

CITY OF WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Tuesday, April 25, 2006 @ 7:30 PM

City of Winters Council Chambers
318 First Street
Winters, CA 95694-1923
Community Development Department
Contact Phone Number (530) 795-4910 #112
Email: dan.sokolow@cityofwinters.org

Chairman: Vacant
Vice-Chair: Don Jordan
Commissioners: Albert Vallecillo, Jack Graf, Joe
Tramontana, Cecilia Curry, and Pierre Neu
Administrative Assistant: Jen Michaelis
Community Development Director: Dan Sokolow

I CALL TO ORDER 7:30 PM

II ROLL CALL & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Staff Report
Current Planning Projects list dated April 17, 2006
USA Weekend (March 17-19, 2006) "Little Big Houses" article
2. Commission Reports
U.S. EPA "Protecting Water Resources with Higher-Density Development" briefing

IV CITIZEN INPUT: Individuals or groups may address the Planning Commission on items which are not on the Agenda and which are within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. **NOTICE TO SPEAKERS:** Speaker cards are located on the first table by the main entrance; please complete a speaker's card and give it to the Planning Secretary at the beginning of the meeting. The Commission may impose time limits.

V CONSENT ITEM

Approve minutes of the February 28 and March 28, 2006 regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning Commission and a special meeting on March 14, 2006.

VI ACTION ITEM

1. Public Hearing and consideration of Parcel Map application 600 – 606 Railroad Avenue (APNs 003-151-24 and 25) to create two parcels 5,637 and 8,648 square feet in size. Applicant: Richard Tortosa.
2. Public Hearing and consideration of Site Plan application for the construction of a 2,988 square foot single-family, one-story residence at 125 Carrion Court (APN 003-360-21). Applicant: Douglas Morgan.
3. Public Hearing and consideration of Conditional Use Permit Modification for the installation of four antennas to the existing cellular tower located at the City of Winters' Wastewater Treatment Facility located near the intersection of County Roads 32A and 88 (APN 030-210-14). Applicant: Yolo County Communications Emergency Service Agency.

VII DISCUSSION ITEM

None.

VIII INFORMATIONAL ITEM

None.

IX ADJOURNMENT

POSTING OF AGENDA: PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE § 54954.2, THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT POSTED THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING ON MONDAY, APRIL 17, 2006.



DAN SOKOLOW – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

APPEALS: ANY PERSON DISSATISFIED WITH THE DECISION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY APPEAL THIS DECISION BY FILING A WRITTEN NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH THE CITY CLERK, NO LATER THAN TEN (10) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER THE DAY ON WHICH THE DECISION IS MADE.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 65009 (B) (2), OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT CODE "IF YOU CHALLENGE ANY OF THE ABOVE PROJECTS IN COURT, YOU MAY BE LIMITED TO RAISING ONLY THOSE ISSUES YOU OR SOMEONE ELSE RAISED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING(S) DESCRIBED IN THIS NOTICE, OR IN WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE DELIVERED TO THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AT, OR PRIOR TO, THIS PUBLIC HEARING".

PUBLIC REVIEW OF AGENDA, AGENDA REPORTS, AND MATERIALS: PRIOR TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS, COPIES OF THE AGENDA, AGENDA REPORTS, AND OTHER MATERIAL ARE AVAILABLE DURING NORMAL WORKING HOURS FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. IN ADDITION, A LIMITED SUPPLY OF COPIES OF THE AGENDA WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE PUBLIC AT THE MEETING.

OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK, AGENDA ITEMS: THE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON ITEMS OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA, HOWEVER, TIME LIMITS MAY BE IMPOSED BY THE CHAIR AS PROVIDED FOR UNDER THE ADOPTED RULES OF CONDUCT OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.

REVIEW OF TAPE RECORDING OF MEETING: PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AUDIO TAPE RECORDED. TAPE RECORDINGS ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOR 30 DAYS AFTER THE MEETING.

COPIES OF AGENDA, AGENDA REPORTS AND OTHER MATERIALS: PRIOR TO EACH MEETING, COPIES OF THE AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE, AT NO CHARGE, AT CITY HALL DURING NORMAL WORKING HOURS. IN ADDITION, A LIMITED SUPPLY WILL BE AVAILABLE ON A FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED BASIS, AT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS. COPIES OF AGENDA, REPORTS AND OTHER MATERIAL WILL BE PROVIDED UPON REQUEST SUBMITTED TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. A COPY FEE OF 25 CENTS PER PAGE WILL BE CHARGED.

ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC MAY SUBMIT A WRITTEN REQUEST FOR A COPY OF PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDAS TO BE MAILED TO THEM. REQUESTS MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A CHECK IN THE AMOUNT OF \$25.00 FOR A SINGLE PACKET AND \$250.00 FOR A YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION.

THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS IS WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBLE

Architecture



Little, big homes

HOME PRICES and sizes have soared in recent years, but not everyone needs — or can afford — to supersize. In fact, the demand for smaller homes seems inevitable when you consider that single people occupy nearly 27% of all households.

Tired of using more space than he really needed, California-based designer Jay Shafer started the Tumbleweed Tiny House Company (tumbleweedhouses.com) in 1999 after building his own 100-square-foot home.

Like Shafer, most people interested in his custom-built homes are concerned about the environmental effects of huge houses and want to save energy. Among Tumbleweed's most popular home models: the 96-square-foot Front Gable (starting at \$38,990) and the 500-square-foot B-52 Bungalow (\$680 for plans only).

At Tryon Farm (tryon-farm.com) in Michigan City, Ind., about an hour outside of Chicago, the small home idea is married with land stewardship. Three-quarters of the housing plan's 170 acres of farmland is protected from development. Homes, which typically range from 465 to 800 square feet, share space with meadows and woodland, which is community owned and managed.

"It is an old idea whose time has come around again," says Sarah Susanka, who co-wrote *Inside the Not So Big House*.

Forget McMansions. Many homeowners are looking to downsize their living space.

BY ROSEMARIE COLOMBRARO

"The average homeowner wants beauty and quality, but he or she can't afford one of these enormous houses."

Most of today's home sales are geared toward families that will grow in time, Susanka says. "We still think of three bedrooms and a two-car garage and a nuclear family, and we don't realize all these other family structures (like singles and empty-nesters) that desperately need a different model," she says.

Corazon del Pueblo, a development in Tucson that offers zero-energy homes (which produce as much energy as they consume), has 616-square-foot models starting in the \$130,000s.

Builder Ted Bednar of Tucson-based TJ Bednar Homes (tjbednar.com) says, "It's going to allow people who are not even dreaming of affording a home to enter the market."

The Greenwood Avenue Cottages development in Shoreline, Wash., created by Seattle-based Cottage Company (cottagecompany.com), received the American Institute of Architects' Housing Committee Award for single-family homes in 2005. The project was developed under a unique city code that limits single home size to less than 1,000 square feet. The cottages (*above*) sold out quickly and rarely come up for resale.

To find a small home builder, search the directory at notsobighouse.com. **EN**

Small, affordable homes help people enter the housing market.



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Smart Growth

[Recent Additions](#) | [Contact Us](#) | Search:

[EPA Home](#) > [Environmental Management](#) > [Smart Growth](#) > [Protecting Water Resources with Higher-Density Development](#)

Protecting Water Resources with Higher-Density Development

Growth and development expand communities' opportunities by bringing in new residents, businesses, and investments. Growth can give a community the resources to revitalize a downtown, refurbish a main street, build new schools, and develop vibrant places to live, work, shop, and play. However, with the benefits come challenges. The environmental impacts of development can make it more difficult for communities to protect their natural resources. Where and how communities accommodate growth has a profound impact on the quality of their streams, rivers, lakes, and beaches. Development that uses land efficiently and protects undisturbed natural lands allows a community to grow and still protect its water resources.

The U.S. Census Bureau projects that the U.S. population will grow by 50 million people, or approximately 18 percent, between 2000 and 2020. Many communities are asking where and how they can accommodate this growth while maintaining and improving their water resources. Some communities have interpreted water-quality research to mean that low-density development will best protect water resources. However, some water-quality experts argue that this strategy can backfire and actually harm water resources. Higher-density development, they believe, may be a better way to protect water resources. This study intends to help guide communities through this debate to better understand the impacts of high- and low-density development on water resources.

To more fully explore this issue, EPA modeled three scenarios of different densities at three scales—one-acre level, lot level, and watershed level—and at three different time series build-out examples to examine the premise that lower-density development is always better for water quality. EPA examined storm water runoff from different development densities to determine the comparative difference between scenarios. This analysis demonstrated:

- The higher-density scenarios generate less storm water runoff per house at all scales— one acre, lot, and watershed—and time series build-out examples;
- For the same amount of development, higher-density development produces less runoff and less impervious cover than low-density development; and
- For a given amount of growth, lower-density development impacts more of the watershed.

Taken together, these findings indicate that low-density development may not always be the preferred strategy for protecting water resources. Higher densities may better protect water quality—especially at the lot and watershed levels. To accommodate the same number of houses, denser developments consume less land than lower density developments. Consuming less land means creating less impervious cover in the watershed. EPA believes that increasing development densities is one strategy communities can use to minimize regional water quality

impacts. To fully protect water resources, communities need to employ a wide range of land use strategies, based on local factors, including building a range of development densities, incorporating adequate open space, preserving critical ecological and buffer areas, and minimizing land disturbance.



[Download Protecting Water Resources with Higher Density Development](#) (PDF, 46 pp., 1.4MB, [about PDF](#)).

For hard copies, please [send an e-mail](#) to ncepimal@one.net or call (800) 490-9198 and request EPA publication 231-R-06-001. If you have any questions concerning this study, please contact Lynn Richards at (202) 566-2858.

[Smart Growth Home](#)

[EPA Home](#) | [Privacy and Security Notice](#) | [Contact Us](#)

This page was generated on Friday, March 10, 2006

View the graphical version of this page at: http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/water_density.htm

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

Chairman Ross called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Curry, Graf, Neu, Tramontana, Vallecillo, Chairman Ross

ABSENT: Jordan

STAFF: Dan Sokolow, Community Development Director

Chairman Ross led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. **Staff Report**

Current Planning Projects list dated February 22, 2006.

Community Development Director Sokolow gave an overview of the Current Project list and the new format of the document. Sokolow added that the only new project on the list is the Mary Rose Gardens Project located at the intersection of Grant Avenue and Cemetery Lane. Chairman Ross asked for clarification on the total number of units on the Current Projects list. Sokolow responded that the total of units for approved projects is 282.

2. **Commission Reports**

Commissioner Neu provided an article regarding limiting the development of franchise restaurants in small towns.

Citizen Input

Peter Hunter, 28472 County Road 87D, is concerned about the Winters Highlands flood impacts on Dry Creek. He states that erosion problems already exist and Highlands would add to those problems. Hunter provided the Planning Commission with a letter on Dry Creek erosion issues.

Catherine Portman, Executive Director of the Burrowing Owl Preservation Society, provided the Planning Commission with a letter regarding burrowing owls on the Winters Highlands project site. Portman said the City needs to consider the impact of a few hundred acres of burrowing owl habitat being taken "bit by bit" within the City's permitting authority.

Carol Brydoff, 425 Abbey Street, said she has read a lot about the Highlands project and doubling of the City's populations in a short period of time. She stated that she supports open space.

Raven Davis-King, 303 ½ Edwards Street, use the Winters Highlands property to walk her dogs and would like the Planning Commission to consider lands that can be shared by hawks and other uses.

Commissioner Neu in reference to a flood-related condition of approval for the Winters Highlands regarding the filing of a Conditional Letter of Map Revisions (CLOMR)/Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) asked whether the applicant has met with FEMA. Sokolow responded that the City Engineer has forwarded information to FEMA regarding the Moody Slough Subbasin Storm Drainage Report and the residential projects in the northwest portion of Winters including Highlands.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

Commissioner Graf said the Winters Highlands Development Agreement (DA) contains significant benefits for the City of Winters, the community, and the school district. He said it was very important to read the DA; there are a lot of things in the DA important to Winters.

CONSENT ITEM #1:

1. Approve minutes of January 24, 2006 regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Curry moved to approve minutes of the January 24, 2006 regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

Seconded by Commissioner Vallecillo.

AYES: Curry, Graf, Neu, Tramontana, Vallecillo, Chairman Ross

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jordan

Motion carried unanimously with Jordan absent.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Continued Public Hearing and consideration of Winters Highlands Tentative Subdivision Map. The project is a proposed residential subdivision of 102 .6 acres to create 413 single-family lots (including 36 "duplex" lots) on 49 .49 acres, a 2.01 acre multifamily lot on which 30 apartments will be developed, a 10 .63 acre park site (plus a proposed 10,000 square foot well site), and a 7 .43 acre wetlands/open space area, an exchange parcel of 0 .04 acres to the Callahan property to the south; and 32 .81 acres in public roads.

The project site is located north of Grant Avenue along Moody Slough Road (County Road 33) in the northwestern portion of the City of Winters. The project site totals 102 .6 acres comprised of APNs 030-220-17 (48 .1 acres), 030-220-19 (21 .0 acres), and 030-220-33 (33 .5 acres) located south of Moody Slough Road, east of the westerly City limits, and north of the existing Dry Creek subdivision.

The following approvals are needed from the City: 1) CEQA clearance; 2) Exclusion from the West Central Master Plan; 3) Approval of the Winters Highlands Development Agreement; 4) Approval of various General Plan Amendments; 5) Approval of various Rezonings and Planned Development Overlay; 6) Approval of Planned Development Permit for PD Overlay, 7) Approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map; 8) Approval of a Lot Line Adjustment; 9) Amendment of the Rancho Arroyo Storm Drain District Master Plan; 10) Amendment of the Circulation Master Plan; and 11) Amendment of the Bikeway System Master Plan.

Community Development Director Sokolow said that staff recommends that this item be continued to a special meeting of the Planning Commission on March 14, 2006 since all the items for the Winters Highlands Development Agreement have not been completed.

Commissioner Curry moved to continue the item to March 14, 2006.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

Seconded by Commissioner Neu.

AYES: Curry, Graf, Neu, Tramontana, Vallecillo, Chairman Ross

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jordan

Motion carried unanimously with Jordan absent.

Chairman Ross asked when staff received the continuance request from the Highlands applicant and then expressed his concerns that staff had not listed the continuance request on the agenda page. He noted that a number of people had expected the Highlands item to be considered at this evening's meeting.

2. Public Hearing and consideration of Site Plan and Variance for the construction of 3041 square foot two-story, single-family residence and attached 715 square foot secondary dwelling unit at 600 Red Bud Lane (APN 038-203-19). Applicant: Nick Wittman.

Community Development Director Sokolow gave an overview of the project and the findings that need to be made to approve the Site Plan and Variance.

Project applicant Wittman addressed the Planning Commission and noted that the Commission is viewing his fourth layout for the project and he's been working on the project for a year.

Commissioner Vallecillo asked whether there was enough depth in the driveway and said that it looks like vehicles will be parking over the sidewalk. He also asked whether recreational vehicles will be parked forward of the house. Vallecillo questioned why there should be a front yard setback when an recreational vehicle can be parked forward of the house.

Chairman Ross noted that the proposed house is very large and he questioned whether the Planning Commission had come to the point that the variance request isn't a grant of special privilege.

Commissioner Graf said he had been through the neighborhood where the house would be constructed and the house complements the neighborhood.

Commissioner Neu said the reason for setbacks is so there isn't interference with the line of sight and neighbors. He didn't think this project would interfere with the line of sight or neighbors.

Commissioner Graf moved to approve Site Plan and Variance for the construction of 3041 square foot two-story, single-family residence and attached 715 square foot secondary dwelling unit at 600 Red Bud Lane (APN 038-203-19). Applicant: Nick Wittman.

Seconded by Tramontana.

AYES: Curry, Graf, Neu, Tramontana

NOES: Vallecillo, Chairman Ross

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Jordan

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

Motion carried 4-2 with Jordan absent.

DISCUSSION

1. Review of antique-type street lights for the Callahan Estates and Hudson-Ogando Subdivisions.

Commissioner Neu asked whether PG&E would paint the lights. Community Development Director Sokolow said the lights would come painted; however, he was unsure of whether painting, as a maintenance function would be handled by PG&E.

Commissioner Vallecillo asked what happened to the installation of the cutoffs for the antique street lights that were installed in the downtown.

Commissioner Tramontana asked if PG&E would be responsible for any damaged street lights. Sokolow said PG&E would be responsible for maintaining the street lights.

Commissioner Curry asked whether the street lights proposed for the Callahan Estates and Hudson-Ogando Subdivisions would be continued in other subdivisions. Sokolow said potentially yes; however, this would be determined by the conditions of approval for future subdivisions.

Commissioners concurred that they were comfortable with the antique-type streetlights.

INFORMATION

1. None.

Chairman Ross voiced concern over the late notice regarding the continuation of the Winters Highlands item. Ross would like more notice in the future if an item will be pulled from the agenda.

City Councilmember Tom Stone, Council liaison to the Planning Commission, said the Council has dealt with this issue in the past and it is not a new issue. The agenda must get to the newspaper nearly a week in advance for notification; some items may be changed or removed during that timeframe. Stone said this is an issue that the City deals with in having a weekly newspaper and notification requirements.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

JACK GRAF, VICE CHAIRMAN

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2006**

ATTEST:

DAN SOKOLOW, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

Vice-Chairman Graf called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Curry, Jordan, Neu, Tramontana, Vallecillo

ABSENT: Graf, Ross

STAFF: Dan Sokolow, Community Development Director; Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner; Nick Ponticello, City Engineer

Neu led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Staff Report

Current Planning Projects list dated March 21, 2006.

Community Development Director Sokolow gave an overview of the Current Planning Projects List noting that there were no changes made except to the Winters Highlands status.

Commission Reports

Vice-Chairman Jordan stated that Chairman Ed Ross had resigned from the Planning Commission and expressed his appreciation for Ross' services on the Commission.

CITIZEN INPUT

None.

CONSENT ITEM

Approve minutes of March 14, 2006 special meeting of the Planning Commission.

Community Development Director Sokolow stated that the minutes are not ready for approval and would be brought to the April meeting of the Commission.

ACTION ITEM

None.

INFORMATION ITEM

Status report on planning review project.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Workshop CEQA/Scoping session on Village on the park residential Project (APNs 003-036-05 & 18).

Contract Planner Tschudin gave an overview of the project and detailed the four major components: proposal for 75 lots; roadway dedications Railroad Avenue and Dutton Street; common area (Parcel A) for landscaping, clubhouse, and other features; and storm drain detention/open space/park area (Parcel X). She said the project has a park acreage deficit; in the interim a portion of the parkland area would be used for flood control facilities. Tschudin discussed how the project fits into the growth rate issue.

Some of the major issues based a staff review of the project are as follows:

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

1. General Plan consistency – a portion of the project site is located in the General Plan Flood Overlay area.
2. Mix of housing stock (for sale versus rental) – the applicant is proposing all for sale units for the R-4 Zone (High Density Multi-Family Residential) site.
3. General Plan Housing Element requirement that development for the R-4 Zone occur at the upper one-quarter of the density range.
4. Regulatory consistency for the R-4 Zone – the applicant is proposing site coverage, setbacks, and other development standards that differ from the R-4 requirements.

Tschudin said the last issue (regulatory consistency for the R-4 Zone) could be addressed by a rezone for a planned development overlay. Staff would oppose the project as proposed.

Bill Kampton, a representative for the project applicant, addressed the Planning Commission. He noted that the project site is one parcel removed from the Downtown Master Plan area and would provide pedestrian and bikeway access to the downtown. Kampton said a high quality craftsman-style design would be used and the project would provide high quality entry-level housing.

Jeff Bray of LSA Associates and the project biologist provided the Planning Commission with a summary of the biological resources found at the project site.

Bryan Bonino of Laugenour and Meikle and the project civil engineer said the project doesn't have serious infrastructure issues. He noted that the project will have to pay its fair share towards expansion of the City's Wastewater Treatment Facility and the City is processing a General Plan Flood Overlay Area implementation plan. Bonino said traffic in general is a "hot" topic in Winters. He discussed the proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements the project would provide including bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to the south.

Commissioner Curry asked why the applicant was calling the storm drain detention facility temporary. Bonino responded that the facility would eventually be replaced and would be designed to retain water for 48 hours. Curry noted that need to address flood issues because of the problems that the Almond Orchard residents have had with flooding.

Commissioner Neu asked how much of the project's pavement would be permeable. Bonino stated that he would not recommend permeability because of clay soils found at the project site.

Commissioner Vallecillo asked whether the storm drain detention facility would be just a "hole in the ground". Bonino responded that viewing platforms and plantings could be incorporated into the facility.

Kampton addressed the General Plan 75% (single-family)/25% (multi-family) split for residential. He said the 25% doesn't specifically mention apartments. The project will result in multi-family units priced at a point for entry-level ownership. Kampton said the units won't come up to the prices of single-family homes and the project will also provide 15% of the total units as affordables. Vallecillo asked how the applicant was going to guarantee that the affordable units wouldn't increase in price. Kampton discussed market forces. Vallecillo said he was worried about the market rate homes. Kampton said the project would always be an alternative to a single-family home in the housing market. Vallecillo asked what would happen

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

if investors wanted to buy a block of homes. Tschudin said there was little the City could do to prevent this. The City could require owner occupation through a development agreement, but this usually only addresses the first round of sales.

In response to a question from Neu, Tschudin said there are 6-inch gaps between to the units to deal with liability issues.

Curry asked whether the applicant had other projects of the type being proposed that the Planning Commission could view. Kampton said the applicant would put together a packet of similar projects and circulate it to the Commission. While the applicant doesn't have a product similar to what is being proposed, the applicant has used similar architecture.

Commissioner Tramontana said he likes the idea of apartments and the way the pond (storm drain detention facility) could be used as an amenity. He said he thinks apartments would be a better idea than townhouses.

Neu said he doesn't like the idea of the pond and the City would be losing out on park area. While he understood the reason not to phase the project's units, Neu said he didn't see how the City could take another 75 units.

Vallecillo said he didn't see how the City could move forward and say "build it" when 2,000 persons will be moving into town from residential projects that have been recently approved. He agreed with Tramontana's comments on apartments because the project site has been designated for apartments. Vallecillo also discussed the need to review the City's General Plan.

Curry expressed her concerns about the stairs for the units and their suitability for seniors.

Vallecillo expressed concerns on the safety of children from the project having to cross a street (Dutton Street) to get to the tot lot play area at the park.

Curry asked City Engineer Ponticello how the residents of the project would access Dutton. Ponticello said access to Dutton would be just from an emergency vehicle access (EVA).

Commissioner Jordan asked whether the General Plan actually says that apartments shall be constructed on the R-4 site. Tschudin said the General Plan doesn't, but she went on to discuss the need for apartments in the City.

Jordan said he didn't disagree on the need to have apartments; however, he cited the firefighters, police, and teachers that can't afford to buy a home in Winters. Jordan said there would be some benefit in having some entry-level homes. There's some entry-level homes that will go into the Callahan Estates, Hudson-Ogando, and Winters Highlands projects; however, most of the units in those projects will sell for more than \$400,000.

Tramontana agreed that the City needs to have smaller homes, but he described the project's lots as "tiny". He stated that apartments would be better than townhouses for the project site.

Jim Nolan, a member of the project team, passed out a cover letter for the economic analysis that the applicant prepared for the project that indicated that market rate apartments were not

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

economically viable for the project site. Nolan discussed the project's history which included a discussion with the City a couple of years ago on developing an affordable 120-unit apartment complex. The applicant then re-engineered the site for 90 units. He said that market rate apartments can't be built on the site. According to Nolan, a subsidy of \$9 million would be needed for a 75-unit market rate apartment project.

Tschudin in response to Nolan's comments about the lack of economic viability for the construction of market rate apartments at the project site said that an important clarification needs to be made. She said that what Nolan is saying is that apartments can't be built on the site now.

Nolan discussed the real estate recession that occurred in the late 1980s/early 1990s and how some people characterized it as a real estate depression. He noted that some people had to sell their homes at a loss at prices less than their mortgages. While prices will come down, Nolan stated they won't fall enough to build apartment on the project site. He highlight the loan and grant assistance that the City was providing the Community Housing Opportunities Corporation for the Winters II project – a 34-unit affordable apartments facility.

Neu said the City is always going to be falling behind on park acreage.

Curry said she would like receive information from the applicant on its company's history and typology of the type product that is being proposed.

Vallecillo said Nolan was right in his assessment that the market won't support the construction of a market rate apartments project.

2. Workshop CEQA/Scoping session on Mary Rose Gardens residential project (APN 003-524-19).

Community Developer Director Sokolow gave an overview of the project and identified the project site on the City's Zoning Map. He also read into the record a letter from Greg Drummond, the property owner at 411 Luis Place, regarding concerns Drummond has with the location of the emergency vehicle access (EVA)/overland flood release at the Carter Ranch subdivision and the location of the park space proposed for the Mary Rose Gardens (MRG) project. Drummond supports moving the EVA/overland flood release to MRG and relocating the park space to another location in MRG.

City Engineer Nick Ponticello discussed the weir in the Rancho Arroyo Regional Detention Facility and the release of floodwaters through the weir into the streets of Carter Ranch and finally out to Cemetery Lane through the Carter Ranch EVA/overland flood release. He said the EVA aspect is secondary to the overland release and the elevations won't allow the relocation of the Carter Ranch overland release to MRG.

Commissioner Neu asked if staff had consulted with the Fire Department on the project. Sokolow said staff had discussed only the street name and addressing for the project.

Dave Snow, project applicant, said project density is below the R-2 Zone requirement because of the proposed park space area and concerns expressed about the number of units. People who

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

attended the neighborhood workshops liked the idea of the mini park. Snow described MRG as an infill project. The homes are setback a significant distance from the existing homes in the Carter Ranch project. In addition, the homes that backup to Grant Avenue are setback at least 31-feet from Grant. Snow has started the development agreement negotiation with City Manager John Donlevy. According to Snow, Donlevy would like to see the project fund the construction of a sidewalk on the south side of Grant.

Snow reviewed proposed elevations of the homes with the Planning Commission and discussed his plans for staggering the front yard setbacks of the homes and the garage front yard setbacks.

Snow said he was licensed as a general contractor in 1993 and he's built custom homes since 1998. He has built a number of subdivisions in various locations and has a number of projects in design using a variety of brick and stone materials. He discussed the switchback configuration for the entrance to the mini park to make it safe. Snow reviewed three conceptual designs for the mini park – all include a clock tower feature. He said that the people who attended the neighborhood workshops preferred a mini park design with open space.

Neu asked whether the sound wall for the project would be installed in front of the mini park. Bryan Bonino of Laugenour and Meikle and the project civil engineer said the sound wall would transition down to a wrought iron fence at the mini park.

In response to a question from Commissioner Curry, Sokolow said the City would be responsible for maintaining the mini park. Curry asked if there was a buffer zone between the mini park and Grant Avenue. Ponticello said the City has designed a Grant Avenue corridor that two traffic lanes with a widened landscape area. There's enough land to expand to four traffic lanes if needed and Caltrans had requested this. The Grant corridor will have a raised landscaped median and wide landscaped area on the north side of Grant. Pedestrian improvements will be installed on the south side Grant. Pedestrian improvements will be constructed at the West Grant and West Main intersection. Ponticello said the Creekside Estates project which backs up to Grant Avenue will have a 32- to 34-foot wide landscape corridor on Grant instead of the originally planned 24-foot. He hopes to have all the improvements for the Grant corridor completed.

Curry asked if it was possible to save the large Walnut trees on the south side of Grant. Ponticello said the proposed work on the south side of Grant would be north of the trees; however, the trees haven't been assessed.

Commissioner Tramontana expressed concerns about having the windows of two story homes in close proximity to the sound wall on Grant Avenue. He asked whether there would be a Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) capacity problem for the project. Ponticello said none of the projects before Winters Highlands have a requirement that they can't be built before expansion of the WWTF. Highlands has a provision in the development agreement reserving wastewater capacity for the first three phases of the project (or 250 units). He said he doesn't see a capacity issue with the MRG project. Highlands has to provide funds for expansion of the WWTF or Highlands doesn't receive a capacity reservation for units.

Curry said she would like to see universal design features in the project.

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

Commissioner Jordan the mini park has been placed in a good location and it would take care of the pedestrian traffic that had been using the Carter Ranch EVA/flood overland release.

Neu asked how long it would take for the project to go forward.

Tramontana would like to see park in-lieu fees used to improve the City's skate park on Valley Oak Drive.

Larry Justice, a member of the Winters Cemetery District board of directors, said a major issue for the District is the fencing along Cemetery Drive. While the conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&Rs) for the Carter Ranch development prohibited the installation of rear yard gates for homes that backup to Cemetery Drive, one of the Carter Ranch residents constructed a gate and accesses Cemetery Lane. Justice said another concern is the lack of lighting along Cemetery Drive; he noted that youths sometimes congregate on Cemetery Drive during the night hours.

3. Workshop CEQA/Scoping session on 723 Railroad Avenue residential/commercial project (APN 003-322-20).

Community Development Director Sokolow gave an overview of the project.

Applicant Eva Brzeski thanked staff for the explanation and described the project as a mixed-use infill development. She noted the project's location in the Downtown Master Plan (DMP) and her work with the DMP Steering Committee and neighbors of the project.

Bob Lindley, project architect from YHLA, worked in Davis and the surrounding areas for the last 15 years. Lindley reviewed a revised site plan and elevations with the Planning Commission. The project will be responsible for street improvements on Railroad Avenue and Anderson Avenue. He said the project will have a fairly high residential density/commercial mix on the Railroad frontage. Lindley said he wanted to create a green oasis (park-type space) at the center of the site and orient houses around it. He noted the proximity of the Double M Trucking company to the project location and the need to orient the residential units away from the trucking company and towards the green oasis. Lindley explained that the site is too far from the downtown to do retail. The ground floor commercial spaces would have their own access from Railroad and one-hour occupancy separations from the residential units.

Lindley said the residential units would consist of 1,000 square foot start homes with two bedrooms and two bathrooms and 1,400 square foot residences with three bedrooms and two bathrooms. In addition, each of the larger units would include a bonus room above the garage area that could be used for a small residential unit.

Commissioner Jordan asked where the clients of the commercial spaces would park their vehicles. Lindley said on-street parking would be provided on Anderson Avenue. While there's a desire to have on-street parking on Railroad Avenue, this won't occur. Lindley indicated that the commercial businesses wouldn't attract a lot of visitors.

Commissioner Curry expressed her concerns about residents of the project not parking in their garages and parking elsewhere such as Anderson west of Railroad. She stated her interest in

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2006**

seeking a market study of the businesses that would use the commercial spaces.

Sokolow read into the record a letter from John Martin, the owner of the Double M Trucking company. Martin expressed concerns about the project's proximity to his company and noted that Double M has been in business at the same location for many years. Sokolow also noted a comment from the March 8, 2006 Development Review Committee (DRC) meeting. One of the DRC members asked why housing was being pursued for the project site, which is zoned Central Business District (C-2) and Office (OF).

Jordan suggested a disclosure item for residents of the project regarding the proximity of the Double M truck yard. He also asked why on-street parking couldn't be provided on Railroad Avenue. City Engineer Ponticello said that Railroad Avenue is an arterial street and the street cross section doesn't include on-street parking. He indicated that he didn't have a problem with a reduced right-of-way on Anderson Avenue. This would result in a monolithic sidewalk rather than a separated sidewalk with a landscape strip between the sidewalk and the street.

Curry asked if the Fire Department had reviewed the project. Lindley responded yes and indicated that changes have been made based on comments from the Fire Department. These changes include an increase in the internal roadway width from 16 feet to 20 feet, an increase in the southeast corner inside radius, and an enhancement in the fire suppression requirement to NFPA 13D because of the three-story buildings.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 P.M.

DON JORDAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

DAN SOKOLOW, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

Chairman Ross called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Curry, Graf, Jordan, Neu, Tramontana, Vallecillo, Chairman Ross

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Dan Sokolow, Community Development Director; Heidi Tschudin, Contract Planner; Nick Ponticello, City Engineer

Commissioner Neu led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

Commission Reports

None

Citizen Input

None

CONSENT ITEM:

None

ACTION ITEM

Continued Public Hearing and consideration of Winters Highlands Tentative Subdivision Map. The project is a proposed residential subdivision of 102 .6 acres to create 413 single-family lots (including 36 "duplex" lots) on 49 .49 acres, a 2.01 acre multifamily lot on which 30 apartments will be developed, a 10 .63 acre park site (plus a proposed 10,000 square foot well site), and a 7 .43 acre wetlands/open space area, an exchange parcel of 0 .04 acres to the Callahan property to the south; and 32 .81 acres in public roads.

The project site is located north of Grant Avenue along Moody Slough Road (County Road 33) in the northwestern portion of the City of Winters. The project site totals 102 .6 acres comprised of APNs 030-220-17 (48.1 acres), 030-220-19 (21.0 acres), and 030-220-33 (33.5 acres) located south of Moody Slough Road, east of the westerly City limits, and north of the existing Dry Creek subdivision .

The following approvals are needed from the City: 1) CEQA clearance; 2) Exclusion from the West Central Master Plan; 3) Approval of the Winters Highlands Development Agreement; 4) Approval of various General Plan Amendments; 5) Approval of various Rezoning and Planned Development Overlay; 6) Approval of Planned Development Permit for PD Overlay, 7) Approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map; 8) Approval of a Lot Line Adjustment; 9) Amendment of the Rancho Arroyo Storm Drain District Master Plan ; 10) Amendment of the Circulation Master Plan; and 11) Amendment of the Bikeway System Master Plan .

Contract Planner Heidi Tschudin gave an outline of the outline of the property, boundaries and landmarks. Key features of the project include neo-traditional neighborhood design, grid pattern street design, traffic calming, bikeways, wetlands, 10.86-acre neighborhood park, and a density of 5.34 dwelling unit per acre. A recommendation on the project is needed for the City Council.

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

Chairman Ross asked if there were any questions; hearing none he asked for the applicant to come forward.

Rick Cheney of Granite Bay Holdings, the applicant for the project, commended the City Council, Planning Commission, and staff for being relentless in looking out for the community. He then provided a PowerPoint slide show outlining the project based on each of the five phases of the project. Cheney noted that Granite Bay has bought into the linear park concept although Granite Bay initially resisted it. He discussed a habitat conservation easement site for Swainson's hawk and potentially other species that he has located within four miles of the city boundaries. In response to a question from Commissioner Curry, Cheney confirmed that the site was located on Putah Creek. He indicated that other developers were interested in using the site and displayed a wildlife viewing area for the site.

Cheney said that it takes about 75 individuals to build a home. He suggesting filling these jobs with local painters, roofers, and other individuals employed in the construction trades.

After he noted a number of the items in the development agreement, Cheney said that all parties worked in good faith through exhaustive negotiations to come to full agreement for the development agreement. He said Granite Bay believes it will be providing a diversity of product in Winters Highlands. Cheney said Granite Bay has taken the approach to meet with City staff, City government, and other parts of the community as well as many groups such as Friends of the Swainson's hawk and the Burrowing Owl Society. He stated that Granite Bay would work, purchase, and hire in Winters.

Cheney provided a brief summary of a potential habitat mitigation site for the project. The site is within four miles of the City limits and would include a viewing area for the public. He petitioned the Planning Commission to support the site.

Regarding CEQA Alternative #3 (preservation of wetland in the northwest corner of project), Cheney said Granite Bay didn't like the way that the Valley Oak Drive and Moody Slough Road intersection would align and was concerned about the intense maintenance the wetland would require. He also cited the poor biological value of the wetland.

Ross opened the public hearing at 8:16 p.m.

John Sexton, 11 Anderson Avenue, stated that the City's water supply is diminishing and new development is a strain on City costs. He noted that water and sewer utility rates have recently gone up. However, Sexton said Winters needs additional families.

Rory Linton, 311 Peach Place and a downtown business owner, said the Planning Commission has approved the Downtown Master Plan (DMP) and additional residents are needed for the DMP to succeed. He discussed car dealerships, grocery stores, and movie theaters that closed in Winters over the years. Linton said the community needs amenities, funding, and other benefits.

Mark Wuestehube of Northstate Resources (1321 31st Street, Sacramento) and a biological consultant for Granite Bay stated that small wetland areas required intensive management of weeds and clean up of trash. Portions of the northwest wetland are located in the right-of-way

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

for Moody Slough Road. He noted that the small amount of buffer for the wetland and future sports park north of it make the wetland a poor candidate for preservation. Wuestehube said he met with a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) staffer today at the project site. The staffer said the USFWS would encourage jurisdictions to go through a wetland bank for the type of wetland located in the northwest corner of the Highlands project. Wuestehube considered the northeast wetland a good candidate for preservation because of the buffer available, but he noted that there would still be a lot of work required to control weeds, pickup trash, and manage the site.

Demar Hooper, an attorney for the applicant, said he sponsored the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Wetland Mitigation Bank Act of 1993 and large wetland mitigation banks can help address small wetland areas.

Phil Snow, 4358 Margaret Lane, said the project is well-thought out – particularly the amenities it provides to the schools. He posed the following question: “If not this project, then what project would you approve?”

Glenn Negri, a Winters businesses owner, wanted to focus on the positives of the project since he had watched various Highlands meetings and most of the comments made at the meetings were negative. He listed various development agreement items that the developers of the project would provide. Negri said Winters has seen a lot of businesses come and go and he’s had to sell some of his business’ high dollar equipment in order to make it through the winters. During some winters, he noted, he’s considered selling his equipment at an auction. Negri said more residents are needed to patronize businesses.

Roy Jones, 106 Orchard Lane and business owner, noted that while serving on the City Council in 1986 it was predicted that the City’s population would reach 15,000 in 2006. He said that someone didn’t predict very well and didn’t support the downtown. Jones said that kids who grow up in Winters don’t end up living in the City because of the lack of available homes, and additional residents are needed to support the City’s businesses.

Tim Caro, Yolo County resident, provided the Planning Commission with a graph that depicted two scenarios: residential growth without delaying the project and residential growth with a two-year delay to slow down the City’s growth. He suggested that other residential projects such as Callahan Estates, Hudson-Ogando, and Creekside Estates need to be considered when looking at the Highlands project.

Joe McCabe, 217 Creekside Way, suggests looking at the cumulative effects of all projects. He also discussed the lack of commercial businesses near the Highlands project and other residential projects. McCabe asked how the City would deal with the residents complaining about the traffic (resulting from the residential growth).

Kevin Jackson, 806 Carrion Circle, discussed EIR alternative 3 and an alternative he created called “3B”. He took alternative 3 and modified it to move the apartment complex to the southern end of the linear park. As a result, the northwest wetland becomes a grasslands park where among other things people can walk their dogs. Jackson noted that there has been a lot of discussion regarding the locations of Swainson’s hawk nesting sites and said he thought there were 17 sites within five miles of the project area. He commented that the provision in the draft

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

City Habitat Mitigation Program for a seven-mile radius from the City's boundaries for habitat mitigation was a good idea.

Charlie Rominger, 311 Main Street, said he wasn't present at the meeting to persuade the Planning Commission not to build but to build something that pays. Traffic from the project will make Grant Avenue "terrible". He urged the Commission to complete the Main Street loop and build up the roadway to assist on flood control efforts. Rominger suggested using the area north of the project site for industrial development. He remarked that industrial development only costs the City 30 cents for every dollar it receives in property taxes. Rominger advocated first starting on an industrial project north of the project site before constructing Highlands.

Valerie Whitworth, 108 Liwai Village Court and downtown business owner, said she's attending the meeting because questions haven't been answered. She said the Dry Creek Citizens group hasn't been included in a discussion of the impact of the project on Dry Creek. Whitworth thought that delaying the project for a couple of years is a good time to get the study on Dry Creek that the Dry Creek Citizens group has been asking for since 1991. Additional water in the creek may create huge problems. She cited the example of a person who put concrete in the creek and the resulting erosion was as big as a house.

Dan Leroy, 407 Columbia Way and a member of the Putah Creek Council, asked about the funds included in the development agreement for Putah Creek. He wanted to know whether the funds were adequate for Putah Creek and how the funds would be spent. If the project is approved, Leroy urged the City Council to work with the Putah Creek Council, Dry Creek Citizens group, and the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee.

Sally Brown, 24 East Main Street, discussed residential projects already approved and how the City's population would increase with these projects and Winters Highlands. She said the impact of the various residential projects isn't smart growth; Brown described it as hyper growth. She suggested what the City needs is industrial growth.

Rich Marovich, Putah Creek Streamkeeper from the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee (LPCC), said the LPCC has taken an interest in Dry Creek because of the stream bank erosion. He didn't see a lot of impact from the Highlands project on Dry Creek stream bank erosion. Marovich suggested taking a look at the stretch of Dry Creek starting at the Balough Bridge and continuing north to SR 128 (Grant Avenue). He commented that the metered storm drain flows into Dry Creek isn't an erosion problem.

Laurie Sengo, 5020 Wolfskill Road and downtown business owner, commented on delaying the project for two years. She said industrial development is great, but she didn't know whether it was feasible. She questioned whether the amenities offered by the developer would still be available if the project was delayed for two years.

Marcia Gibbs, 204 Main Street, stated that Winters is the amenity in and of itself. She said the cumulative development needs to be looked at; the City is maxing out. Gibbs viewed traffic as a significant problem. She recommended the relocation of the industrial area as suggested by Charlie Rominger as well as completing the Main Street loop. Moving the industrial area will create permanent jobs. Gibbs supported a delay in the Highlands project so jobs in the City can catch up with the residential growth resulting from the project.

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

Bryan Bonino, a civil engineer for Laugenour and Mickle and the civil engineer for Granite Bay, who works for Winters Highlands, noted that the applicant had spoken with a wetland restoration contractor on the various options for addressing wetland areas at the project site.

David Springer, 200 Madrone Court, supports local habitat mitigation, EIR alternative #3, and Charlie Rominger's plan on moving the industrial area. He said what the developers of the project are offering is politics, not philanthropy.

Susan DeLao, 1123 Grant Avenue, described the project as well thought out, particularly the improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Darlene Benson, 8 Edwards Street, recalled how she was told to "watch out" in 1975 when she acquired property at the time because the City was in a growth mode; however, she said the growth hasn't occurred.

The Planning Commission took a recess at 9:29 P.M. and reconvened at 9:39 P.M..

John Hasbrook, 5111 Putah Creek Road, said the project would be good for the City and community and was concerned about letting the opportunities provided by the project pass.

Rory Linton, 311 Peach Place, described the project developers as a "class act". Linton expressed his concerns that the Police Department doesn't have a prisoner holding cell, an officer has to take a prisoner to the jail in Woodland and this reduces police coverage in the City, and the Fire Department is sitting on prime land. He also spoke about the traffic problems at the schools. Linton said requiring a delay for the project would force the developers to back out. He stated that the project would help the City's infrastructure, tax base, and economy.

Ross closed the Public Hearing at 9:45 P.M.

Commissioner Graf stated that the developers have spent five or six years on the project and he believes they are dedicated and interested in improving Winters. He said he's met their staff, visited their offices, and seen their product. Graf is impressed with their affordable housing plan. Without growth, there isn't affordable housing. He said the project would provide unprecedented benefits for the schools and community. Graf said public input on the project has been incredible and now is the time to build the community in a very appropriate way. He noted that the Planning Commission has been faithful to the process and there is no set agenda to the process. Graf supports the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Tramontana asked whether the storm drain flows from the project would cause erosion problems on Dry Creek. Mike Nolan, a civil engineer from Wood Rodgers and a storm drain consultant for the City, said his firm did look at the storm drainage from the project. The storm drain flows would be diverted to the Rancho Arroyo Storm Drain Detention Facility and then metered out to Dry Creek. As a result, this would decrease the peak storm drain flows from the project and even it out as much as possible.

City Engineer Ponticello said the storm drain flows from all project that will flow through the 48-inch storm drain pipe into Dry Creek will only increase the water level of Dry Creek by 0.04

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

feet. He added that there is no evidence that the projects would increase erosion on Dry Creek

Tramontana asked whether the City would receive credit if habitat mitigation for the project occurred outside of Yolo County. Community Development Director Sokolow discussed the status of the City's efforts in establishing a habitat mitigation program and concerns expressed by the Yolo County HCP/NCCP JPA that mitigation outside of Yolo County wouldn't be credited to the county. Commissioner Curry asked whether staff had talked to the California Department of Fish and Game regarding the habitat mitigation program.

Curry commented that the attendance at the January City Council-Planning Commission workshop for the project was disappointing. She noted that change is difficult and expressed concern about the high school swimming pool being closed this summer. Curry said the applicant has done a really nice job and delaying the project makes her nervous. She noted that the cost of construction materials will continue to increase. Curry supports the staff recommendation on the project. She likes the location of the apartments near the park and said small wetland areas are difficult to maintain.

Commissioner Jordan said the Planning Commission had a vision when it looked at the northwest area in terms of parks and connectivity. He questioned whether holding off the project was positive. Jordan noted that he supports Charlie Rominger's plan for relocating the industrial area and suggested pursuing Rominger's plan at the same time as the Highlands project. He expressed his concerns that some of the development agreement items could be "pulled of the table" the longer the project gets delayed.

Tramontana discussed the Caltrans planning grant the City received for improving walking and biking on Grant Avenue and the upcoming visit by walkability expert Dan Burden in early May. He asked whether the traffic signals slated for Grant Avenue negate what may come out of the planning grant project. Ponticello responded that the Grant Avenue Access Study will be discussed as part of the Caltrans planning grant project. Bob Grandy, a traffic engineer with Fehr and Peers and a consultant for the City, briefed the Planning Commission on the Grant Avenue Access Study and discussed several alternatives to traffic signals on Grant.

Commissioner Vallecillo stated that overall he likes the project but is concerned about the growth rate and supports slow phasing. He said the City was getting a lot from Highlands and other projects, but asked whether the City was paying a price to get these benefits. Vallecillo said every day the project gets delayed results in more expensive homes. He indicated that he would be more supportive of the project if there was a way the phasing could be spread out.

Commissioner Neu stated that Highlands is a good project at the wrong time. He characterized the second year of the project's phasing as "real frightening" because of the combination of the Highlands' residential units and units from other projects. Neu said the phasing schedule should be spread out. He supports taking out the requirements for traffic signals in order to obtain more connectivity. Neu asked why the fiscal impact analysis stopped at year 2010. Dave Sanders, a City consultant from Economic and Planning Systems, responded that the City's service standards don't go beyond 2010. Sokolow explained how the adjustment formula for the fiscal neutrality annuity worked.

In response to a question from Jordan, Ponticello said the extensions of Taylor Street and Main

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

Street would be constructed even if the Winters Highlands project doesn't go through.

Tramontana asked Ponticello to distinguish between the wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) expansion to 1.2 million gallons per day (mgd) and 1.6 mgd. Ponticello said 1.2 mgd is the phase two expansion 1.6 mgd would cover the entire planning area for the City. He noted that the City's WWTF consultant, Larry Walker and Associates, will be updating the WWTF master plan.

Tramontana asked whether the City would have enough water. Ponticello said the developers of the Callahan Estates, Creekside Estates, Hudson-Ogando, and Winters Highlands projects funded an SB 610 study to look at the water use for the four projects. The study determined at the present that there would be enough water to serve the projects; however, this doesn't mean that the City shouldn't continue to plan for water usage beyond the four projects. Ponticello said the Highlands development agreement requires that the project fund its share of a comprehensive urban water management plan for the City.

Curry said at the last City Council meeting an individual brought up a sewer flow problem. Curry asked how Highlands will impact sewer flows. Ponticello said this was an operational issue and it has been corrected. He's recommending some upgrades to the Carter Ranch Sewer Lift Station.

Ross discussed keeping jobs in the City and limiting growth. He suggested a general plan amendment to move the industrial area as well as to limit growth. Curry questioned whether it was appropriate to discuss a general plan amendment at this time. Ross said he thought it was an appropriate discussion now to see if the general plan amendment could be funded in the project's development agreement. Further, he said the developer has a commonality of interests with the City in limiting the supply of houses to protect their investment.

Vallecillo said updating the City's General Plan is one of the most important things we need to do. He stated that the City would "get in a lot of trouble" if it didn't update the General Plan.

Graf moved to approve : 1) CEQA clearance; 2) Exclusion from the West Central Master Plan; 3) Approval of the Winters Highlands Development Agreement; 4) Approval of various General Plan Amendments; 5) Approval of various Rezonings and Planned Development Overlay; 6) Approval of Planned Development Permit for PD Overlay, 7) Approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map; 8) Approval of a Lot Line Adjustment; 9) Amendment of the Rancho Arroyo Storm Drain District Master Plan ; 10) Amendment of the Circulation Master Plan; and 11) Amendment of the Bikeway System Master Plan .

Seconded by Curry.

Neu offered an amendment to the motion to require that all future residential projects approved must adhere to a cumulative growth rate of no more than one-half percent per year until the year 2025 and the industrial area be relocated/remove from the flood zone. In response to Neu's amendment, Graf said the amendment should be deferred.

AYES: Curry, Graf, Jordan, Tramontana

NOES: Neu, Vallecillo, Chairman Ross

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL WINTERS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006**

ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried 4-3.

Commission adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

DON JORDAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

DAN SOKOLOW, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR