

Woodland City Council/Planning  
Commission Joint Minutes  
Council Chambers  
300 First Street  
Woodland, California

February 27, 2001

**CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**JOINT REGULAR SESSION**

Mayor Borchard and Commission Chairperson McMahan called the joint meeting of the Woodland City Council and the Woodland Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Mayor Borchard invited all in attendance to join him in the pledge of allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**ROLL CALL:**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Borchard, Martie Dote, David Flory, Jeff Monroe, Neal Peart,

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Barzo, Kevin Bryan, Michele Carotenuto, Jack Mahan, Dennis O'Bryant, Julie Salley-Gray, Toni Thompson

STAFF PRESENT: Richard Kirkwood, Phillip Marler, Ann Siprelle, Margaret Vicars, Del Hanson, Gary Wegener, Steve Harris, Karl Diekman, Charlie Wilts, Sue Vannucci, Paul Hanson, Bruce Pollard, Mike Horgan

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ernie Pfanner of the Yolo County Taxpayers' Association addressed the Council and Commission regarding his concerns about the toxins at the school district site on Cottonwood Street. This site was a former dry cleaning operation. He feels the contamination may have reached the water wells. He also expressed concern about the Water Treatment Plant monitoring and the capacity with increases in the population.

## COUNCIL STATEMENTS AND REQUESTS

Council Member Dote said the Water Resources Association met and is aware that the Memorandum of Understanding is supported by the Council. The Gaining Ground group met on the Habitat Conservation Plan and West Sacramento and Winters have moved to go forward with the Environmental Impact Report.

Council Member Peart reported that Saturday evening there was an incident handled very well by the Sheriff's Department, Highway Patrol and Woodland Police Department. He commended these Officers for controlling the situation. In a meeting with Congressman Ose, Chief Hansen, City Manager Kirkwood and Council Member Peart discussed possible grant money for the new Police Station. There is a possibility that up to \$3 million will be available to assist the City for this project.

## REPORTS OF THE CITY MANAGER

### REGULAR CALENDAR

### SPRING LAKE SPECIFIC PLAN STATUS REPORT

Contract Planner Heidi Tschudin summarized the current status of the plan for the Council and Commissioners. Council had directed staff to work with the applicant, property owners and/or their representatives, and a two-member Council Sub-Committee to review and modify the plan to achieve financial feasibility. Several of these meetings have been and continue to be held. Five technical groups were formed: circulation, infrastructure, land use, parks, and financial/fiscal/other. Work has been completed by three groups while the infrastructure and financial/fiscal/other groups continue to meet. The Planning Commission has considered several design issues and agreed to address these issues in the Spring Lake Design Standards following final action on the Plan. The Contract Planner will rewrite the Specific Plan and oversee the preparation of a revised land use plan incorporation team decisions. The process will be validated, financial feasibility reassessed and peer review services engaged. A comprehensive report will then return to the Planning Commission and on to the Council for direction.

Following tentative approval of the Plan, the following tasks will be initiated: (1) testing of traffic and circulation assumptions; (2) finalizing infrastructure plans; (3) verifying CEQA compliance; (4) testing financial feasibility phase by phase; (5) assessing fiscal impact; and (6) securing property owner commitments, including financial participation and indemnification.

It is anticipated that final action on this Plan will come before Council by the first meeting in August. The applicant has some concern that this schedule is excessively long and should be tightened, which is a possibility. They are also validating some tentative agreement reached with interest in the affordable housing community. There will be one more meeting with this group to close the final issues.

Council Member Dote asked that the schedule be tightened, as by August, another year of construction will be lost. She asked to be included on the affordable housing meeting schedule. The property owners are included in the process at present but there has not yet been any financial component in which they have participated. She asked for clarification on that issue. Planner Tschudin said they have been asked to add \$300,000+ to the budget. This would raise the budget to over \$1.5 million to be paid for by the property owners. By not offering them the opportunity to have input on future costs at some point is not to the City's advantage. Normally, the City would not be involved in the financial process. The development of this project has included the City in this initial phase and feedback is needed from the parties at all phases. The budget will return to Council in any respect.

Council Member Monroe has a problem with the timeline and would like final action in May. Should that date not be met, they could return for an extension of time. Planner Tschudin said she has concerns regarding the timeline as well. The items are steps in the process which each take time. Some of the pieces would normally take excessive time to complete and we have shortened the components, but Council and the Commission should be aware of the constraints which may face the project timeline.

Commissioner Thompson asked if clarity regarding some of those unclear issues would be returned to the Commission. Planner Tschudin said there are items where alterations were made and input is sought from the Commission on those changes, but it would not be for every phase of the project. The Commission would not be asked to re-deliberate every piece of the process. Commissioner Thompson wants to be sure these issues return to the Commission for clarification. Commissioner Bryan said they had discussed removing the design guidelines from the Specific Plan and generating a different document which would codify different standards and guidelines. He asked if that process has been scheduled, would it occur at a later time and how does it fit into the Plan. Planner Tschudin said it was never in the document. The document contained a description of the guidelines. The Commission decided to take one particular piece of the regulations in the document and move them out into the standards which have not yet been written. The standards would be prepared at

the conclusion of the Specific Plan process, would stand alone and would be adopted following adoption of the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Bryan said in other projects, eventually a master illustrative plan looking at land use patterns, design guidelines into an overlay indicating potential lots, where the streets could go, etc., is created. Planner Tschudin said it has been a desirable outcome but this is a unique plan so we do not have that portion at present. We have only come to the Specific Plan level. Commissioner Bryan said without a master illustrative plan is showing the overall development and what it might look like could create concerns at a later time.

Commissioner Thompson left the meeting at 7:30 and returned at 7:31.

Council Member Monroe asked how long it would take and the cost involved to create a document such as this. Planner Tschudin said that Planners would create the document fairly quickly at ±\$10,000. We do not have one property owner or a group banded together so it is not possible create without the property owner input. This would be land use map with lots laid out. She said this type of document is very useful but she does not feel the project is to a point where this can be developed as yet.

Tom Lumbrazo of Turn of the Century feels the process is better to separate the design guidelines out of the document and let the document be approved. They could then work simultaneously on the design guidelines. One facet of the design guidelines could be a series of designs which could be acceptable. The more certainty the builder has of what the City wants and having a roll in those discussions, would be helpful to them as well. Council Member Dote feels this type of document would have some historical value for the process and how it was achieved. Council Member Peart asked if we had a master illustrative plan on Sycamore Ranch and Mr. Lumbrazo said we did not.

Council Member Monroe left the meeting at 7:40 and returned at 7:42.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION - SMART GROWTH AND LIVEABLE COMMUNITIES

Paul Zykofsky, Director of Land Use and Transportation Programs for the Local Government Commission presented information on the Commission and its

purpose. Some of the elements of the process of revitalizing the City are tied to incorporating distinctive landscaping and period architecture to create focal points, urban spaces and an entryway to the area. Mixed use development where walking and biking is encouraged for people walk to work or leisure activities reduces congestion, stress levels and promotes a healthier life style and workforce.

Council Member Peart left the meeting at 7:46 and returned at 7:48.

The principles of this type of planning were developed by a group of architects who met to develop new planning ideas and community principles, dubbed the "Ahwahnee Principles" as the meeting was held at the Ahwahnee Hotel in Yosemite.

Commissioner Salley-Gray left the meeting at 7:48 and returned at 7:50.

These fifteen principles to be included in community planning are: (1) complete and integrated communities with those elements essential for daily living; (2) community size of such that daily needs are within easy walking distance; (3) activities should be within easy walking distance of transit stops; (4) diversity of housing types to meet all economic levels and age groups; (5) provision of a variety of jobs within the community; (6) location consistent with the larger transit networks; (7) center focus combining varied uses; (8) specialized open space; (9) public space design to encourage use at all hours of the day and night; (10) well-defined edge to community or community cluster; (11) streets, walkways and bikeways should be fully connecting and encourage walking and biking; (12) natural terrain, drainage and vegetation should be preserved; (13) conservation of resources and minimize waste should be utilized; (14) provision for efficient use of water; (15) street orientation, building placement and shading should contribute efficiency of energy.

Council Member Peart left the meeting at 7:58 and returned at 8:00.

Mr. Zykofsky suggested to Council and the Commission that they view the Aggie Village development in Davis for ideas on how effective this type of project can be and the overall concept. The design of these types of communities within

the community promote people-friendly development. With the integration of housing, shops, work places, parks and civic features essential to daily life, the community becomes safer.

Council Member Peart left the meeting at 8:20 and returned at 8:22.

#### CITY GENERAL PLAN FIVE-YEAR REVIEW AND UPDATE FRAMEWORK REPORT

Senior Planner, Bob MacNicholl, indicated to Council and Planning Commission Members he would be providing background information on the Plan in an effort to help them move forward on the General Plan Update. He summarized the process and identified the Matrix as one that is very similar to that of the past. It lists the items by category and the responsible party to address each item. Some of the items are blank which indicate some of the processes have not yet been implemented or completed. The process to reach this point has been to interview each of the Departments by sending copies of the Matrix to them requesting and updates on status. The implementation measures are in a variety of stages and complexity. Some of issues have not been completed as they may not have been of a particular value to the Department; they have found other means to address the issues. This is an ongoing process and is a measurement of where we are to date.

Larry Mintier, of Mintier and Associates, was involved in the 1996 General Plan Update and has reviewed this Plan update. Mr. Mintier said a review every five years affords the opportunity to look at progress to date and to adjust as needed. Each year an annual report is prepared, which is then compiled into the matrix as the five-year update. He said further information was needed to fill in the gaps and adequately analyze the implementation thus far. The disposition of the issues then provides the tools to remove those which are complete, modify others as needed, eliminate those which are no longer valid and add others. This is a three-month process which involves working with all of the Departments, and conducting an assessment. We would then have a qualitative dimension to the Matrix which is not in place at present. The outcome would set the stage for what the City will be doing over the next year.

Commissioner Thompson asked if this would be presented back to a Joint Session or go the Planning Commission first. Senior Planner MacNicholl said it would go before the Planning Commission first and then to Council, but a Joint Session could be scheduled if desired. The estimated return would be in June, 2001.

Community Development Director Harris said the Implementation Report is an annual report required by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. We have been contacted by several Cities as we have been cited as successfully utilizing the process as required by the State. A more complete status report will return on the housing element. The affordable housing portion is one element the City has indicated on which they will be conducting a more thorough study. Commissioner Thompson asked about the five major issues in the current General Plan, in light of the current energy crisis, is there any consideration for adding an energy conservation efficiency element to the General Plan Update. Director Harris said it is quite timely as other communities are adding this element to their Plan. He said at this point the City would like to receive input from the Council on the Plan and the Policy issues as assistance and direction is needed on how comprehensive the Council would like the plan.

Council Member Dote asked when public review would begin. Director Harris said it would be at all phases of the process. Director Harris stated consensus is requested from the Council and Commission on each of the issues.

Commissioner Thompson asked if we would be looking at alternative buildings. Director Harris said it is part of the current application.

#### Growth Boundaries

Commissioner Thompson asked for clarification on the urban limit line. Director Harris said this clarification is in the introduction of the General Plan document. Mayor Borchard feels that if Smart Growth is implemented, we should be able to stay within the urban limit line for quite some time. Commission Chairperson Mahan said one of the issues we need to keep in mind is the growth of Sacramento toward the airport.

#### Community Growth and Growth Monitoring

Council Member Peart said he feels developers will be moving in very quickly if we open up to all building. Commissioner Salley-Gray feels we will be receiving pressure regarding building. She feels we should establish some control but does not want to control so much that we constrain. Commissioner Thompson feels that methodology is the critical component. Mayor Borchard said these issues came before Council at a previous meeting with one of the methods to control growth as ceasing issuance of building permits and it was decided at that point it was not necessary. However, it may be time to slow it down a bit. Commission Chairperson Mahan said the Commission has asked staff to continue reporting on this issue. Permits are generally pulled in lump

sum. Some months will be high, while others less. Averaging makes more sense as you can then see the growth for a specified period. Perhaps controlling by quarters would be an alternative. Mayor Borchard said this issue should go back to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Thompson asked that it include the affordability issues with low-income housing brought up previously and be tracked separately.

Council Member Dote said since we have had such a slow growth rate over the last year, perhaps it would be another year or two before we see building pick up. This will then bring our percentage higher. By limiting the amount of land, we have capped the growth. She does not think we can monitor the building permits as we will be looking back over the previous year. Mayor Borchard said the cycles are five to seven years and perhaps we should use that as our averaging time period.

Commissioner Carotenuto said the Commission had wanted to have staff develop a management plan for monitoring and maintaining an approximate growth rate of 1.7%. He would like the continuing monitoring and put in place some management tools to allow the monitoring and altering as necessary. The previous number was 300 per year, average.

Commissioner O'Bryant would like to give the public several options to control the growth and standards, with methodologies to measure that growth.

Commissioner Thompson asked if the conservation enhancement in the existing areas would be added to the Master Plan Update. Mayor Borchard said there was a consensus that an element on energy efficiency will be incorporated into the General Plan.

**Commissioner Salley-Gray left the meeting at 9:40 p.m.**

Director Harris asked that Council and Commission gave staff direction on each of the Policy issues that would begin the framework for the update. They need to return with a more detailed work program and a projected budget, timeline, public participation and how they will proceed.

Council Member Dote asked if we would be utilizing a Consultant or staff for the update and Director Harris said there would be consultants, but also staff involvement. This will not be a comprehensive update of the General Plan but will be focused on specific areas.

On motion of Council Member Peart, seconded by Council Member Dote and unanimously carried by the Council and on motion by Commissioner Carotenuto, carried by Commissioner Thompson and carried by unanimous vote of the remaining Commissioners present at the meeting, the Council and Commission authorized staff to prepare a work program and budget for addressing the selected issues during the update process.

#### HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN/HABITAT MITIGATION UPDATE

Senior Planner Bob MacNicholl stated the HCP is tied to the General Plan. The County Gaining Ground group is developing the Plan and seeks input from the Council and Commission. The plan is voluntary and mitigates the loss of species and their habitats. The HCP will allow for an incidental "take permit" from the Federal Government. At present, it is anticipated that 11,672 acres of land will be mitigated with an additional 1,000 acres of development from agricultural processing and related facilities. The fees will range from \$2,509 to \$2,833 per acre and are only for the land not offered in lieu of payment.

The landowners who do not participate will be provided indemnification protection within one-half mile of the mitigation site. Should listed species begin to inhabit their land as a result of enhancement activities on adjoining participating properties, they will be protected while conducting activities on their own property. Participation is entirely voluntary. No eminent domain shall be utilized.

Implementation will be directed through an Implementation Agreement between local jurisdictions and regulatory agencies. This Agreement will establish terms of the regional permit under State and Federal regulations. The structure of implementation will be comprised of a Joint Powers Authority with a Board, Technical Advisory Committee and a Land Manager.

Planner MacNicholl asked the Council and Commission for input on areas where they would like to see a focus. The process involves landowners, developers and environmentalists to enable acquisition of easements on property primarily on agricultural land in the County, where habitat will be established. The land will continue to be used for agricultural purposes but there will be an understanding it will also be utilized for habitat. Commissioner O'Bryant asked for clarification on the term "registered property owner" in the document. Planner MacNicholl said the property owner, not a lessee, would be the contact. It was also clarified that 10% would be enhancements and these would be where the fee title purchases would be focused. These may be nesting sites or other

critical locations. The vast majority of the properties on agricultural lands would be easements. The restrictions would depend on the easement. Due to the nature of some of species who utilize cropland for their foraging, those areas would be considered easements. There may be some restrictions on keeping land as row crops which would then include fees identified. Mayor Borchard asked about the landowner/farmer protection language regarding agricultural land which could become inhabited by endangered species due to enhancements on adjoining participating properties, the farmer will be protected from "take" while conducting lawful activities on their own property. As agricultural entities have endured increasing regulations and restrictions on such things as pesticide applications and he has concerns about these limits being changed. Planner MacNicholl said current standard agricultural practices would remain in place. Council Member Peart asked about the JPA and the Board makeup. Planner MacNicholl said preliminarily, one representative from each City and two from the County will be on the Board but other participants may be added. This will collectively give the Cities more votes. All agencies will participate in the cost. The only new hire for the project would be the Land Manager.

Council Member Dote said that West Sacramento and Winters have moved to support the program, the County will likely approve soon and Davis is still considering. She does not see any major problem issues but we need to craft the JPA carefully. The habitats will be up to the JPA Board. There is a mandate to update the process as well. The plan does provide a program to protect those species which have been identified and we need to keep in mind those species which may surface later.

Planner MacNicholl said they are asking for support in concept from the Council and Commission for the Plan and to spend funds on the EIR and EIS. A formal process will then return to the Council and Commission for each jurisdiction to consider adoption of the Implementation Agreement. These funds are from Development fees held and further collections to be received.

On a motion by Commissioner O'Bryant, seconded by Commissioner Barzo and carried by unanimous vote, the Commissioners moved to support the Habitat Conservation Plan and directed staff to move forward with the EIR and EIS by providing funds in support.

On a motion by Council Member Dote, seconded by Council Member Peart and carried by unanimous vote, the Council moved to support the Habitat Conservation Plan and directed staff to move forward with the EIR and EIS by providing funds in support.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Borchard and Commission Chairperson Mahan adjourned the Special Meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission at 10:10 p.m.

---

City Clerk of the City of Woodland