

**CITY OF SANTA ROSA PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY FEBRUARY 9, 2006**

4:00 PM REGULAR MEETING SESSION (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bartley called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Commissioners Arendt, Cisco, Faber, Gorin, Walsh, and Chairman Bartley

Commissioners absent: Commissioner Poulsen

Staff Present: Marie Meredith, Deputy Director Community Development – Planning; Pat Wilson, Assistant City Attorney; Tamara Taylor, Administrative Secretary, Planning Commission

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 26, 2006 were approved with a minor spelling correction on page 7 and modifications to Item 14 (Ditty Village), page 10: References to the steepness of the roof pitches were clarified to be for the houses on lots 2 and 4.

4. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None.

5. DEPARTMENT REPORT

None.

6. PLANNING COMMISSIONERS' REPORT

Commissioner Faber reported that the Planning Commission/Design Review Board subcommittee met last Friday to discuss items to be incorporated into the workplan.

7. STATEMENTS OF ABSTENSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS

None.

8. CONSENT AGENDA

None.

9. CONTINUED ITEM (continued from 12/8/05) – PARCEL MAP/HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT – EDWARDS PARCEL MAP – 3394 Parker Hill Road - Subdivide a one-acre parcel into two single-family residential lots – File No. MJP05-015

Ex parte communication disclosure: All Commissioners visited the site.

Acting Senior Planner Joel Galbraith reported that this item is a request for a hillside development permit and parcel map to subdivide a one-acre parcel into two single-family residential lots.

The Planning Commission Conducted a hearing on this item on October 13, 2005, and voted to continue the project to December 8, 2005, to allow the applicant time to provide additional information regarding the visual analysis, tree removal, and landscape plan for the common driveway. At the public hearing on October 13, 2005, several neighbors raised issues with ongoing construction issues and drainage issues regarding the common driveway, which will serve this project as well as the two adjacent projects. The driveway has been completed and no recent complaints have been received.

On December 8, 2005, and January 12, 2006, the Planning Commission continued the item at the applicant's request to allow the applicant additional time to prepare the requested information.

The only issues identified with the lot split, are the visual impacts from the construction of one new home. The site is not highly visible except from Hidden Valley Park. The simulations show the location of a home under construction to the north and the proposed new home on Lot 2.

On January 10, 2006, the applicant submitted a revised visual analysis and driveway landscape plan. It is Staff's position that the applicant has provided the additional information requested showing that the project site can be developed consistent with the City's hillside policies, and therefore approval is recommended.

A landscape plan has also been provided and staff recommends that it be referenced as a condition of approval in the tentative map resolution.

Acting Senior Planner Galbraith responded to questions and concerns of the Planning Commission:

- He described the buildable area of Lot 2, pointing out that the upper 1/3 is heavily forested and includes 25% or more slopes and is therefore not developable.
- The story-poles were erected by the applicant; the accuracy of the poles is not regulated by the City.

William Edwards (the applicant) stated that he believes that he has addressed the Commission's previous concerns, and indicate that the project's landscape architect and Civil Engineer are available to answer questions.

Paul Bartholow, the project's Civil Engineer, responded to concerns of the Planning Commission regarding the retention of existing trees and the location of the future home on Lot 2:

- The rear of the house will likely be no further up the hillside than the newly built house next door.
- It is expected that the new home would be set back far enough from the front to retain the existing trees, and that as many of the trees at the rear of the buildable portion of the lot would also be retained.

In response to the Commission's questions regarding the story poles, Mr. Edwards explained that they were erected according to the topography map and in reference to known site points. They represent a typical 2-story home with garage, and the highest poles are 29 ½-feet tall.

Chairman Bartley re-opened the public hearing.

There being no one wishing to speak, Chairman Bartley closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued regarding the visual analysis, accuracy of story-pole placement, tree preservation, building envelope, the sensitivity of this scenic, hillside site, the Planning Commission's charge to consider the requested subdivision, and the Zoning Administrator's role in the Hillside Development Permit consideration.

Commissioner Faber proposed to include conditions regarding the future home which would limit the ridge height and restrict the building envelope in order to preserve the trees in front and in line with the house next door to the rear, consistent with the applicant's visual analysis.

Further discussion ensued regarding the sufficiency of the City's Hillside Development Ordinance to address the sensitivity of the site and the Zoning Administration process.

Mr. Galbraith described the public participation in the Zoning Administration (ZA) review process, noting that Zoning Administration is noticed and ZA decisions are subject to appeal to the Planning Commission.

The majority of the Planning Commission agreed that the Hillside Development Ordinance would adequately address its concerns regarding the development of Lot 2, and that the Zoning Administration process provides sufficient public participation and appeal process. The Planning Commission concurred with staff's recommendation to include the reference to the landscape plan in the tentative map resolution and requested that the Zoning Administrator consider the following concerns regarding the future development of Lot 2:

- The preservation of the trees at the front of the site so as to provide screening of the home, and the preservation of as many trees in the rear can be preserved outside of the actual building footprint.
- That the construction and design quality of the new home, as well as any upgrades the existing single-family home on Lot 1, be compatible with that of the home under construction to the north.

- The design and height of any home approved on Lot 2 should respect the integrity and sensitivity of this scenic site,

Commissioner Gorin commented that the site is highly visible from many places and indicated that she would support that the height of any home approved for Lot 2 be no higher than the newly constructed house next door.

Commissioner Faber explained that due to the discrepancies in the actual placement of the story poles to their location on the plan, and in light of the majority opinion not to condition the project for height limitation and building envelope to respect the sensitivity of the site, he will not support the project.

Motion: Commissioner Walsh made and Commissioner Arendt seconded a motion to adopt **Resolution No. 10889:** RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR EDWARDS PARCEL MAP LOCATE AT 3399 PARKER HILL ROAD FILE NUMBER MJP05-015. The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: (5) (Arendt, Cisco, Gorin, Walsh, Bartley)
 Noes: (1) (Faber)
 Abstentions: (0)
 Absent: (1) (Poulsen)

Motion: Commissioner Walsh made and Commissioner Arendt seconded a motion to adopt **Resolution No. 10890:** RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA APPROVING THE EDWARDS PARCEL MAP LOCATED AT 3399 PARKER HILL ROAD - FILE NUMBER MJP05-015, with the addition of the following condition:

Parcel Map Improvement Plans shall include landscaping of the common driveway consistent with the Planting Plan dated January 8, 2006.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: (5) (Arendt, Cisco, Gorin, Walsh, Bartley)
 Noes: (1) (Faber)
 Abstentions: (0)
 Absent: (1) (Poulsen)

Motion: Commissioner Walsh made and Commissioner Arendt seconded a motion to adopt **Resolution No. 10892:** RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA APPROVING A HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR EDWARD PARCEL MAP LOCATED AT 3399 PARKER HILL ROAD - ASSESSORS=S PARCEL NUMBERS 173-250-035 FILE NO. HDP05-010. The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: (5) (Arendt, Cisco, Gorin, Walsh, Bartley)
 Noes: (1) (Faber)
 Abstentions: (0)
 Absent: (1) (Poulsen)

10. CONTINUED ITEM (continued from 1/12/06) – REZONE/SMALL LOT CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/TENTATIVE MAP – RACHEL DRIVE SUBDIVISION – 375 Brittain Lane – Rezone an 0.83 acre site from RR-40 To R-1-6 (Single Family Residential) and subdivide into five lots ranging in size from 4,941 sq ft to 6,508 sq ft for Rachel Drive Subdivision - File No. MJP05-018

Ex parte communication disclosure: All Commissioners visited the site.

Consultant Planner Rick Hirsch presented this application to rezone the subject site from RR-40 to R1-6 with a development plan and tentative map to develop four single family homes with an existing home to remain. The project requires a Conditional Use Permit for a "Small Lot Subdivision", for lot sizes not meeting the typical minimum 6000 square foot lot size.

On January 12, 2006, the Planning Commission held a hearing on this item. It was the position of the Planning Commission that the existing home on Lot 2 does not meet the minimum requirements of the Zoning Code in that the lot does not provide for at least 400 square feet of usable, private open space and the attached carport encroaches into the required rear yard setback. The existing home is also in a dilapidated condition. The Commission continued the item to allow the applicant time to redesign the project to bring the home on Lot 2 into conformance with the Zoning Code and to prepare design plans indicating how the existing home and lot will be renovated.

On January 24, 2006, the applicant submitted revised plans, which are now before the Planning Commission for a decision. Modifications include removal of the existing carport, construction of a new two-car garage and second dwelling, shifting the proposed emergency vehicle access (EVA) northward with plantings on both sides, and installing contiguous sidewalk and detached planter strip at the Lot 2 Rachel Drive frontage to soften the planned fence.

It is Staff's position that all issues raised by the Planning Commission have been addressed by the proposed modifications to the project, and therefore approval is recommended.

Mr. Hirsch noted that the rear property line of Lot 1 proposes a 6-foot fence abutting the sidewalk on Brittain Lane, and recommended that a condition be added to require a 5-foot landscape strip consistent with the other homes to the south with double-frontage on Brittain Lane and Rachel Drive.

Consultant Planner Hirsch responded to questions and concerns of the Planning Commission:

- The stairs for the 2nd dwelling unit above the garage encroach into the setback as allowed by the small-lot regulations.
- The proposed resolutions do not contain an anti-graffiti condition.
- The Fire Department requires that the 18-foot access be free and clear, which would require revision of the Landscape Plan.

Randy Figuredo (representing the applicant) described the revised site plan, including 1) removal of the carport on proposed Lot 2; 2) a new two-car garage with second story second dwelling with driveway access to the Rachel Drive cul-de-sac; 3) shifting the proposed EVA northward with foundation plantings on both sides to soften the appearance of the adjacent building walls; 4) reversing the sidewalk and planter strip locations at the Lot 2 Rachel Drive frontage to soften the planned six-foot rear yard fence; and, 5) providing elevations and a landscape plan for the renovation of the existing home on proposed Lot 2. Mr. Figuredo indicated willingness to include a 5-foot planter strip along the Brittain Lane frontage and to accept direction from the Planning Commission regarding the landscaping along the EVA and outlined some alternatives such as foundation plantings, to soften the EVA hardscape.

Mr. Figuredo responded to questions from the Commission:

- The gable on the north wall of the existing home/2nd unit extends about 4"
- As an alternative to dedicating the EVA to the City, the property lines could be adjusted to include the EVA so the property owners would be responsible for its maintenance.

Chairman Bartley opened the public hearing.

Terry Hilton of Leisure Park Circle expressed support for the proposal.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bartley closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued, with the Planning Commission expressing general support for the proposal. The Commission commended the applicant for his response to the Planning Commission's previous concerns, particularly as to the architecture and the EVA treatment and further requested the following changes prior to formal approval:

- Adjustment of property lines to include the EVA within the property lines, with EVA access easements where necessary, in order to establish maintenance responsibility of the EVA. Irrigation for the EVA shall be provided from Lot 1.
- A 5-foot landscape strip between the fence and the sidewalk on the Brittain Lane frontage of Lot 1.
- Provide a planter strip between the EVA and building wall of the home on Lot 1.
- Include anti-graffiti measures for new fencing.
- Fencing shall be more substantial than proposed.
- Lot 1 home shall be designed with a hipped roof rather than a gable on the rear elevation facing onto Brittain Lane.

Motion: Commissioner Cisco moved and Commissioner Gorin seconded a motion directing staff to draft revised approval Resolutions to address the points listed above and to schedule final action on February 23, 2006 consent calendar. The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: (6) (Arendt, Cisco, Faber, Gorin, Walsh, Bartley)
Noes: (0)
Abstentions: (0)
Absent: (1) (Poulsen)

11. PUBLIC HEARING – TENTATIVE MAP FOUNTAINGROVE INN HOTEL CONDOMINIUMS - 3586 MENDOCINO AVENUE - Subdivide a 2.84-acre parcel into two lots; and further subdivide an approved hotel on lot 1 into 22 airspace hotel condominium units - File Number MJP05-045

Ex parte communication disclosure: All Commissioners visited the site. Commissioner Faber also reviewed this item as a member of the Design Review Board .

Consultant Planner Kim Voge reported that the applicants request a Tentative Map to (1) split a 2.84-acre parcel located at 3586 Mendocino Avenue into two lots; and (2) subdivide an approved hotel on Lot 1 into 22 airspace hotel condominium units.

The proposed Tentative Map does not change any aspect of the approved Conditional Use Permit for Fountaingrove Inn Extended Stay Suites. The approved use remains the same.

Consultant Planner Voge responded to questions and concerns of the Planning Commission:

- She confirmed that transient occupancy tax would be collected except from guests who stay past 30 days, or when the unit is occupied by the owner.
- She clarified that some of the guest parking shown on the map has been removed and outlined locations for additional parking. She further noted that these locations would require retaining walls, additional cut & fill, Hillside Development Permits and Design Review Board approval.
- The project does not meet the threshold for traffic analysis

The Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit and Hillside Development Permit for Fountaingrove Inn Extended Stay Suites on January 27, 2005. Final Design Review was approved for the hotel on June 16, 2005.

Robert Miller (the applicant) described the hotel condominium concept, indicating that they have become increasingly common in other cities and that this would be the first in Santa Rosa. The proposal is a key piece in the Round Barn renovation project, which will bring additional access and parking to the subject site.

Chairman Bartley opened the public hearing.

Terry Hilton of the South and West Business Association expressed support for the proposal.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bartley closed the public hearing. Discussion ensued with the Planning Commission expressing its support for the project, noting that the future Round Barn parking lot would provide additional parking if it were needed.

Motion: Commissioner Arendt made and Commissioner Walsh seconded a motion to adopt **Resolution No. 10892:** RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA APPROVING THE FOUNTAIN GROVE INN CONDOMINIUMS AND LOT SPLIT TENTATIVE MAP LOCATED AT 3586 MENDOCINO AVENUE - FILE NUMBER MJP05-045. The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: (6) (Arendt, Cisco, Faber, Gorin, Walsh, Bartley)
Noes: (0)
Abstentions: (0)
Absent: (1) (Poulsen)

Chairman Bartley called a recess at 5:23 p.m., reconvening at 5:31 p.m.

12. PUBLIC HEARING - WAL-MART STONY POINT PLAZA CENTER DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) - 2001 and 2025 Sebastopol Road - Receive public comment and recommendations on the draft EIR prepared for this project consisting of the demolition of existing vacant home improvement and Rite Aid stores (98,000 sq. ft.) to construct a new 101,048 sq.ft. Wal-Mart discount retail store – File No. MNP04-034

City Planner Kraig Tambornini reported that the Draft EIR for the project evaluates environmental effects of a new 106,000 square foot retail discount store, including a 4,900 square foot garden center that would occupy 2.3 acres of an existing 16-acre shopping center (Stony Plaza Shopping Center), exclusive of parking, loading and access areas. The new retail building would replace an existing 98,437 square foot vacant home improvement store and a drug store, as well as 4,000 square feet of retail shops, which would be demolished to accommodate the new Wal-Mart store and expanded parking area.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been circulated for a 45-day public review period that began on December 28, 2005 and will extend until 5:00 PM on February 10, 2006 (per CEQA §15087). The Planning Commission will hold and close a public hearing allowing the public to comment on the adequacy of the EIR.

He introduced Ted Adams of EIP, the consultant responsible for preparing the EIR, and Steve Colman of Dowling and Associates, the preparer of the Traffic and Circulation portions of the EIR.

Ted Adams described the proposed project, size, summarized the proposed project, noting that the proposed Wal-Mart store “footprint” would occupy about 2.3 acres near the westerly property line of the shopping center. The Wal-Mart store would occupy a building site previously used by retail outlets House to Home specializing in retail sales for home remodeling, repair and outfitting, and Rite Aid specializing in retail sales of

drug and healthcare products. The existing building would be demolished to allow construction of the proposed Wal-Mart store which would occupy the same building footprint previously occupied by House to Home and Rite Aid.

A portion (6,400 square feet) of a commercial building located immediately to the north of the existing store that is currently vacant would also be demolished to provide for an additional 13 parking spaces. While the new building would consist of 101,048 gross square feet of space, there would also be provided approximately 4,900 gross square feet of outside area for setting up a retail garden center. Therefore, the project would include about 106,000 gross square feet of retail space as noted above. With project completion, the shopping center would contain about 200,000 gross square feet of commercial and commercial support space (about the same as existing). The building would rise to about 29 feet in height, which is approximately the same height as the existing buildings.

The project would include re-striping for 454 parking spaces in the vicinity of the Wal-Mart store to achieve a total of 828 parking spaces at the Stony Point Plaza shopping center in compliance with City parking requirements. A delivery access drive would separate the structure from the westerly property line as is currently the case.

The public pedestrian store entries are planned to be located on the east facing side of the building oriented toward the parking lot area. Public pedestrian and vehicular access into the shopping center and parking areas would be from two existing entry/exit locations along Stony Point Road and two existing entry/exit locations along Sebastopol Road. In order to improve noise conditions the loading dock for truck deliveries would be located at the north side of the building away from its current location on the west side directly adjacent to the Casa Del Sol residential complex.

Mr. Adams stated that the proposed Wal-Mart project has been found to be generally consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan. In those cases where partial consistency is noted, mitigation measures are provided to bring project development into consistency with the provisions of the General Plan.

A significant and unavoidable impact is identified for project-induced as well as cumulative development-induced increased traffic noise. The project and cumulative development would not be consistent with General Plan Noise and Safety Element Policy NS-B-3 regarding the prevention of new noise sources in developed areas.

Area residents are currently exposed to exterior traffic noise levels that exceed City standards. Future noise levels (based on Year 2020 traffic volumes) in the area would continue to be dominated by vehicular traffic on Highway 12, Stony Point Road, and Sebastopol Road. However, building interior noise levels would be less than the City's standard for interior noise levels.

Other potential project-generated sources of noise would include new stationary sources such as an outdoor trash compactor, outdoor ventilation and air conditioning equipment and increased activity throughout the project site at the shopping center including the movement of delivery trucks, loading dock operations and parking lot

cleaning, the impacts of which can be mitigated to a less than significant level wherein the projects contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Steve Colman described the traffic impacts for Wal-Mart, which would be greater than was for previous home improvement store on the site. The Wal-Mart project would generate more vehicle trips than previous uses of the site (as a home improvement store), and more trips than a general shopping center use of the site. In the nearterm, after the Stony Point Road phase I widening, project-generated traffic (along with approved and proposed development traffic) would cause the existing westbound LOS on Sebastopol Road (Corporate Center Parkway to Dutton Avenue), to decrease from D to E during the PM peak hour.

Chairman Bartley opened the public hearing.

Fred Pepper of Hopper Avenue, representing the members United Food and Commercial Workers' Union 588 expressed opposition to the project because it does not serve the community. Employees not paid well at just over \$8/hour.

Norm Howard with Casa del Sol Homeowners' Association (HOA) referred to their previously submitted document outlining the HOA's concerns. He requested that the EIR demonstrate how the proposed commercial use is compatible with the high-density, well-managed Casa del Sol housing community. He believes that the traffic and noise of the proposed use would have too great an impact on the residents of Casa del Sol. He believes that the loading dock is still too close to the residential uses and noted that he was informed that the store would not be open 24-hours a day.

Kevin O'Connor of Roseland agreed with Mr. Howard regarding the traffic impacts. He indicated that a Wal-Mart store would not contribute to the revitalization of Roseland. He would support mixed use with some green space on the site and pointed out that both Rohnert Park to the south and Windsor to the north each already have a Wal-Mart.

Terry Hilton of Roseland stated that many neighbors support the project. Wal-Mart would bring business to the shopping center. His research shows that employees earn a \$10.50/hour starting wage and that Wal-Mart has an employee health plan..He believes that the store would contribute to the revitalization of the southwest area.

Terra Freedman with Citizens Against Wal-Mart indicated that the EIR failed to consider consistency with the Southwest Area Plan. She believes that the General Plan does not supercede the policies of the Southwest Area Plan.

Ben Boyce of the Living Wage coalition, and with Citizens Against Wal-Mart, referred to previously submitted documents. He believes that the Wal-Mart is not consistent with the Southwest Area Plan and would displace jobs and place a burden on health services and affordable housing. Non-managerial workers make an average of \$10.38 an hour.

Monica Sallouti with Citizens Against Wal-Mart expressed that Wal-Mart's proposal to sell alcohol 24-hours per day is not consistent with the Southwest Area Plan.

Gayle Anderson with Citizens Against Wal-Mart requested that the EIR address a housing option, and agreed with previous speakers that the proposal is not consistent with the Southwest Area Plan.

Calvin Simons with Citizens Against Wal-Mart indicated that the EIR does not address Roseland's unique entrepreneurial character, nor does it address how a Wal-Mart store would affect smaller "mama y papa" businesses along Sebastopol Road.

Caroline Banuelas with Citizens Against Wal-Mart indicated that the traffic impacts are understated and need to be re-analyzed.

Scot Stegeman with Citizens Against Wal-Mart stated that different building sizes are listed in the EIR, that the General Plan consistency analysis is inadequate and that there is no Southwest Area Plan consistency analysis. There has been no analysis of the project's consistency with the existing PD District. The Joe Rodota trail has not been acknowledged, nor has access to the trail been proposed. The mitigation measures are not strongly worded.

Donna Norton with Citizens Against Wal-Mart stated that the Police Department cannot currently meet response time goals in General Plan and that adding a 24-hour Wal-Mart with liquor sales would impact the response time. Impacts to safety resources need to be looked at closer and clarified, and there needs to be definite and enforceable security plan.

Veronica Jacobi with the Sierra Club stated that the EIR inadequately addresses impacts to small and medium businesses. She indicated that on-site housing would mitigate traffic impacts. The EIR should evaluate Santa Rosa's plan to reduce vehicle emissions.

Julie Lumine stated that the EIR does not address the economic impact to other businesses in area. She noted that other sources of information about Wal-Mart, such as the internet, books and movies, should be reviewed.

Diane S. of Casa del Sol stated that out of 188 people polled as to what store should occupy the subject site, only 10 wanted a Wal-Mart. The majority of respondents preferred a smaller store, more variety of uses and community services on the site. The traffic is already bad and would be worse with a Wal-Mart.

Peter Tschesneff indicated his opposition to Wal-Mart.

Diana Stenlon asked that the EIR address the economic impact to other local business, including the vacancy rate for businesses in the vicinity. She asked whether the recycling center would remain and requested that the impact of alcohol sales on gangs, crime and schools be reviewed.

Jenny Bard of Carr Avenue indicated agreement with previous comments and also expressed concern about the proposed design of the Wal-Mart as shown on the cover of the EIR. She asked how does this design relate to the visual character of Roseland and encouraged the consideration of the 'new urbanism' style of design.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bartley closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission requested that the following issues be reviewed in the EIR:

- More options for structuring the parking & circulation—currently uses existing circulation. If this will be the configuration, review how traffic queuing would be impacted and the effect it would have on existing businesses within the shopping center.
- The Walgreens listed in the EIR is not going in; review the impact of the loss of Walgreens on the traffic pattern and circulation.
- What does Wal-Mart propose regarding the sales of alcohol? What percentage is alcohol sales?
- What are police call numbers and types for other Wal-Marts?
- What is the difference between 'Wal-Mart and 'Wal-Mart' discount store referred to in the document?
- Discuss the Southwest Area Plan and history of land use change from the Southwest Area Plan to the General Plan, including compatibility with the Southwest Area Plan, and clarification of whether it is superseded by the General Plan.
- How might a Wal-Mart with housing better serve the community?
- Discuss Wal-Mart employee wages and benefits and the impacts to public services by employees not covered by health insurance.
- Discuss Wal-Mart's practice of off-shoring manufacturing and how that would impact local manufacturers.
- Review alternatives of form-based design.
- Display the work on the daily traffic counts.
- Discussion the class-action suits against Wal-Mart.
- Discuss the impact of Wal-Mart on local businesses, including the names and types of local merchants and the vacancy rates after a Wal-Mart store opens.
- How does the project strengthen the visual quality of this entryway?
- How does the project contributes to the revitalization of Roseland
- Discuss how the project would meet SUSMP regulations.
- Discuss how the project complies with policies that prevent urban sprawl.
- Review and offer additional mitigations to noise impacts.
- Discuss the effects of traffic queuing on Sebastopol and Stony Point Roads.
- Discuss mitigations using alternative transportation, including shuttle service.
- Discuss the integration of the Joe Rodota trail.
- Have the City Traffic engineer review the traffic analysis.
- How will the parking changes impact the existing businesses in the shopping center?

- Discuss construction impacts and mitigations.
- Provide more information on demolition, including the recycling of concrete and building materials.
- Provide more information on Wal-Mart's security policies and practices.
- Clarify the proposed 24-hour operation and the resulting impacts on calls for police service and the neighborhood.
- Provide more detail on soundwall between Wal-Mart and Cas del Sol.
- Further explore housing inclusion and mixed use.
- Explain how do Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds tie into the project, and how development fees would impact Stony Point Road improvements.
- Review impacts and mitigation for litter.
- Clarify the type of worker that Wal-Mart looks for as it relates to the type of traffic generated.
- Clearly define the relation of the proposed structure to the existing structure and discuss whether the existing the Wal-Mart is going to be a superstore and how it would affect the FoodMaxx store.
- How will increasing the number of parking spaces compliance with orchard-style parking lot design requirements?
- What are the impacts of demolition and construction to existing shopping center tenants during the construction process?
- The Draft EIR is inconsistent in places because it analyzes the impacts for traffic with the impacts on the previous use, but in other sections of the EIR it analyzes the impacts versus a vacant use

The Planning Commission acknowledged that some of the socio-economic concerns expressed may not be addressed in the EIR, but could be discussed when the Wal-Mart project comes before the Commission.

Chairman Bartley called a recess at 7:07 p.m., reconvening at 7:14 p.m.

13. REPORT - Planning Commission 2006 Workplan discussion

Deputy Director Marie Meredith introduced the discussion of the 2006 Planning Commission workplan and report to City Council.

On February 15, 2005 The City Council adopted Resolution No. 26191, which adopted and directed implementation of the Planning Commission Workplan for 2005. To this end, the Planning Commission held a joint study sessions with the Design Review Board on November 17, 2005, as well as several sub-committee meetings. It is proposed at this time that the Planning Commission will discuss issues related to the workplan and will begin drafting its report to the City Council for 2006.

The Planning Commission agreed that much has been accomplished towards its goals in the past year and concurred on a 2-year cycle of goal planning (1st year) and progress review (2nd year), as practiced by the City Council.

Chairman Bartley stated that the Planning Commission and Design Review Board Chairs and Vice-Chairs will be meeting in order to decide on how to re-implement the referral process.

The Commission summarized the work done by the various sub-committees:

Planning Commission/Staff subcommittee: Commissioner Cisco stated that she and Commissioner Arendt had worked with Mr. Regalia to discuss bubble-up issues and how policies are made. She has the agenda ready to submit to staff for a study session, after which she and Commissioner Arendt would meet again.

Planning Commission/Design Review Board subcommittee: Commissioner Faber indicated that the Board and Commission members should be included in meetings and discussions of downtown planning projects such as the 6th Street linkages and Station Area plan and that a joint Design Review Board/Planning Commission study session is needed to discuss quality of design and compliance with the Design Guidelines for development of some areas in the County within the City's sphere of influence.

Planning Commission/Cultural Heritage Board subcommittee: Commissioner Walsh indicated that the 'planning body' of the Planning Commission, Design Review Board and Cultural Heritage Board meet together in a less formal setting. Commissioner Gorin agreed that such a 'planning summit' is needed in order to clarify what 'pedestrian and bicycle orientation' means to all the Boards and Commission and to then make corrections and additions to the Zoning Code and General Plan as needed.

The Planning Commission agreed that the following issues are a priority to address in the coming year:

- Re-establish the referral process
- Review/updating the condominium conversion ordinance.
- Review design/circulation/intensity/compatibility issues of infill projects.
- Hold a study session with the Santa Rosa Junior College neighborhood.
- Have the Advance Planning Team do a review of downtown planning projects.
- Discuss the interaction of City/County with the design guidelines.
- Clarification of pedestrian-bicycle orientation.
- Discuss the quality of design and raising the design bar.
- Address how to handle bubble-up issues.
- Hold a 'planning summit'.
- Discuss the impacts of the midrise policy - Commissioner Cisco will represent the Planning Commission on the Downtown Station Area Plan.
- Support staff as changes are made

The Planning Commissioners requested that they receive notice of downtown planning meetings.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Bartley adjourned the meeting at 7:34 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission Meeting to be held at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber at Santa Rosa City Hall on Thursday February 23, 2006.

PREPARED BY:

Tamara Taylor, Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

APPROVED BY:

Chuck Regalia, Executive Secretary

Chairman Bartley