

CITY OF VALLEJO PLANNING COMMISSION

Kent Peterman, Chairperson
Gail Manning, Vice-Chair
Norm Turley
Bruce P. Gourley
Suzanne Harrington Cole
Wanda Chihak
Lori Reese-Brown

**WEDNESDAY
3 September 2008**

7:00 P.M.

City Hall
555 Santa Clara Street
Vallejo, California 94590

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection on the table in front of Council Chambers during normal business hours. Such documents are also available on the City of Vallejo website at <http://www.ci.vallejo.ca.us> subject to staff's ability to post the documents before the meeting.

Those wishing to address the Commission on a scheduled agenda item should fill out a speaker card and give it to the Secretary. Speaker time limits for scheduled agenda items are five minutes for designated spokespersons for a group and three minutes for individuals.

Those wishing to address the Commission on any matter not listed on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission may approach the podium during the "Community Forum" portion of the agenda. The total time allowed for Community Forum is fifteen minutes with each speaker limited to three minutes.

Government Code Section 84308 (d) sets forth disclosure requirements which apply to persons who actively support or oppose projects in which they have a "financial interest", as that term is defined by the Political Reform Act of 1974. If you fall within that category, and if you (or your agent) have made a contribution of \$250 or more to any commissioner within the last twelve months to be used in a federal, state or local election, you must disclose the fact of that contribution in a statement to the Commission.

The applicant or any party adversely affected by the decision of the Planning Commission may, within ten days after the rendition of the decision of the Planning Commission, appeal in writing to the City Council by filing a written appeal with the City Clerk. Such written appeal shall state the reason or reasons for the appeal and why the applicant believes he or she is adversely affected by the decision of the Planning Commission. Such appeal shall not be timely filed unless it is actually received by the City Clerk or designee no later than the close of business on the tenth calendar day after the rendition of the decision of the Planning Commission. If such date falls on a weekend or City holiday, then the deadline shall be extended until the next regular business day.

Notice of the appeal, including the date and time of the City Council's consideration of the appeal, shall be sent by the City Clerk to all property owners within two hundred or five hundred feet of the project boundary, whichever was the original notification boundary.

The Council may affirm, reverse or modify any decision of the Planning Commission which is appealed. The Council may summarily reject any appeal upon determination that the appellant is not adversely affected by a decision under appeal.

If any party challenges the Planning Commission's actions on any of the following items, they may be limited to raising only those issues they or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this agenda or in written correspondence delivered to the Secretary of the Planning Commission.

If you have any questions regarding any of the following agenda items, please call the assigned or project planner at (707) 648-4326.

A. ORDER OF BUSINESS CALL TO ORDER

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. ROLL CALL

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: July 21, 2008 and August 4, 2008.

E. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

F. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

None.

G. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT

H. REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND LIAISON REPORTS

1. Report of the Presiding Officer and members of the Planning Commission
2. Council Liaison to Planning Commission
3. Planning Commission Liaison to City Council

I. COMMUNITY FORUM

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on items not on the agenda are requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Secretary. The Commission may take information but may not take action on any item not on the agenda.

J. CONSENT CALENDAR AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Consent Calendar items appear below in section K, with the Secretary's or City Attorney's designation as such. Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on Consent Calendar items are asked to address the Secretary and submit a completed speaker card prior to the approval of the agenda. Such requests shall be granted, and items will be addressed in the order in which they appear in the agenda. After making any changes to the agenda, the agenda shall be approved.

All matters are approved under one motion unless requested to be removed for discussion by a commissioner or any member of the public.

K. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

L. OTHER ITEMS

1. The One-Year Capital Improvement Program is an informational document only, which rates and ranks requested projects and, where possible, identifies funding sources. It does not commit nor authorize the City to carry out any specific project. When a specific project is considered for implementation, appropriate environmental review will occur, as required.

Staff recommends **approval** of PC Resolution 08-16 declaring that the CIP projects are in agreement with the Vallejo General Plan.

2. Presentation of appreciation plaques to outgoing Planning Commission Members.

Vallejo Planning Commission
September 3, 2008

M. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES

A. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. The pledge of allegiance to the flag was recited.

Chairperson Peterman introduced and welcomed the two new Commissioners: Lori Reese-Brown and Wanda Chihak.

C. ROLL CALL:

Present: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Chihak, Peterman, Reese-Brown, Turley, Manning.

Absent: None.

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Commissioner Manning moved the approval of the minutes of June 16, 2008.

Please vote.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Turley, Peterman.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: Manning, Chihak, Reese-Brown.

Motion carries.

E. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

F. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

Don Hazen: Tomorrow night at the City Council meeting Tour will be presenting their preliminary bubble diagram for the Project 2 Area of North Mare Island. They are also going to be showing the Council the Touro Cancer Treatment Center that you approved several meetings ago. That is an item of interest that you will be seeing coming your way many months down the road. I thought I would pass that along to you.

G. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT

None.

H. REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND LIAISON REPORTS

1. Report of the Presiding Officer and members of the Planning Commission. None.
2. Council Liaison to Planning Commission.

Chairperson Peterman: I would like to welcome his honor, Mayor Davis. In all the years that I have been on the Planning Commission no mayor has ever come to our meetings and this is the third time that Mayor Davis has attended. Thank you for your interest in our Commission and the City of Vallejo.

3. Planning Commission Liaison to City Council. None.

I. COMMUNITY FORUM

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on items not on the agenda are requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Secretary. The Commission may take information but may not take action on any item not on the agenda

Chairperson Peterman: I see we have no cards. Is that correct, Ms. Marshall? May we have a motion for approval of the Consent Calendar and the Agenda, please?

J. CONSENT CALENDAR AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Consent Calendar items appear below in section K, with the Secretary's or City Attorney's designation as such. Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on Consent Calendar items are asked to address the Secretary and submit a completed speaker card prior to the approval of the agenda. Such requests shall be granted, and items will be addressed in the order in which they appear in the agenda. After making any changes to the agenda, the agenda shall be approved.

All matters are approved under one motion unless requested to be removed for discussion by a commissioner or any member of the public.

Commissioner Manning: I move that we approve the Consent Calendar and the Agenda.

Chairperson Peterman: Please vote.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown, Chihak, Peterman, Turley, Manning.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

It is unanimous. Motion carries.

K. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Use Permit 07-0008 is an application to establish a fast-food restaurant with a drive-thru on a vacant pad within the Redwood/Tuolumne Shopping Center. Proposed CEQA Action: Exempt. Staff Planner: Marcus Adams, 648-5392.

Staff recommends **approval** based on the findings and conditions.

Marcus Adams: Good evening Commissioners. Welcome to the new Commissioners. The item tonight is a proposed restaurant in the Tuolumne Shopping Center. It is a KFC/A & W co-blended restaurant. *Marcus presented a short PowerPoint presentation. It is an existing shopping center, formerly known as Fleming Town. Marcus pointed out where the pad was for the location of the restaurant. He also showed pictures of co-blended restaurants in other cities. He showed the elevations and pictures of the surrounding area. It was always intended for this pad to be developed. When the shopping center was first opened it was imagined that the existing pizza place would stay there and do some exterior modifications. However, they chose to go ahead and demolish that.*

Some of the issues that came up on this project, there were three I would like to bring to your attention tonight: traffic circulation, smell, and aesthetics. Last Friday we had a call from a neighbor who was worried about the smell. We are recommending that we add a standard language condition tonight that addresses odors. They are not supposed to be detectable to the average person from the property line. I talked with the applicants and they informed me that it really is not a problem with new restaurants it is the older

ones that have the problems with the smells; it is not a problem with the newer ones.

The next issue is the traffic circulation. When the shopping center was developed in 2002 there was a thorough traffic study for the whole build out of the center. Because this was a drive-thru and not just pizza we did route it to the Traffic Engineer. There are two ways to get access to the pad. One was right here on Redwood Street. The Valle Vista resident's issue was the added amount of trips that would be added because people were using Valle Vista as a shortcut to get to the center. If you happen to go into this area you know it is very busy. The Traffic Engineer said that the amount of trips that would be generated during peak hours would not change the level of service at this intersection significantly. It is at a level of service B and it would stay at a B level. Even a level C would be OK, usually it is when they get to a level D that we get concerned. Trying to cross Valle Vista to make a left, because this is not a signalized intersection, is very difficult to do. With all respect to the resident we do not believe that a lot of people will be doing a shortcut here to get to the site.

There were also some concerns about the line-of-sight coming out of the drive-thru because of some of the landscaping that is being proposed here. The Traffic Engineer does have a condition that he gets another chance to review that so he can make sure the line-of-sight is adequate so that people will be able to see cars leaving and entering. There are no restrictions as far as people leaving the drive-thru and making a left back into the center. The Traffic Engineer said that would not be an issue.

As far as the aesthetic concern as to whether the KFC would complement the center, *Marcus showed a slide that showed that there were several complimentary details between the new KFC and the already built center.* The heights are similar, the color palate is very similar, the crown molding on the parapet is the same, the trim is matching, the material is matching stucco, as well as the arches match. We were happy to see that the applicants were taking into consideration the existing center. I am available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Manning: I have a question about the cleaning of the area. The recommendation of the litter cleaning program is a 600 foot radius. Is that similar to the conflict of interest, which is 500 foot radius?

Marcus: It is another 100 feet out.

Commissioner Manning: When you look at that, if you just look at the conflict of interest map, a big portion of that is the parking lot for the shopping center. I am assuming that the shopping center already has a cleaning program. I would think the bigger concern for litter would be in the neighborhood. Like the housing along Redwood and also on Valle Vista and on Tuolumne, the part that fronts the shopping center, would be in more need of cleaning. Living in kind of the urban part of Vallejo myself I know that people buy fast food and then they walk places, especially the kids, and they tend to drop garbage. Is there a way to set the litter cleaning so that it is more focused in the front yards and the frontage along Redwood rather than in the parking lot. Does what I am saying make sense?

Marcus Adams: It does. The area does cover Tuolumne and Redwood and the apartments across the street. I have had projects where the

Commissioners have asked for a larger radius as far as the pick-up program. If the Commission is so inclined you can make that a condition.

Commissioner Manning: It is not so much making it larger as shifting it so it is more focused on the street front, especially for the homes. What does the litter program consist of?

Marcus Adams: We have asked to review their litter program with this project because I too, was concerned about the houses along there. They are going to have to actually write something up, present it to our staff, including who is going to be doing the collecting, at what time, how many times per day. That is probably what we should be doing all the time on these fast food applications. It is something that we have asked for with this application.

Commissioner Manning: That is a really important thoroughfare, along Redwood and on Tuolumne. If there were a lot of wrappers and containers and stuff it would be a real concern.

Don Hazen: I might just add to what Marcus was saying, typically what we would be looking for is a combination of the location of the trash receptacles on site and the frequency of collection. Our thought is that if we can get at the source of the litter, which would be the parking lot itself, it would be on the parking lot and then blow off site. If we can focus our efforts on site we could prevent it from blowing off site. We think that most of the people that take the food away in their car are not going to litter it as they are driving away. We would typically look for those things in a litter clean up.

Commissioner Manning: I agree that the majority of this is going to be drive through but there are going to be people that are going to be walking. That is my concern when they walk down Redwood, Tuolumne, or Valle Vista that they don't throw trash.

Don Adams: I would say that we typically would not be seeing KFC personnel patrolling the right-of-way and going and picking up litter off site. That would be a little unusual. We would not want to have them going on private property. I know we would not want them being in a dangerous situation on Redwood either.

Commissioner Manning: Sure but by definition here it says 600 foot radius. That does take you out past their site.

Don Hazen: Yes. We would be looking at that very cautiously and we would want to focus most of the effort on site and within the rest of the shopping center. I would not want to give the idea that this radius includes KFC hired help patrolling up and down a lot of these streets and on people's lawns and things. I would not want to give you the impression that that is going to be as effective as focusing most of the effort within the shopping center itself. On site litter prevention is the strongest approach that we would advocate.

Commissioner Manning: I agree that on site would be primary but again I would say that what staff is recommending is more than that. Maybe we need to take it back and define it. I also would say that the residents in that area would be much more welcoming and happy to have KFC and A & W there if they don't find, in the morning, a bunch of trash in their yard. I will

leave it to you guys to figure out what all that means but I just wanted to raise that issue here about how you would go about doing that.

Don Hazen: I would be interested in the other Commissioner's viewpoints. One thing that we might think about is that a lot of jurisdictions are getting aggressive on litter issues in their city. Maybe there is a comprehensive approach that we could be looking at as well. I will kind of see how this discussion goes and whether we wish to pursue that because a lot of that. Litter is one of the things that we have heard in our community that is an issues and I know fast food litter is a primary issue. Rather than create a new prototype with this particular project maybe we identify that these are some of the constraints with that, is looking at this radius map and from a practical standpoint it seems very hard to ask them to patrol that. I would not want to give the impression that we are going to have an effective litter program that extends back into these residential blocks.

Chairperson Peterman: I heard what you said. We walk by the academy and there is litter from every fast food known to mankind. None of them are anywhere nearby. People do drive away and eat and then throw it out their windows.

Commissioner Turley: Is this a take-out restaurant only?

Marcus Adams: It is dine in and take-out.

Commissioner Turley: If you drove in the parking lot to go in and eat in the restaurant could you then drive from the parking lot through the Lucky parking lot and exit on Tuolumne?

Marcus Adams: Yes.

Commissioner Turley: If you were to go in and use the drive-in then would your only option be to exit on Redwood Street?

Marcus Adams: No, you could go left at the drive-through and you could exit through the parking lot on Tuolumne or you could go right on Redwood.

Commissioner Turley: I think I noticed another KFC at Redwood and Broadway. The restaurants don't conflict with each other?

Marcus Adams: It is planned that once this one opens that one will close shortly thereafter.

Commissioner Reese-Brown: You mentioned that the Traffic Engineer said this was Level B and talked about Level C and so forth on Valle Vista Ave. You may not have this information now but the build-out of the shopping center would have a certain level of impact because all of the uses would be here for retail or commercial uses so could you tell me what the level of service was for this entire shopping center being built out, taking into consideration any type of uses that would go there. Once it is built out completely do you know that level of service?

Marcus Adams: I don't know what the traffic study said that the level would be upon build out but I do know that this pad, and one other small pad that probably will not be developed, are pretty much the only spots left. This pretty much is the full build out. Currently it is a level of service B.

Commissioner Reese-Brown: And that takes into consideration all retail uses for every pad even if you had not done the lot line adjustment it would have taken into consideration that retail use.

Marcus Adams: Correct.

Commissioner Reese-Brown: The Lucky store came in and all the other uses to the north of Lucky, it took into consideration that level of service and traffic impacts in the EIR, am I right? So any type of use that would come there in the future, even if one left and another moved in, it would take into consideration all the traffic impacts?

Marcus Adams: The Mitigated Negative Dec took into consideration all maximum intensity uses that could go in. It did that at full capacity. I don't have the traffic study with me but the mitigations for that were that they had to do some signalization there at that intersection, they had to add two turn lanes, they closed three driveways. There were some strong mitigations done.

Commissioner Reese-Brown: There are no other cumulative impacts as a result of another business coming in or others moving out.

Marcus Adams: Correct.

Commissioner Chihak: I think this project is compatible with the surrounding area. I think it would also be good for the center. I had some questions on the traffic circulation but you have responded to those already. One question that I did have is how far is the drive-through from the driveway on Redwood Street?

Marcus Adams: I am guessing between 30 and 50 feet. I don't have a scaled drawing with me but this is pretty close.

Commissioner Chihak: On page 6, in the Staff Report, under Expiration, it says expires 36 months from approval of the Master Plan. Shouldn't that say from the Unit Plan approval?

Marcus Adams: That is language from the Code so I would defer to the City Attorney tonight for clarification on that.

Claudia Quintana: I am looking at it right now and will have an answer before the end of the night.

Commissioner Harrington-Cole: I noticed that I did not see any landscaping plans. Are they coming later?

Marcus Adams: We do have a landscaping plan I just did not put it in the packet. They will just be using the landscaping that is there on the site. Any additional plants will be some of the same.

Commissioner Harrington-Cole: This is a pretty barren area. I would like to see some trees incorporated if that is possible.

Marcus Adams: I will make a note of that and see what we can do on that.

Chairperson Peterman: I know that the other KFC will be closed, are there any plans for that site at this time?

Marcus Admas: I don't know of any but the applicant is here, perhaps he will have more information on that.

Chairperson Peterman opened the Public Hearing.

Linda Budge: I am a land use planner and I am here tonight to represent Harmons. Marcus has done an excellent job of presenting. One thing that was not included in your staff report was a small color version of the landscape plan. It takes off on the plants that are existent. I will pass that down so you can all have a chance to look at it. I would be happy to answer any questions. The other location that is being replaced is not an owned property. That is a site that is leased so we are not in control of what the property owner does. Typically spaces like this become incubators for entrepreneurs who want small cafes or small restaurants.

Commissioner Manning: Can you speak to the litter abatement program that you are using on other sites?

Linda Budge: It would be unusual for us to go out significantly off the property and into somebody else's neighborhood. Especially since people are so paranoid today about strange vehicles driving up and down. Yes it would be like the PG & E guy, the person who would be there would have on a KFC suit but I think the comment about having someone on your street or in your front yard and the concern that that arises is pretty well taken. However, it is important to know that the manager of all the stores is a part owner in his company and so it is important for them to keep their site looking as nice as possible, any litter any graffiti or anything like that is removed immediately. They do join in the parking lot maintenance making sure that they are keeping not only the parking lot clean but also the hill right there on Redwood is one of those things that tends to be a trash magnet. We are hoping that the shopping center actually does have an active program for getting people on that hill and picking up the trash. We would certainly participate in making sure that our litter is not up and down Redwood and Tuolumne. If there is a problem we could certainly consider going into the neighborhoods but it would not be usual.

Commissioner Harrington-Cole: On the landscape plan that you passed down, are these little circles bushes or trees?

Linda Budge: Trees. We plant 15 gallon trees. We want them to look nice as soon as possible. Shrubs are all 5 gallon shrubs.

Claudia Quintana: The unit plan is supposed to expire 36 months after approval, so if approved it would expire 36 months from today's date. If construction has begun the expiration is with the expiration of the building permits.

Chairperson Peterman closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Manning: My intention to discuss the litter clean-up in the neighborhoods was not to suggest that anyone would go onto private property. I am talking about on the curbs and on the sidewalks, against fences. I would just encourage the discussion at staff level to look into that.

Vallejo Planning Commission Minutes
July 21, 2008

Commissioner Manning: I move the approval of Use Permit 07-0008 with the findings and conditions.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown, Peterman, Chihak, Turley, Manning.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

It is unanimous. Motion carries.

Commissioner Manning: I move approval of the Planned Development 07-0010.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown, Peterman, Chihak, Turley, Manning.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

It is unanimous. Motion carries.

L. OTHER ITEMS

1. Changing of seats.

From left to right the seating order will now be: Marshall, Hazen, Quintana, Chihak, Tourley, Manning, Peterman, Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown.

M. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, this session of the Vallejo Planning Commission is now adjourned at 7:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



(for) DON HAZEN, Secretary

MINUTES

A. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. The pledge of allegiance to the flag was recited.

C. ROLL CALL:

Present: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Chihak, Peterman, Reese-Brown, Turley, Manning.

Absent: None.

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

No minutes to approve.

E. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

F. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

None.

G. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT

None.

H. REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND LIAISON REPORTS

1. Report of the Presiding Officer and members of the Planning Commission. None.
2. Council Liaison to Planning Commission.

Hermie Sunga: I want to remind you to participate in National Night Out. Also there is news about the old Wal-Mart site. Home Depot decided not to build. We just found out about it today. That is another issue that we have to deal with. When we have the City Council meeting we are hoping that the Planning Commission can participate as well. I would also like to congratulate the new Commissioners. We are proud that you are serving the City of Vallejo. Thank you.

3. Planning Commission Liaison to City Council. None.

I. COMMUNITY FORUM

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on items not on the agenda are requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Secretary. The Commission may take information but may not take action on any item not on the agenda

None.

J. CONSENT CALENDAR AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Consent Calendar items appear below in section K, with the Secretary's or City Attorney's designation as such. Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on Consent Calendar items are asked to address the Secretary and submit a completed speaker card prior to the approval of the agenda. Such requests shall be granted, and items will be addressed in the order in which they appear in the agenda. After making any changes to the agenda, the agenda shall be approved.

Vallejo Planning Commission Minutes

August 4, 2008

All matters are approved under one motion unless requested to be removed for discussion by a commissioner or any member of the public.

Deborah Marshall: Before we vote on the agenda I need to make one correction. In K-1, the Planned Development, I have the CEQA Action down as Exempt. That should be Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Commissioner Manning: I move that we approve the Consent Calendar and the Agenda with corrections.

Chairperson Peterman: Please vote.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown, Chihak, Peterman, Turley, Manning.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

It is unanimous. Motion carries.

K. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Planned Development 07-0008 is an application to establish Solano Townhomes located at the southeast corner of Solano Avenue and 9th Street, and consisting of 14 units with live/work options. Proposed CEQA Action: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Staff Planner: Marcus Adams, 648-5392.

Staff recommends **continuance**. Project will be re-advertised prior to the new meeting date.

Don Hazen: Staff is recommending that this item be continued off calendar to allow us an opportunity to process a General Plan Amendment application and recirculate the initial study. When the application was first submitted there was a General Plan Amendment application filed but it was staff's recommendation that this become a work/live project rather than just a straight residential project and in the process of doing that we asked that the applicant deed restrict a number of units to be live/work for perpetuity. The applicant did not want those restrictions placed on them but for that to be voluntary. After the initial preparation of this packet, in working with the City Attorney's Office, it was decided that to consider this a live/work project you cannot just call it a live/work project and hope that it turns into work/live we really need the restriction of the units. The applicant is unwilling to do that and ask that we process the General Plan Amendment to make it a straight residential project. When this item returns back to you, you will not see any design changes so it is good that you have had an advance review of the project to get prepared for the next meeting. Everything that is in the analysis and description will be the same. The project is designed as a work/live from a structural standpoint and architectural standpoint. The applicant will proceed and ask for your action as a voluntary work/live project depending how the market is in the future. I estimate that it will be back in about 1 ½ months. I regret that we have a false alarm here but word did get around to the neighborhood folks who were planning on attending so they did not make a trip down here. I know we will have some additional comments from the public when we readvertise this.

Chairperson Peterman: I can certainly understand why, in this instance, it was continued, but my own personal opinion is that as a Commission we

Vallejo Planning Commission Minutes
August 4, 2008

continue far too many items. We have caused people hundreds and thousands in lost time. We have lost businesses for the City. My hope is that from now on we will be doing less continuing and more actions.

Commissioner Manning: I move that we continue the item off calendar.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown, Peterman, Chihak, Turley, Manning.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

It is unanimous. Motion carries.

L. OTHER ITEMS

1. Appointment of two Commission members to the ad hoc committee to work on the Landscape and Screening Ordinance.

Chairperson Peterman: I was there when the Ordinance went to the City Council and I believe it was flawed in many ways. I am glad the Council and the Commission are working together to try and resolve some of those issues. Mayor Davis asked me to appoint two members so I have talked to the Commission members and am appointing Commissioner Gourley and Commissioner Harrington-Cole to the committee. I think they will do an admirable job with this subject.

AYES: Harrington-Cole, Gourley, Reese-Brown, Peterman, Chihak, Turley, Manning.

NOS: None.

ABSENT: None.

It is unanimous. Motion carries.

M. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, this session of the Vallejo Planning Commission is now adjourned at 7:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



(for) DON HAZEN, Secretary



**STAFF REPORT
CITY OF VALLEJO PLANNING COMMISSION**

Date of Hearing: September 3, 2008 **Agenda Item:** L-1

Application Number: Not Applicable

Recommendation: Staff recommends the Planning Commission ADOPT the attached resolution which states that the projects listed in the One-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 are in conformance with the General Plan

Project Description: The proposed new and revised projects for the One-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 outline anticipated public projects (costing more than \$25,000 each) which will be undertaken by the City in the upcoming year. It also identifies the funding sources for these projects. All operating departments were involved in preparing this capital improvements program.

Location: The One-Year Capital Improvements Program is citywide.

Applicant: City of Vallejo

Property Owner: City of Vallejo

Environmental Review: The One-Year Capital Improvement Program is an informational document only, which rates and ranks requested projects and, where possible, identifies funding sources. It does not commit nor authorize the City to carry out any specific project. When a specific project is considered for implementation, appropriate environmental review will occur, as required.

General Plan Land Use: Citywide

Zoning: Citywide

Existing Land Use: The One-Year Capital Improvement Program is citywide. See more detailed information for each project in the attached project documents.

Surrounding Land Use: The One-Year Capital Improvement Program is citywide. See more detailed information in the attached project documents.

Public Notice: Public notices will be mailed when a specific project is considered for implementation, as required.

Related Actions: This application is for the One-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2008/2009. On June 6, 2005, the Planning Commission found the comprehensive citywide Five-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2005/2006 through 2009/2010 in conformance with the Vallejo General Plan. A resolution to that affect was approved and forwarded to the City Council.

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The One-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 consists of one new project and four revised projects. The proposed budget for these projects for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 is \$2,261,259.

All operating departments have reviewed this proposed One-Year CIP and have determined that the program is ready to proceed to the public hearing. State law requires the Planning Commission to review and report to the City Council as to the conformance of the CIP with the General Plan.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Both the Planning Division and the City Attorney's office have investigated and agreed that the One-Year Capital Improvement Plan is eligible for a Class 6 exemption from the requirements of CEQA. State Guidelines (Section 15306) define a Class 6 exemption as "...basic data collection, research, experimental management, and resource evaluation activities that do not result in major disturbances to an environmental resource. These may be strictly for information gathering purposes, or as part of a study leading to an action which a public agency has not yet approved, adopted or funded."

Appropriate environmental review will occur when a specific project is being considered for implementation.

3. CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN

Planning Division staff have reviewed the goals and policies and the Land Use Map of the Vallejo General Plan, and determined that the new and revised projects in the One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 are in conformance with these goals and policies.

4. CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER ADOPTED PLANS

Planning Division staff have reviewed the other adopted plans, and determined that the new

and revised projects in the One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 are consistent with these other adopted plans.

5. CONFORMANCE WITH ZONING REGULATIONS

Planning Division staff have reviewed the zoning for the proposed projects, and determined that the projects in the One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 conform with the requirements of the applicable zoning ordinance.

6. CONFORMANCE WITH SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Planning Division staff have reviewed the subdivision regulations as they relate to the proposed projects in the One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 and determined that the subdivision regulations do not apply to any of these proposed projects.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments have been received.

8. AGENCY REVIEW AND COMMENTS

The revisions to the CIP have been reviewed by the Public Works Department and the Development Services Division.

9. REFERENCES

- ❖ State of California, Office of Planning and Research; CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act (Statutes and Guidelines 1999)
- ❖ City of Vallejo General Plan
- ❖ City of Vallejo Zoning Ordinance: Chapter 15 – Subdivision Ordinance

10. STAFF ANALYSIS

The One-Year Capital Improvement Program is a tool for planning and budgeting public improvements and new equipment projects for the next fiscal year. All projects are in conformance with the General Plan, Zoning Plan, and Subdivision regulations.

11. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the attached resolution which reports the One-Year Capital Improvement Program is in conformance with the General Plan.

These findings are made based upon all evidence in the record including the staff report, all of which are incorporated by reference.

- A. The One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 will not result in any significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated per Section 2 of this report.
- B. The One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 is consistent with the goals and policies of the Vallejo General Plan per Section 3 of this report.
- C. The One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 meets the Specific Plan and specific standards prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance as discussed in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.
- D. The One-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 is in conformance with the Subdivision Map Act and the Subdivision Ordinance as discussed in Section 6 of this report.

12. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant or any party adversely affected by a decision of the Planning Commission may appeal the decision by filing an appeal to the City Council. Such appeal must be filed in writing with the City Clerk within ten calendar days after the Commission's action. The Council may affirm, reverse, or modify any decision of the Planning Commission which is appealed.

If you challenge the Planning Commission's actions regarding this item in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Secretary of the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing.

13. EXPIRATION

Unless revised, the One-Year CIP will be effective until 2009.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Proposed New and Revised Capital Improvement Projects for Fiscal Year 2008/2009
- 2. PC Resolution 08-16

Reviewed by:


Don Hazen, Planning Manager

**PROPOSED NEW AND REVISED
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009**

NEW PROJECTS:**SR2S (Safe Routes to School) Steffan Manor Elementary**

The SR2S Steffan Manor Elementary project will improve the safety of pedestrian and bicycle modes of student travel and provide safe passage to Steffan Manor Elementary. The SR2S grant will require a local in-kind match. Grant funding of \$130,460 and local in-kind match of \$20,900 is being proposed in the FY 2008/09 budget.

REVISED PROJECTS:**PW9786 2008 City Wide Overlay Project**

The City Wide Overlay project is new this fiscal year, with the City of Vallejo total allocation of Proposition 1B funding in the amount of \$3,800,808, of which \$3.4 million has already been budgeted. The remaining \$400,808 is being proposed in the FY 2008/09 budget. The project includes street paving improvements for eight streets.

PW9844 Mare Island Sewer EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) Grant #2

The Mare Island Sewer project will continue with the current EPA grant and a new EPA grant to install a bypass piping system for the domestic sewage pumping stations on Mare Island to improve the ability of Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District to control, divert and manage sewer flows. Total project budget is \$1,742,727, of which \$1,129,091 is new money. The EPA grants require a local match of \$784,227, to be provided by Lennar Mare Island, LLC. Grant funding of \$621,000 and local match of \$508,091 is being proposed in the FY 2008/09 budget.

PWTX02 Streetscape Design

This project is part of the Triad Downtown Development project, and consists of pedestrian enhancements including traffic calming, re-striping, diagonal on-street parking, decorative lighting, brick pavers, street furniture, art and improved signs. Additional federal CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) funding in the amount of \$580,000 is being proposed in the FY 2008/09 budget.

Vallejo Station

The Vallejo Station Project is a major component of the Waterfront Master Plan, and includes:

PW9839 Vallejo Station Transit Center

This project will relocate the existing bus transfer station currently located at York and Marin Streets to a new Transit Center to be located between Sacramento and Santa Clara Streets. The improvements include a 12-bay bus transfer center, construction of the new Vallejo Transit Center, landscaping, lighting and safety enhancements. Funding is a combination of federal CMAQ funding, STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program) funding, RM2 funding and local match, partially budgeted in prior years.

PW9866 Vallejo Station Parking Structure

The City plans to construct a parking structure located along Santa Clara Street between Georgia and Maine Streets for ferry system riders, which will consolidate the existing surface parking lots along Mare Island Way. This will free up over ten acres along the waterfront for development.

CITY OF VALLEJO PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. PC 08-16

BE IT RESOLVED, by the City of Vallejo Planning Commission, as follows:

WHEREAS, the City staff has prepared the Citywide One-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 which lists the public improvement, maintenance, and new equipment projects anticipated in the city in the next year; and

WHEREAS, City Staff have prepared a list of projects to be included in the Citywide One-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed projects at this time; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds the proposed CIP to be in conformance with the goals and policies of the General Plan and carries out the capital improvement programming step recommended by the Action Program of the Plan; and now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Vallejo Planning Commission does find that the Citywide One-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 is in conformance with the Vallejo General Plan.

ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Vallejo at a regular meeting held on Wednesday, September 3, 2008 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:

KENT PETERMAN, Chair

DON HAZEN, Secretary