Approval of Minutes:

**March 6, 2008:**

- Commissioner Dote: She noted a typo on page 3. "He" should be changed to the word "She".

It was moved by Commissioner Wurzel and seconded by Commissioner Murray to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes of March 6, 2008 as written, and including the above noted correction.

AYES: Wurzel; Dote; Murray; Sanders; Gonzalez  
NOES: None  
ABSTAINED: None  
ABSENT: Barzo, Spesert

3. Public Comment: This is an opportunity for the public to speak to the Commission on any item other than those listed on the Agenda. The Chairman may impose a time limit on any speaker.
  - a. None.
  
4. Communication – Commission Statements and Requests: This is an opportunity for the Commission members to make comments and announcements to express concerns or to request Commission’s consideration of any item a Commission member would like to have discussed at a future Commission meeting.
  - Commissioner Wurzel: He asked Staff for an update on the two community workshops held recently. These were the Downtown Parking and Housing Element meetings. He said that he was only able to attend one of them and would like to know status and next steps.
  - Robert MacNicholl: He said that on the Parking issue, the next step is that Staff will prepare a report based on the comments that were received at that meeting and the other meetings. He said that there have been 3-4 meeting on this issue, including the Chamber. He said that Staff had received a couple comments from the adjoining property owners to the proposed City Center Lofts project. For the most part, he feels that the comments were as expected. He said that at this point Staff is re-drafting the standards to reflect some of the comments received at that hearing as well as the previous City Council meeting. He believes it is scheduled to go back to City Council in April 2008 so the turn-around will be quick.
  - Commissioner Wurzel: He asked about the Housing Element update.
  - Robert MacNicholl: He introduced the new Associate Planner, Dan Sokolow, who comes to us from the City of Winters, where he was previously the Community Development Director.
  - Dan Sokolow, Associate Planner: He said that they did hold the Housing Element workshop back in February 2008. He said that there were two focuses. One was to introduce the project, explain what it is and discuss some of the details. The second was to reach out particularly to service providers to provide input on the Housing Element. Staff did receive two surveys that were returned regarding service needs of two providers. One was a service provider for mentally ill adults stating that they do need additional housing units. The other one was from a retirement community. It was not necessarily affordable housing but could be considered a special needs group. He said that their comments included a need for more assisted living type facilities. The next step is that Staff will incorporate some of that data in the background report of the Housing Element. Staff is assisting the Consultant, Willdan, hired to oversee the project for the City. Staff has been updating a lot of the data, including the number of clients of in-home supportive service in Woodland and the number of SSI recipients in Woodland. Staff has starting looking a little at the housing inventory, which will be one of the more significant aspects of the project. The issue will be quantifying if we can accommodate our regional housing needs allocation within our Housing Element period. He said that we are looking to get a draft out to HCD

(Department of Housing and Community Development) to review and a draft to Legal Services of Northern California. He is hoping to get the Housing Element with revisions to the Planning Commission in May 2008 to review and make a recommendation on it. Then it will go to City Council but it is a very tight schedule. He said that the goal is to get a new Housing Element adopted by City Council before its expiration date of June 30, 2008.

- Commissioner Sanders: He welcomed Dan and thanked him for the report. He said that the City has a proud tradition of having a great Housing Element. He said that a few years ago the City received recognition for it so they are looking forward to it again.
- Commissioner Dote: She noted in Staff's General Plan update that there have been delays due to lack of staffing. She asked for an estimate of what unfulfilled staff needs are within the department.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said that the General Plan update has been bounced back and forth in large part due to recent budget constraints that the City is now facing. He said that he could not give an estimate of when the General Plan update will happen. He said that the focus now is getting the Downtown Specific Plan revised due to pressure Staff is facing regarding downtown development. That should begin in the next several months but he can not give a more specific timeline for the General Plan other than to say that it has been postponed.
- Commissioner Dote: She also stated that she met with the project proponents on agenda item No. 9.
- Commissioner Murray: She said that she also met with Mr. Lumbrazo. She also had another item to discuss that is critical due to timing. She said that she is friends with the President of the Historical Society and the President of the Art Council. She said that they have been working for 2-3 years on trying to establish a cultural center in Woodland. She said that they were promised a building at one time and the City promised them a lot down on Oak and Fifth. They applied for a \$250,000 grant to do a site plan on this lot. She said that the house got taken back and then the lot got taken back by the City because the City had other plans for that lot. She said that they have worked long and hard on this project and read an excerpt from their mission statement:

*The Cultural Center project is guided by our mission to promote Yolo County's rich history and unique culture through artistic, educational and social activities and events for individuals of all ages and cultural backgrounds...*

- Commissioner Murray: She made a plea to Staff for ways to resolve this issue as time is running out on the grant. She said that if they can not find a site, they will have to give the money back. She stated that other communities around Woodland have offered them sites to put this Cultural Center, but this is the County seat and it seems to be the place where we have something like this located- in Historical Woodland. She said that she would appreciate any help that could be given.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She wanted to understand why the City made changes to the Affordable Housing and Parking and then more recently have had workshops for

both. She said that it seems backwards and that the workshops should have come before the changes.

- Robert MacNicholl: He explained that Staff first prepared a draft of proposed changes to the ordinance. Then it is forwarded for review and comments to the City Council and Planning Commission. He said that the intent is to gather further input before the changes are finalized and then ultimately adopted by City Council. He said that at this point, the changes are not yet finalized.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She asked then if the changes are not yet set in stone.
- Robert MacNicholl: He reiterated that Council has not yet adopted the changes.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She asked then if this would happen after the workshops and elements are put together.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said that he is discussing the Downtown Parking Plan and the Housing Element. Regarding Downtown Parking, Staff has met with a number of organizations and the plan is being finalized in terms of an ordinance, which will then be adopted by City Council.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He clarified that the Commission heard a presentation about the Inclusionary Housing ordinance which is the ordinance that effects how new development will provide Affordable Housing. The workshop was on the Housing Element, which is a comprehensive plan for housing in Woodland. The two are definitely related. The Housing Element is required by law. The Inclusionary Housing affects Affordable Housing.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She asked if one is a small piece of the other, the Housing Element.
- Robert MacNicholl: He confirmed this and said that the Inclusionary Housing ordinance will be discussed to some extent in the Housing Element.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He stated that the workshop was not about the ordinance, but was about the Housing Element.
- Robert MacNicholl: He apologized and said that he thought her question was about Downtown Parking.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He confirmed that the other topic that Commissioner Gonzalez brought up was about Downtown Parking. He said that the Commissioners received a presentation from Cindy Norris about parking. He said that they did not approve anything but that Cindy presented what those policies were and then subsequently there was a workshop. He said that no changes have been set in stone for Downtown parking yet. Therefore, the Planning Commission discussion was in advance of a public workshop and the cart was not put before the horse in that respect.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She said that that was what her perception was, not knowing the process.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said that he thought that she was originally asking about the Downtown Parking exclusively. He offered to discuss Inclusionary Housing ordinance further with her following the meeting if she is interested.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She said that she understands now. She then asked who is responsible for the tree trimming between the Fairgrounds and the Mall along the median.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said that he believes it is the City.

- Commissioner Gonzalez: She said that whoever it is, they are doing a disservice to the trees. They are being cut at 90 degrees possibly so that vehicles will not hit the branches.
- Commissioner Dote: She believes that some of the median maintenance is the responsibility of the Mall, but she is unsure of what side. She said that it could be just along East Street or East and Gibson.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said that some Gibson medians were the responsibility of the Mall and East Street may have been. He said that there has been an issue of that lately because Staff wants the landscaping in that median updated completely. He said that there have been a lot of discussions between Staff and the Developer about that. In regards to the tree trimming, he still feels that may have been the responsibility of the City but he will have to find out.

5. Subcommittee Reports.
  - a. None

## PUBLIC HEARING

6. **PAYLESS AUTO CARE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MODIFICATION.** Request for a Conditional Use Permit Modification to add automotive repair services to an existing automotive dealership (Payless Car Sales) at 317 West Main Street in the General Commercial (C-2) Zone (APN: 005-212-01).

Applicant/Owner:	Rosalin R. Prasad
Environmental Document:	Categorical Exemption
Staff Planner:	Jimmy Stillman, Associate Planner
Recommended Action:	Conditional Approval

*This agenda item had been continued to a future date to be determined.*

## DISCUSSION

- Commissioner Sanders: He asked Staff if the Commission needs to vote on this continuance.
- Robert MacNicholl: He confirmed that no vote is needed and that Staff is fine.

CONTINUED

**7. RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION FOR A GENERAL PLAN**

**AMENDMENT.** Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission reconsider and reverse their previous conditional acceptance of a petition for a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning for North Kentucky Avenue (College Village Project). The proposal is to convert 32.4 acres of Service Commercial (C-3) property into 5.15 acres of Service Commercial (C-3) and 27.26 acres of Low Density Residential (R-8). APN 027-340-25, 26, 31

Applicant/Owner: Tom Lumbrazo / North Kentucky Partners  
Staff Contact: Paul L. Hanson, AICP, Senior Planner  
Recommend Action: Reverse previous conditional acceptance of the petition

**DISCUSSION**

- Commissioner Dote: She asked when this property was annexed.
- Paul Hanson, Senior Planner: He believes it was approximately 1995.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked when the General Plan was last updated.
- Paul Hanson: He said it was 2002.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked when the Flood Plain maps were issued.
- Paul Hanson: He said that in 1996 this was recognized as being in the flood zone.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked if they had not yet identified the depths. She wanted to know what is different since December 2006. She asked what is different now.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said that based upon what we know and what we have in the way of maps now, existing setting and limited access. This project, which was considered to be an infill development, he considers to be difficult to justify in terms of an infill development for reasons that were stated in the Staff report. First, it is simply a location that is not meeting defined infill under CEQA. It is evidently a site that has other uses adjoining it that are unlikely to change. These uses are potentially hazardous to an isolated residential area. These issues that are still there and he suspects were there in 2006. They include potential issues of nuisance and harm which are the result of having adjoining areas that are very heavy industrial in character and heavy commercial use as well.
- Commissioner Dote: She said that Trisha Stevens, the Community Development Department Director then, introduced the concept of Greenfield Infill. Those are areas that were annexed within City boundaries should be considered infill projects even though they were not reuse projects and hadn't had reuses on them but were still annexed within City limits. She said there were Brownfield Infill, or reuse, and Greenfield Infill. This project was considered a Greenfield Infill project in 2006, which would have exempted it

from population cap. It also exempted Affordable Housing and Multiple Family from population cap.

- Robert MacNicholl: He said that although they make reference to BUA in this Staff report, BUA is a limitation found within the Spring Lake area. He explained that other choices for this site are superior. Areas in which the City and Development community have committed tremendous resources to make it viable, such as Spring Lake, make more sense from a planning perspective for residential.
- Commissioner Dote: She discussed building unit allocation within Spring Lake. One reason for it was to prevent any overrun of growth cap. The second one was a control and allocation of units to the builders and developers who had actually funded all of the work on the project. They were in the first A and B sections, so it was a fairness thing about who had actually taken the risk in funding all of the Spring Lake Specific Plan for ten years. She explained that there were multiple property owners in there and some participated and some did not. She said it was about being fair about who had taken the risk and funded the money for the Specific Plan. So, there were really two purposes.
- Robert MacNicholl: He confirmed that this information is true.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He reviewed Attachment A in the Staff report. He said that the Staff report indicates that the Planning Commission made a motion to receive the application for a General Plan Amendment on 12/8/06 but the minutes say 2005. He asked for confirmation of the motion date and indicated that the application was submitted close to 2 ½ years ago.
- Robert MacNicholl: He explained that there was some concern by the Commissioners that there needed to be a more comprehensive approach taken if they were to look at this area.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He just wished to make note of the correction to the Staff report, changing the date of December 2005.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

- Tom Lumbrazo, North Kentucky Partners: He said that he thinks that Staff wants to see this project killed at this time rather than process it. He thinks that the process is unfair and flawed. He said that they are still waiting and wasting money. He agreed with Commissioner Dote's comments that nothing has changed since then but that they have spent \$50,000 on plans in good faith. They have spent \$20,000 on the issue of air quality as they hired Sierra Research who reported that there is no air quality problem. He spoke to a number of issues presented by staff. 1) He said that this project is inconsistent with the General Plan but the law allows an amendment of the General Plan for certain cases. 2) He said that Staff indicates that residential surroundings are incompatible but really only on the east side. He questioned the issue of agricultural use surrounding the project and, therefore, they will not be able to approve other projects in the future. He said that there is clearly no impact and it is not fair to single them out, as Centex would also have incompatibility

issues. 3) He explained that mixed-use developments are popular now in the U.S., and include commercial, industrial and residential. He provided an example in Sacramento at the railroad hub. He said that this example is a mixed-use of commercial and residential that is raised above the freeway. He said that he likes this and thinks that it works. 4) He addressed the issue of the residential development being viewed as isolated. He said that this is because Centex bailed out. He said that this project is planned to provide access to the next parcel by use of 5-6 roads. He said that there is connectivity. He said that this area has been annexed for quite some time. 5) He said that their engineers have provided a design solution for the 100 year flood plan. He said that a 1-1 ½ foot fill will correct this problem and that no flood insurance would be needed. He also stated that one-half of Woodland is in the flood plan also. 6) He discussed the issue of absorption and BUAs. He said that this project is 111-115 single family homes and is not a massive project. He said it is fairly minor and he does not see the conflict. 7) He discussed competitive projects in the City, like the senior living at the mall property. He said that there would be lower fees and no BUAs. He said that he would consider it growth management. 8) He addressed the issue of this project not meeting the criteria for Infill within the City. He said that he disagrees with Staff and that 2/3 of the boundaries are not contiguous to development. 9) He discussed growth management and requested that the Planning Commissioners allow them to continue the process and do a full project plan first.

- Commissioner Wurzel: He questioned the Applicant about the flood control issue. He said that the 1-1 ½ feet might meet FEMA requirements for 100 year and asked if it would be possible to meet the 200 year standard.
- Bill Streng, North Kentucky Partners: He explained that it would not be much different to meet the 200 year standard.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He asked if the Applicant would do this.
- Bill Streng: He said yes, that they would do this as it would only take a couple more inches to elevate the land. He then also explained that a large portion of the City is in the flood zone and showed his own map of the City to demonstrate. He also indicated that to address the air quality issue they hired a premier company to research and then Staff waited 6 months to request a peer review, which could have been done during that time. He also discussed the Infill and Annexation issues addressed earlier by Mr. Lumbrazo.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked how wide the buffer is on the railroad line.
- Tom Lumbrazo: He said that it is eighty feet.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked what constitutes the buffer. She asked if it is swale or trees.
- Bill Streng: He said that it is both.

## DISCUSSION

- Commissioner Gonzalez: She said that she remembers the event of that meeting. She said the question was how to set this “triangle” apart when there

is no development east of Kentucky. She asked why they are doing this when better times are coming ahead.

- Commissioner Sanders: He said that he met Bill in his office in 2004 and told him then that he did not like the project. He feels the same now. He believes that the Kentucky area needs a comprehensive plan and not to piece meal it out. He said it is OK to leave the property vacant but does not believe that the project merits justify it. He said he can not speak to the issues about Centex. He does not support residential development along this corridor and does not think the location is suitable due to the isolation. He said that this project does not meet the definition of a mixed-use project. He said that the point is well taken about most of the City in the flood zone. He is concerned that the water will go elsewhere if they raise the ground level. He discussed building unit allocation being not just in Spring Lake. He agrees about promoting Infill but this is not an Infill project. He discussed the issue raised about fairness and indicated that the Planning Commission did not decide the fees for the project next to the Mall. He feels uncomfortable about passing on this project to have the work done and having them spend more money to try and convince the Planning Commission. He said he is not in favor of passing this project on and he sides with Staff about what is in the best interest of the City.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He said that he feels a lot of the same things that Commissioner Sanders does. He confirmed that the Commissioners are not being asked to consider the merits of the project. He said that if it is approved, he is committing Staff resources to consider an application for future rezone. He said this is not a wise investment of Staff resources and City money. He stated that it doesn't seem a wise investment or location for a residence until a comprehensive plan is done. He is not in favor of using more Staff resources on this project.
- Commissioner Murray: She said that she feels bad about the unfairness. She said that in the past she voted no on similar projects. She said that she can not say yes to this Applicant and no to others. She said that the comprehensive plan is far off still. She feels that they were jerked around.
- Commissioner Dote: She said that there is a lot to consider but she is not concerned about residential project on North Kentucky. She said that she liked the project in 2005-2006 and voted for it. She is concerned about why the project has taken so long. She again asked what has changed, the flood zone and the Master Plan. She identified that the annexation was approved so it was seen as developable. She said that she went out and looked at the location. She measured one-third mile to industrial. She does not think that the industrial uses are a great impact as not heavy industrial. She is also concerned about the fairness issue. She said that she would vote to let the process continue as no compelling new issues were identified.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She said she wanted to stand up for Staff and say that when this project was discussed last, Staff told the Applicant that this was not a commitment. She said that Staff advised that they may need to spend some money and it was a gamble.

- Commissioner Dote: She again said that she is concerned about the time it has taken.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She remembers that there were lots of discussions and arguments about not piece mealing this out.
- Commissioner Murray: She said that the original plan was to be just a business park and not residential.
- Bill Streng: He said in 1995 they requested to rezone to residential.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked what uses are allowed.
- Robert MacNicholl: He said it would allow a business park, heavy commercial, offices, and incubator facilities. He said that he has had discussions with the Applicant and that he finds no pleasure in this recommendation. He said that Staff has an obligation to guide these planning projects and what would benefit the City. He addressed the issue of what has changed. He said that the market has changed and that it is about choices. He said that Bill and the City are committed to Spring Lake and that it needs to come to a positive fruition. He said that even if this is a small project, the location has problems; it is remote and less desirable as a residential setting. He stated that Bill should not spend more time and money on a project that has so many negatives that it does not warrant the effort. He said that Staff thinks that this recommendation is sound.
- Bill Streng: He asked if he heard correctly that Commissioner Murray said that if he comes back with an application for a project that it is properly zoned for, that it would be turned down, too.
- Commissioner Sanders: He said no, it is not her position.
- Commissioner Murray: She said that she could not state that because she does not know what the City is going to do and Staff does not want building in this region. She said it puts the Commissioners in a position that limits what they can say.
- Bill Streng: He asked if he then can not do anything until Knaggs develops, no matter what it is.
- Robert MacNicholl: He confirmed that this is not what Staff is saying. This area is currently zoned for Service Commercial. He said that he knows that Bill has tried for years to find a successful development in Service Commercial. He said that he thinks that residential development is more problematic than Service Commercial. He said that staff is willing to work with him to come up something. He stated that there are constraints to this site that, regardless of the type of development, for example there are other issues that need to be addressed like flooding. In regards to the issues of nuisance and potential harm, it makes more sense to have something as a buffer and a less susceptible type of development than residential. He said that without knowing specifically what is being proposed, he could not advise how they would end up reacting to it.
- Ann Siprelle: She said that if the Developer is going to propose a use that is consistent with the General Plan and zoning then they would be coming in with something like a tentative map application, in which the Planning Commission has far less discretion to deny.

- Commissioner Murray: She acknowledged that the Applicant has been in our community for a long time and has done good things, and so she feels bad when he feels bad. Therefore, she hopes we can resolve something so that he can realize some benefit from his property ownership, and not have to wait thirty years.
- Bill Streng: He said that he hopes that we can all live that long.
- Commissioner Dote: She asked for clarification that if this is not an infill or residential site and the Applicant brings in another proposal, these conditions will not restrict it, as long as it is not a residential proposal. She wanted clarification that it does not indicate that he can not do anything until Spring Lake is completed.
- Commissioner Wurzel: He confirmed that they are rejecting this previous application and no other applications are presumed by this motion.
- Ann Siprelle: She clarified that this motion is rejecting only this General Plan Amendment and rezoning petition.

It was moved by Commissioner Wurzel and seconded by Commissioner Murray that the Planning Commission rejects the previous acceptance of the North Kentucky Partners General Plan Amendment and Rezone petition for further processing by the Planning Commission subject to the following findings and conditions:

- The amendments proposed by the petition are considered inconsistent with City’s General Plan and accepted residential planning principles.
- The proposal is not considered an “infill” residential development under CEQA definition, and should be required to wait until the Spring Lake Specific Plan has completed its development.
- The proposal does not meet the Commission requirement “That the project shall be considered only with the encouragement of the inclusion properties directly south.”

AYES: Wurzel; Murray; Sanders; Gonzalez  
 NOES: Dote  
 ABSTAINED: None  
 ABSENT: Barzo, Spesert

- Commissioner Sanders: He said that he is sorry but knows that they will see this Applicant again.

NEW BUSINESS:

**8. GENERAL PLAN ANNUAL REPORT**

Staff Contact: Dan Sokolow, Associate Planner  
Recommended Action: Review

## DISCUSSION

- Commissioner Murray: She asked about the governmental constraints mentioned on page 2.
- Dan Sokolow, Associate Planner: He explained that the Compliance Bonus Density Plan is part of the Housing Element update.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She wanted to know what the rewards or punishments were with regards to the 58% met of goal given the allocation.
- Dan Sokolow: There are a number of grants and loan programs that the State offers that you have to have a housing element compliance or conditional compliance in order to be eligible for. There is a particular award that he believes the City has received twice called the Workforce Housing Grant Award, which is based on income-restricted units at the low and very low level. A portion of the funds received from that grant will go towards the Casa Del Sol Project. The funds could have conceivably have been spent on purchasing vehicles for their fleet, fire equipment, etc., but chose to give the money to developers for low income housing.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She asked with the current housing market has the allocations been readjusted.
- Dan Sokolow: That's correct, it is significantly lower
- Commissioner Gonzalez: So, actually we can in a lot closer.
- Dan Sokolow: The housing need overall may not have been as acute. The allocation is not a production number although it appears so. It is essentially looking at the zoning, density and the City's track record in terms of assisting affordable housing projects and Woodland has a very good record.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: She wanted to know what is going on with Casa Del Sol.
- Dan Sokolow: He's not sure of the status other than it is still an active project. He will check with Redevelopment, since it is their project.
- Commissioner Murray: She asked if it was Federal money.
- Dan Sokolow: HOME is Federal money; Community Design is probably Federal funds as well.
- Commissioner Wurzel: CDBG is a Federal program but at some point it is administered by the State.
- Dan Sokolow: Woodland is an entitlement City, so we get an annual allocation.
- Ann Siprelle: There is a significant legal benefit to having an approved Housing Element. If it has been approved by HCD and someone challenges it in court then there is a presumption that it is valid.
- Commissioner Gonzalez: So they would have to sue the City in order for that to be brought up.

- Commissioner Dote: She wanted to clarify that the 27 acre Gateway Revitalization area is the rail yard area.
- Dan Sokolow: He stated that it was Armfield.
- Commissioner Dote: Is it Armfield or the rail on East St?
- Dan Sokolow: He agrees that it is the rail.
- Commissioner Dote: Is the rail ever going to relocate their switching yard
- Dan Sokolow: He does not know. Obviously if that area is redeveloped for what we term “highest and best use” there will have to be some changes, but he does not know the technical aspects on it.
- Commissioner Dote: She wanted to congratulate Staff on the Community Design Grant from SACOG for Casa Del Sol. She also asked if the Joint Powers Agency for the Habitat Conservation Plan been adopted yet.
- Dan Sokolow: No it has not. He does not think that the EIR has begun yet. We need to look into permitted activity in terms of future projects in the City that we want coverage under the plan for, but I do not know the timetable.
- Commissioner Dote: She wanted to know if they purchased any mitigation lands yet.
- Dan Sokolow: He stated that they either have funded easements or that they are close to it. He understands that is not a complete answer and he will follow up with Commissioner Dote on that.
- Commissioner Dote: She would appreciate that. Is there a share arrangement with the County on the Transient Occupancy Tax?
- Dan Sokolow: He is not sure if there is a split on that.
- Ann Siprelle: She thinks there is.
- Commissioner Dote: She thinks it has to do with the Redevelopment Agency.
- Ann Siprelle: She thinks it is in connection with the Annexation Agreements.
- Commissioner Sanders: The General Plan is very important to us, it is a major tool and the Commission is behind anything we can do to support it and its components updated and through. The Housing Element is very important, we want to win those awards, it’s very important to the people who need those low and moderate income housing.
- Commissioner Dote: She supports Commissioner Sanders' concern with regards to the General Plan update especially as the City is considering adding commercial space. We really need that EIR done.

It was moved by Commissioner Wurzel and seconded by Commissioner Dote that the Planning Commission takes the following actions:

- Accept the General Plan Annual Progress Report required by the State of California; and
- Direct Staff to forward the Report to the City Council for review and subsequently to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for filing.

AYES: Wurzel; Dote; Murray; Sanders; Gonzalez  
NOES: None  
ABSTAINED: None  
ABSENT: Barzo, Spesert

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:49 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert MacNicholl  
Planning Manager