

**Planning Commission Minutes
Community Chambers
Wednesday, June 9, 2010, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioners Present: Mark Braly (Chairperson), Ananya Choudhuri, Lucas Frerichs, Rob Hofmann, Kris Kordana, Terry Whittier

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Mike Webb, Principal Planner; Katherine Hess, Community Development Administrator; Sarah Worley, Economic Development Coordinator; Brian Abbanat, Economic Development Specialist; Lynanne Mehlhaff, Planning Technician

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Braly called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by consensus.

3. Staff and Commissioner Comments (No action).

Mike Webb, Principal Planner, announced that the City Council will hear the Willowbank Park Subdivision project next week as well as the amendments to the Verona project.

4. Public Communications

There were no public communications.

5. Consent Items

A. Planning Commission Minutes of February 24, 2010

Action: Commissioner Whittier moved approval of the minutes and Commissioner Choudhuri seconded the motion.

AYES: Whittier, Kordana, Choudhuri

Abstain: Hofmann, Frerichs

The motion carried 3-0-2.

6. Business Items

A. Business Park Land Strategy; (Sarah Worley, Economic Development Coordinator; Brian Abbanat, Economic Development Specialist)

Recommendation: Review draft study and recommended Business and Economic Development Commission (BEDC) actions.

Brian Abbanat, Economic Development Specialist, presented a power point of the Business Park Land Strategy.

Commissioner comments (not necessarily concensus from Commissioners):

- This is a good start and good info but there needs to be more detail on how to take action. These are laudable goals but I don't see how they get us there. How do we take these goals and next steps? Each goal needs to be broken down into tactical action items. What can be done in the next year and then strategically in the next three years.

- Suggested that the opinions from people are quoted so that it doesn't appear as facts.

- There are some suitable developable sites outside of the City limits that should be considered and mentioned.

- Why do we not consider our sphere of influence, land around the City, for the Business Park Land Study?

- What kind of outreach or communication done with any of the landowners from these sites on page 31?

Staff responded that the study was constrained to the existing land supply in the City limits. The Study was focused on what was going on within the boundaries of the City and not outside the City limits. Staff has spoken to some of the land owners and some peripheral land owners as well.

- There seems to be things that are missing. Just became aware of a letter from the Conagra owners that points out that the City felt the ConAgra site was best suited for residential uses and a minor ancillary component. It would have been helpful to have this information included in the staff report.

Katherine Hess, Community Development Administrator, explained how the purpose of the Business Park Land Strategy report tonight was to step back and look at the bigger picture and not at specific sites.

- We do need a more thorough report then and look at all the different sites such as Nishi, the Mace curve and the northwest quadrant and look at all potential business park land. We do need the comparisons done with these different parts of land in order to get a complete picture.
- The whole picture needs to be analyzed and then broken down into specifics. We want to be proactive and not reactive.

Staff explained that the role of the study was to look at the policy questions and inform people so as to decide on how to quantify the information and go forward with future steps.

Chairperson Braly opened for public comments.

Eileen Samitz, resident who also served on the Housing Element Steering Committee and General Plan Update, said the ConAgra site should be for residential uses as recommended by the Housing Element Steering Committee. She reminded the Commission how Cannery Park went through five years of study by the city and the City Council which supported mixed use. The neighbors supported residential yet staff kept pushing the 100 acre business park. She said the business park studies said that they needed visibility and accessibility from a highway for a viable business park. The neighbors wanted residential and some mixed use. She said staff should not force the issue of a business park here in this location, it is the wrong location. If we want to pursue a Business Park then let's put it at I-80 and Mace Boulevard where trucks and cars can have access. Most importantly it would be a safety issue to place a business park at the location of the Conagra site.

Jeanne Jones said figure 11 on page 120 was a land decision-making chart to be adopted and used. There are policy decisions here that could make land use decisions without looking at the big picture. This could take the land use intensity up from a mixed use project up to intense traffic issues at the Conagra site as an all business park site. This is why it doesn't make sense to make a business park at the Conagra site when it needs to be by a freeway for the traffic use. The decision making chart didn't make sense, it discouraged the business community from being able to discuss where the right locations are for a business park. The Housing Steering Committee got it right that the Conagra site should be a mixed use site with residential uses.

Chairperson Braly closed the public comment period.

- Commissioner Kordana stated if we are serious about looking at the long term policy questions, then it is premature to look at specific sites and start talking about that. There is a conflict here.

Hess explained there would be a workshop in the fall to discuss goals. The City needs a General Plan Update but there is a lack of funds for that but we do need to do that which would help.

- Commissioner Frerichs said there are two key issues that should be brought before BEDC and then the City Council. A full picture of what is out there should be brought forward with the full range of options. Also, communication between property owners hasn't been all there such as the East Mace Ranch 100 site developers who want to be included in this study.

Chairperson Braly moved that the Commission recommend to the BEDC that this *Draft Framework for Business Park, Office and Industrial Land Decision Making Chart* be amended to include sites other than Conagra, such as sites outside the city limits. Commissioner Frerichs seconded the motion with a friendly amendment to the motion to not just state sites outside the city limits but to specify sites such as the Nishi property, the Northwest Quadrant, the property outside the Mace curve – the East Mace Ranch 100 etc. Chairperson Braly agreed to the amendment.

Commissioner Hofmann said that staff wasn't expecting this to be acted on tonight and therefore would refrain from voting.

AYES: Kordana, Frerichs, Choudhuri, Braly

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Whittier, Hofmann

The motion passed 4-0-2.

Commissioner Whittier said this was a valuable step to go along in parallel with starting a new General Plan. This should be adopted as part of the new General Plan.

Katherine Hess asked if the Commission would like to give info on what would the Commission need to help answer the question of does the City need a business park and where.

Commissioner Kordana said everything in the report was good with laudable goals. The next step would be to come up with a time frame and a road map. Then break it down into sub-goals. If affordable housing was a major issue, then the City needs to look at that and look at what are the solvable issues. Each area could then have action items figured out. He wanted some hard dates on some of these issues with goals so that something can get done. The goals should be prioritized.

Chairperson Braly said the question he wanted to get at was where the business park should be.

8. Informational Items

A. Planning Commission Schedule

9. Staff and Commissioner Comments (continued).

Chairperson Braly said he would be absent due to surgery for the July 28th meeting.

Commisisoner Frerichs said the meeting tonight was only for an informational item and was frustrated by only having a single informational item.

Staff explained that this was a timely item and therefore important to hear tonight due to the fact that the item needed to go before the BEDC.

Chairperson Braly said he felt it was necessary tonight to review the item and therefore appropriate.

10. Public Communications (continued).

There were no public communications.

11. Adjournment to the next regular Planning Commission meeting to be held on Wednesday, June 23, 2010 in the Community Chambers (23 Russell Boulevard).

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:46 p.m.