



City of Woodland

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

City of Woodland Planning
Commission
c/o Community
Development Department
300 First Street
Woodland, CA 95695
530-661-5820

Thursday, July 16, 2015

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

A. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm

Staff Present:

Ken Hiatt, Director

Cindy Norris, Principal Planner

Erika Bumgardner, Senior Planner

Heidi Tschudin & Sophie Martin, General Plan Team Consultants

B. Roll Call

Present 7:

*Chairman Kirby Wells, Vice Chairman Chris Holt, Commissioner Steve Harris,
Commissioner Marco Lizarraga, Commissioner Fred Lopez, Commissioner John
Murphy and Commissioner Elodia Ortega-Lampkin*

C. Approval of Minutes

No minutes presented.

D. Communications - Directors Report

E. Communications - Public Comment

None provided

F. Communications-Commission Statements Requests

None provided

G. Communications - Subcommittee Reports

*Chairman Wells regarding the Public Art Subcommittee; reported that the Public Art
Committee has met twice.*

*Vice Chairman Holt a Design Liaison to the Planning Commission; reported that he
has met regarding Sixth and Main Street Project.*

H. Public Hearing

[16-016](#)

Woodland Tractor Parcel Map No. 5074 (PLNG 15-00024). The project includes a request for a tentative parcel map to divide a 9.33 acre parcel into two parcels of 3.33 acres and 6 acres. The property is located at 95 West Kentucky Avenue in the Industrial Zone.

Location: 95 West Kentucky

Applicant/Owner: Jeff Huckins/Woodland Tractor & Equipment Co., Inc.

Environmental Report: Class 15 Categorical Exemption (CEQA Guidelines, §15315)

APN: 027-440-012-000

Project Planner: Erika Bumgardner, AICP, Senior Planner

Staff Recommendation: Conditional Approval

Attachments: [1. Planning Commission Resolution including Exhibits a. & b.](#)
 [2. General Application](#)

*Motion was made by Vice Chairman Holt and seconded by Commissioner Lizarraga to approve Woodland Tractor Parcel Map No. 5074 (PLNG 15-00024), request for a tentative parcel map to divide a 9.33 acre parcel into two parcels of 3.33 acres and 6 acres. The motion was carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Chairman Wells, Vice Chairman Holt, Commissioners Harris, Lizarraga, Lopez, Murphy and Ortega-Lampkin.*

[16-009](#)

SUBJECT: General Plan Update 2035 - Overview and Presentation Regarding Development Scenarios Analysis and Draft Preferred Land Use Map and Proposed Development Strategy

DATE: July 16, 2015

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make the following recommendations to the City Council:

- 1.) Accept the Draft Land Use Map as the Preferred Land Use Exhibit for the purposes of drafting the revised General Plan and General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

- 2.) Accept the Proposed Development Strategy as conceptual direction for key land use and related policies in the General Plan Update.

3.) Direct staff and the consultant team to prepare the Draft General Plan incorporating the Preferred Land Use Exhibit and proposed development strategy.

Attachments: [1 - February 2013 City Council Report on Why a General Plan Update](#)
[2 - Community Workshop Report Summary](#)
[3 - General Plan Steering Committee Minutes from May 12 & June 9](#)
[4 - Land Use Crosswalk Table](#)
[5 - Draft Preferred Land Use Map](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Lizarraga and seconded by Commissioner Lopez to open and continue the General Plan Update 2035 - Overview and Presentation Regarding Development Scenarios Analysis and Draft Preferred Land Use Map and Proposed Development Strategy item to the Planning Commission, Special General Plan Meeting scheduled for July 23, 2015.

NOTE: Detailed notes for the July 16, 2015 General Plan discussion were prepared. They have been included as an attachment to these minutes.

I. New Business

None provided

J. Old Business

None provided

K. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm.

The Planning Commission of the City of Woodland encourages all parties interested in a matter scheduled to be reviewed, discussed and acted on at a meeting, to participate in the public discourse, which may include the submission of written comments and materials. The Planning Commission notifies the public that those materials received less than 24 hours before a meeting date and time may not be able to be considered completely. Further, the Planning Commission encourages interested parties to attend the meeting to discuss any matter of concern and to explain their comments more fully.

NOTES from the Woodland Planning Commission Session – July 16, 2015 - Part 1

July 16, 2015, 6:30 pm
City Council Chambers

ATTENDANCE

All Commissioners were in attendance along with approximately 28 members of the public.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

- Marco Lizarraga– I would have liked to have seen a more complex analysis of the fiscal impacts of each scenario to the city.
 - Sophie – We focused on types of jobs and the tax revenues generated. Job growth is something that needs to be supported by strong economic development policies. Economic growth is a complicated story and we can certainly look into it in more detail.
- Fred Lopez – I agree that economic development is important. No one could predict what was going to happen 6 years ago. It's also important that a flood plan/solution is reached before some of those other plans are in place.
- Chris Holt– I'm a big proponent of infill and compact development. Have we been in conversation with the County about the tax sharing agreement for the southern site (SP-1)?
 - Sophie – To some extent yes. We looked at historic tax sharing agreements with the County over time and location.
 - Ken – We've been actively been working with the County on annexation in different scenarios with BAE. We are deep into this analysis and working to understand the cost burdens for both sides. We'll continue this process over the next several months.
- Chris Holt– Is infrastructure planned for all of SP-1, or just SP-1A?
 - Ken – Spring Lake infrastructure was upsized to accommodate SP-1A and areas around the interchange. The drainage is being updated right now to accommodate for all of SP-1. We believe there is adequate infrastructure to support all of SP-1.
- Chris Holt– FARs in Downtown and Mixed Use Areas: The lower thresholds are more suburban and not appropriate for an urban context. This will allow projects that are not appropriate for the urban core. We really want to push the density and intensity of these areas. Would we consider moving those lower thresholds up?

- Sophie – These are not finalized and open to refinement. We chose something to do a calculation of buildout. The FARs are representative of a town on the cusp of moving from more suburban to more urban. Higher FARs might be challenging if we don't take a careful look at parking requirements. That is, it can be hard to fit higher density/intensity on smaller sites and still meet parking requirements. Another way this issue can be addressed is to allow a wider range of FAR in the GP, but become more specific in the Zoning Ordinance. Perhaps allow for lower FARs further from the urban core and higher intensity in the core. I would advise considering projects in Woodland that were successful and look at what their constraints were to decide what is feasible.
- Chris – Can we see examples of policies that incentivizing infill downtown?
 - Sophie – I can come up with some example policies that we've seen in other jurisdictions.
 - Ken – At this phase we're looking for general direction. If there is support for infill policies, we will write them as we prepare the final General Plan.
- Kirby Wells– Outstanding job on this project so far.
- Marco Lizarraga– You say that depth of flooding is not deep enough in some areas to prohibit development. But insurance would still be a concern, because it is expensive whether the flooding risk is one foot or five feet deep. This could hamper the possibility of commercial growth.
 - Kirby Wells – Yes, and it also affects the ability to borrow money.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- David Storer – I represent the Knaggs property in the northwest part of the city.
 - I agree that we need to spur investment in the northwest quadrant. We could also use investment with respect to services. The NW quadrant is well located, as it's closest to Downtown and near the Kentucky corridor. It has great things going for it in terms of commercial activity. Based on jobs generated, it is one of the better scenarios.
 - I'd also like to make the comment that it would be very beneficial to Specific Plans to be able to tier off of the GP EIR.
- Tim Taron (East Woodland LLC) –
 - Prioritize development on non-Prime Farmland.
 - By going to MPRA first after SLSP, you're looking at an area that would destroy 45% of Prime farmland in the ULL. SP-3 has 25% of the Prime Farmland in the ULL. At last GPSC Meeting, by asking "when" development should start in SP-1, instead of "whether" it should, influenced the outcome of that discussion.

- SP-2 only has 9 acres of Prime Farmland. That land is so badly degraded only grass can be grown. It is worthless as ag land.
- It seems to us that the logical way to approach the preferred alternative is to minimize the amount of Prime Farmland doesn't need to be developed now.
- Our proposal is very close to Scenario 2: Spring Lake first, then SP-1A, then allow SP-2 to plan right away (before flood solution is in place). If you make it wait, more Prime Farmland will be lost while waiting for it to develop.
- We have marked up the Preferred Plan (Dev. Scenarios Analysis?) in a way that will be consistent with our goals. I'd like to allow questions next week. We'd also like an opportunity to respond to questions/comments about our plan.
- Mona Shulman (PCP) – PCP is not an uninterested bad corporation. We are a grower owned co-op. Most live in and around Woodland. We are interested members of the community, and want to be a good corporate citizen.
 - We concur that our site is not Prime Farmland. (As a result of a historical accident, not anything we did.) We manage our site just fine. There have been issues in the past, but we've spent money to do a good job in the past few years (sprinkle the area).
 - However, urban development close to our site might cause conflict. Changes to the General Plan might mean we should move to other sites that are not burdened by the urban conflict we experience now.
 - We're fine with development of 900 acres.
 - Want to present petitions on behalf of the Cannery Teamsters.
- Jesse Ortiz – Lifelong member of Woodland community
 - Support preserving Prime Farmland and finishing Spring Lake. The community deserves for this project to be completed
 - I prefer Scenario 2.
- Olga Nevares –
 - I'm here is support of Scenario 2.
 - Preserve ag land
 - Complete Spring Lake
 - Move railroad tracks
 - Support rezoning of unused City properties
- Skip Davies:
 - Scenarios make sense, you'll have to take a little bit of each one.

- Gateway are very important. They need to be treated differently.
- Tax sharing agreements – Some now are unfair to City of Woodland.
- I chair the flood committee – I think a flood scenario is closer than anticipated. There are two preferred solutions that will be narrowed to one, but we still need funding. The design is closer with the \$5 million. I think the GP as it's presented allows for this.
- Rail relocation may take longer. Opportunities north of 1-5 and eastern development becomes more palatable.
- Art Pimentel – Here to represent my 2 year old daughter Isabella.
 - This is an important process. Staff has done a good job.
 - Priorities:
 - Finding a flood solution
 - Protecting prime agricultural land – particularly in south and north, just because there's a significant amount of property within ULL, voters didn't intend for that to be developed.
 - Move railroad tracks outside of City of Woodland
 - Make a difference downtown and in core areas
 - Consider combination of Scenarios 1 and 2
- Glen Barton –
 - Concern with ½ mile buffer around sewer treatment plant. Does that belong to a study of any kind or a number pulled out of the air? How will that affect the development of land on east side of 102?
 - Cindy: ½ mile buffer is based on best practices in industry for odor impacts. At this time, it's considered the best mitigation. The City is continuing to work on other mitigations that could reduce the buffer, but they might be costly.
- Bob Thomas – General Manager of Conway Ranch
 - Water problem – Conway is working with UC Davis on the water project that will be put together next summer. You need to consider the future of water in the City of Woodland.
 - It would be good to see prime farmland mapped for each scenario.
 - Next Thursday, it would help to have a better description of the flood problems in Woodland. They want to expand Yolo bypass. The West Levee on Conway Ranch would need to be strengthened to widen the bypass. It is a State levee that has been decertified. Strengthening it will help solve some of the city's problems.
 - Mayor came to us for help with a flood solution and getting the train tracks out of Woodland. They've identified a rail solution to get the

tracks out of all three cities. The rail and flood solutions are on Conway Ranch.

- Drew Palmeiro Jr. – Lifelong resident
 - Support Scenario 2, vital for future of Woodland
 - Strongly believe relocating the train tracks would heighten the city's economy by opening up the eastern corridor.
- Jenny Lilge –
 - A year and a half ago the process seemed like it was getting hijacked by private interests. Do not develop on 900 acres because it stretches the city and moves the center. It would be expensive to spend money on infrastructure, services, etc.
 - I think agriculture heritage is being used as a catch phrase to push the 900 acres.
 - An extra fire station, police station, new onramp? Developers stand to make a lot of money off of this. Think about who stands to gain what.
- Kenneth ___?
 - Having farmland within the city is not the best.
 - Kentucky and that entrance to the city has been totally ignored. We've been trying to clean up the old buildings to make it nicer, but it's just been abandoned. It needs to be taken care of.
- Al Eby – GPSC Member
 - Some inherent design flaws in the way the city is perceived when driving through. In SP-3, what makes you want to stop? An AM/PM, but that's it. You don't start to know what this community is about until Main or 102. By then people have already decided to keep going to Sacramento. How do we get people to stop and say "Hey that's a really nice town!" or "Wow, should we stop in that community?" That area looks like an industrial wasteland. We have to change that.
 - I don't agree with triggers. 80% buildout is a problem so people will delay. Instead, give a timeline.
 - As Marco said, generating revenue is key. As a small business owner, we have to look at turnover of customers.
- Ron Caceres –
 - I'd like to advocate for more infill; You have a strong directive to do so. We have plenty of sites now.
 - I don't have a vested interest in SP 1, 2, or 3, but I do in downtown. I'd like to encourage higher density development on the sites we do have downtown. Brings more people to the core. Overall, that would be the best thing.

Attachments :

- Handout from Tim Taron – Map with notes
- Copies of Petitions from the Employees at PCP Woodland