Council Chambers 300 First Street Woodland, California

June 29, 1995

The Woodland City Council met in special session with the City Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL:

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandy, Flory, Rominger, Slaven

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: Borchard

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT: Seiberth, Friedlander, Agostini, Schwartz, Fernandez, Moore

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: Hicks

STAFF PRESENT: Ruggiero, McDuffee

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

PRESENTATION FROM SOUTHWEST WOODLAND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP:

David White, representing the Southwest Woodland Neighborhood Group, indicated that the group wants commercial growth. He stated that they want 21st century schools and parks. He said between Alternatives 1 and 2 they prefer 2, but without ranchettes. He informed the Commission that his group supports growth east of West Street, south of the existing City limits. He expressed the desire to meet with Larry Mintier.

Council advised Mr. White that it would not be acceptable.

GENERAL PLAN:

Council and Commission received a report from the **Ag Subcommittee on Permanent Urban Limit Line** working paper. Larry Mintier reviewed the recommendations of the Subcommittee.

Commissioner Friedlander expressed concern about establishment of an ultimate urban limit line but would support the urban limit line.

Commissioner Tom Schwartz indicated that the City needs to develop a permanent urban limit line, and he prefers Technique No. 3. He stated that he is concerned about

the use of conservation easements.

Commissioner Friedlander indicated that he feels that conservation easements are essential.

Commissioner Fernandez stated that the use of conservation easements are important and that we are only beginning to use them in Yolo County.

Commissioner Agostini concurred with the recommendations of the Agricultural Subcommittee.

Dudley Holman raised the question about who manages and controls conservation easements. He stated his concern about a political body, i.e. future City Council, being the manager. He suggested a third party be used to manage easements.

Council Member Sandy indicated support of an ultimate urban limit line to the north, west and south. He said it is premature to establish an ultimate urban limit line to the east. He indicated support of Option 5, expressed concern about the practicality of Option 3 and would support joint financing but would like to see what type of method that is.

Council Member Slaven expressed concern about Options 3, 4, and 5. He stated that he would support Option 6. He said he is concerned about funding, about financing of these easements and about more and more costs being placed on existing residents as well as new development.

Council Member Rominger indicated concern with the ultimate urban limit line but said she feels that we should start with west and north and hold off on <u>south</u> and east. She expressed concern about who pays for easements. She felt that the cost should be borne by new development. She stated that Options 3 and 5 may fit in certain locations as well as other alternatives, i.e. walkways, use of public lands, setbacks.

Council Member Flory stated that he does not favor Option 3. He indicated that he is in favor of an ultimate urban limit line but it depends on where the line is placed. He said he feels that new development should pay the bill.

Council Member Sandy indicated that the issue is not who causes development but who benefits from establishment of an ultimate urban limit line which is the entire community. He stressed that we do not want a "Davisland." He said he concurs with County Road 98 to the west, I-5 to the north between County Road 98 and West Street. He said the only area of difference between himself and Council Member Rominger is an ultimate line to the south.

Council Member Rominger stated that she supports an ultimate urban limit line to the south but felt it is premature to say where until a decision on which land use alternative is chosen.

Council Member Sandy asked about the feasibility of Option 3.

Larry Mintier replied that it would be difficult but it could happen.

Council Member Rominger stated that she felt that Options 3 and 5 may work in different locations.

Council Member Sandy supported use of Option 4.

Council Member Rominger discussed the use of double purpose tools.

Council Member Flory removed his objection to Options 3 and 5 depending on the locations.

It was the general consensus that the Council supported an ultimate urban limit line being established with support tools identified in the Subcommittee report. The financing mechanisms need more input.

Commissioner Friedlander asked a clarifying question about Council Member Rominger's position regarding line development to the south. He stated that the pressure for growth precipitates the need for an ultimate urban limit line to the south.

Council Member Rominger clarified that she supports the ultimate urban limit line to the south but felt this meeting was not the time to identify the location of that line to the south.

Larry Mintier walked through the working paper on **Neighborhood Conservation and Enhancement**.

Commissioner Schwartz commented on PRIDE for community and expressed concerns about graffiti and nuisance abatement issues.

He asked how to improve neighborhood involvement in notifying the City of nuisances to allow the City to abate problems.

Commissioner Fernandez stated that we need clear goals in neighborhoods.

Commissioner Agostini indicated that the Historical Element needs to be strengthened to avoid future conflict, e.g. Beamer Arches. She stated that the City should provide tools to restore historical sites.

Council Member Slaven stated that this should be a high priority for the City and that he is concerned about program cuts.

Council Member Sandy indicated that this report is important because the Plan usually ignores existing neighborhoods. He pointed out that rundown apartments affect the public purse. We should be reinvesting in the City center.

Council Member Flory stated that more code enforcement officers are needed.

City Clerk of the City of Woodland

:		
	IDVI	MENIT.
ADJO I	JKINI	VICIVII:

At 9:02 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.			

Written by Community Development Director Janet Ruggiero