



City of Woodland

300 First Street
Woodland, CA 95695

530-661-5820

Meeting Agenda - Final Planning Commission

Thursday, March 6, 2014

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

A. Call to Order

B. Roll Call

C. Approval of Minutes

[14-073](#)

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of October 17, 2013 and February 6, 2014.

D. Directors Report

This an opportunity for the Community Development Department's Director or designee to provide the Commission with information on any items other than those listed on the Agenda.

E. Public Comment

This is an opportunity for the public to speak to the Commission on any item other than those listed on the Agenda. The Chairman may impose a time limit on any speaker.

F. Communications

Commission Statements and Requests: This is an opportunity for the Commission members to make comments and announcements to express concerns or to request Commission's consideration of any items a Commission member would like to have discussed at a future Commission meeting.

G. Subcommittee Reports

H. Public Hearing

1. [14-051](#)

SUBJECT: Ron Caceres Tentative Parcel Map No. 5041

APPLICANT: Ron Caceres

STAFF CONTACT: Paul Hanson, AICP, Senior Planner

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT: Categorical Exemption, Class 15 - Minor
Land Division

RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

2. [14-083](#) SUBJECT: Petitions to Amend the General Plan and the Spring Lake Specific Plan

RECOMMENDATION: It is Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Hold a public hearing;
- 2) Review the four proposed Spring Lake Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments;
- 3) Provide input and direction on key policy questions concerning future application review, and;
- 4) Accept the proposals for further application processing.

I. Adjournment

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



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 14-073 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Minutes **Status:** Agenda Ready
File created: 2/25/2014 **In control:** Planning Commission
On agenda: 3/6/2014 **Final action:** 3/6/2014
Title: SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of October 17, 2013 and February 6, 2014.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [October 17, 2013 PC Minutes](#)
[February 6, 2014 PC Minutes](#)

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
3/6/2014	1	Planning Commission	approved	

TO: Members of the Woodland Planning Commission

DATE: March 6, 2014

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings of October 17, 2013 and February 6, 2014.

STAFF CONTACT:

Cindy Norris, Principal Planner

Attachment: October 17, 2013 and February 6, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 14-051 Version: 1 Name:

Type: Staff Report Status: Agenda Ready

File created: 2/6/2014 In control: Planning Commission

On agenda: 3/6/2014 Final action: 3/6/2014

Title: SUBJECT: Ron Caceres Tentative Parcel Map No. 5041

APPLICANT: Ron Caceres

STAFF CONTACT: Paul Hanson, AICP, Senior Planner

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT: Categorical Exemption, Class 15 - Minor Land Division

RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [Caceres TPM 5041 Attachment A.pdf](#)

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
3/6/2014	1	Planning Commission	approved with changes	

Title: Ron Caceres Tentative Parcel Map #5041

Location: The southwest corner Main and First Streets at 520 Main & 412 First Streets

Applicant/Owner: Ron Caceres

Environmental Report: Categorical Exemption, Class 15 - Minor Land Division

APN: 006-561-014

Project Planner: Paul L Hanson, AICP, Senior Planner.

Staff Recommendation: Conditional Approval

Report For: March 6, 2014

General Plan Designation: Central Commercial (CC)

Current Zoning: Central Business District

Specific Plan Designation: Downtown Specific Plan - Area A

Existing Land Uses: Commercial Buildings

Flood Zone: X

Street Access: First and Main Streets

Adjacent Land Uses & Zoning: Commercial Buildings / Central Business District

<u>DIRECTION</u>	<u>LAND USE</u>	<u>ZONING</u>
North	Commercial	CBD
South	Commercial	CBD
East	Commercial	CBD
West	Commercial	CBD

PENDING/POTENTIAL ACTION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take action on the following:

1. That the Planning Commission approve the Tentative Parcel Map No. 5041 for 520 Main & 412 First Streets, application dated 12/30/13 and Tentative Parcel Map #5041 dated 12/14/13, as based on the Findings of Fact and subject to the Conditions of Approval as provided in the Staff Report presented on March 6, 2014 **(See Attachment A - Application, Tentative Parcel Map No. 5041).**

PROJECT SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject property consists of two (2) buildings on 5,170 square foot parcel (0.119 acres) of land on the southwest corner Main and First Streets at 520 Main & 412 First Streets.

BACKGROUND

The 540 Main Street building was constructed in 1870 and was originally three stories tall. In the past, the Bank of Woodland and IOOF Lodge occupied the building. The 412 First Street building was constructed in the 1920's.

PROJECT PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting approval for a proposed tentative parcel map to subdivide the existing parcel into two (2) parcels. The lot split would create two (2) parcels - Parcel 1" would be approximately 3,478 sq. ft (0.080 ac.) and "Parcel 2" would be approximately 1,692.66 sq. ft. (.039 ac.). **(See Attachment A - Application and TPM #5041).**

CITY SERVICES

The property is currently served by city services. Water, electricity, sewage, and garbage services are available to the site currently, and will be available to each of the developable parcels proposed.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Public notice advertising for the public hearing on this project was prepared by the Community Development Department in accordance with notification procedures set forth in the City of Woodland's Municipal Code and State Planning Law. Two methods of

public notice were used:

- Legal notice was published in the Woodland Daily Democrat on February 25, 2014.
- Notices were mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the project site on or before February 25, 2014.

Copies of the factual staff report for the proposed project have been on file at City Hall since February 28, 2014.

APPLICABLE LAWS, CODES, AND ORDINANCES

The project is subject to several laws, codes, and ordinances:

- The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- The State of California Subdivision Map Act
- The City of Woodland General Plan
- The City of Woodland Zoning Ordinance
- The City of Woodland Subdivision Ordinance
- National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Regulations (44 CFR Parts 59-78).

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATUS

This project is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, as it is considered a Class 15. CEQA identifies this as a Class 15 - Minor Land Division exemption and is listed in Title 14, Article 19 §15315 of the California Code of Regulations. A Class 15 exemption applies to the division of property in urbanized areas zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial use into four or fewer parcels when the division is in conformance with the General Plan and Zoning, no variances or exceptions are required, all services and access to the proposed parcels to local standards are available, the parcel was not involved in a division of a larger parcel within the previous 2 years, and the parcel does not have an average slope greater than 20 percent.

Prior to taking an action to approve the project as recommended, the Planning Commission is required to confirm this environmental determination in conjunction with action on the project. If this project is approved staff will file a notice of exemption with the Yolo County Clerk's Office in conformance with Article 5 §15062(a) of the CEQA guidelines

REVIEWING AGENCY COMMENTS

All reviewing agency comments have also been integrated into the conditions of approval. Economic Development and Environmental Operations had "no comment" on the project

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff supports this Tentative Parcel Map subject to the attached conditions of approval and provides the following analysis:

General Plan Consistency

The 2002 General Plan (GP) designation for the site is Central Commercial (CC), which provides for retail, services, restaurants, banks, entertainment, professional and administrative offices, residential units above the ground floor, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses. The current use of the site as a grocery store and office is consistent with General Plan. **The proposed tentative parcel map is consistent with General Plan.**

Zoning Consistency

The zoning designation for the site is Central Business District (CBD). The purpose of this designation is to provide a general commercial area for the sale of commodities or the performance of services to serve the entire community. The proposed tentative map is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. **The proposed tentative parcel map is consistent with the Zoning.**

Consistency with Other Plans

The project site is subject to the requirements of the Downtown Specific Plan.

APPEAL

The subdivider, or any party adversely affected by the decision, the City Council, an individual City Council member, or the City Manager, may appeal any action of the Planning Commission with respect to a tentative map to the city council **within ten days** after

the action of the Planning Commission. No conflict of interest shall exist solely by reason of the filing of an appeal by the City Council, an individual City Council member, or the City Manager. Any such appeal shall be filed with the City Clerk and, except an appeal by the City Council, a City Council member, or the City Manager, shall be accompanied by a filing fee as prescribed by City Council resolution. Upon the filing of an appeal, the City Clerk shall set the matter for hearing. Such hearing shall be held within thirty days after the date of filing the appeal. Within ten days, or at its next regular meeting following the conclusion of the hearing, the City Council shall render its decision on the appeal

SUMMARY

The applicant is requesting approval for a Tentative Parcel Map No. 5041. The request is to subdivide a parcel of land, a 5,170 sq. ft. (0.119 ac.) commercial parcel into two (2) parcels. "Parcel 1" would be approximately 3,478 sq. ft (0.080 ac.) and "Parcel 2" would be approximately 1,692.66 sq. ft. (.039 ac.). Staff recommends approval of the tentative parcel map with staff's recommendations being incorporated as conditions of approval for the tentative parcel map. **(See Attachment A - Application and TPM #5041)**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the Tentative Parcel Map by making an affirmative motion as follows:

MOTION #1 Move That The Planning Commission Approve The Ron Caceres Tentative Parcel Map #5041 Dated December 14, 2013, Based On The Identified Findings Of Fact And Subject To The Identified Conditions Of Approval, By Taking The Following Actions:

- Confirmation of finding of exemption from the provisions of CEQA. This project is considered categorically exempt, Class 15, Minor Land Division.
- Determine that the project, as conditioned, is consistent with the General Plan.
- Determine that the project, as conditioned, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.
- Approve Tentative Parcel Map #5041 dated December 14, 2013, subdividing APN 006-561-014 into "Parcel 1" and "Parcel 2" as identified by the attached Tentative Parcel Map.

-OR-

Should the Commission decide to deny the project, the motion should be made as follows:

Motion #2 Move That The Planning Commission Deny The Ron Caceres Tentative Parcel Map #5041 Dated December 14, 2013 Based On The Identified Findings Of Fact (Specify Findings)

CEQA Findings:

1. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA, this project qualifies for a categorically exempt from environmental analysis. The project is considered a class 15 exemption, "Minor Land Division." This is an action to clean up property lines conflicts with the existing building.
2. The categorical exemption reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Woodland.

General Plan Consistency Findings:

1. The proposed project, as conditioned, is consistent with the provisions that have been outlined by the General Plan

Zoning Consistency Findings:

1. The proposed project, as conditioned, meets all regulatory requirements of the Zoning Ordinance

Tentative Parcel Map Findings:

1. The proposed project, as conditioned meets all regulatory requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and the City of Woodland Subdivision Ordinance.
2. The conditions of approval are reasonably related to the use of the property.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - Ron Caceres Tentative Parcel Map No. 5041

PLANNING

1. The project is as described in the staff report prepared for the March 6, 2014, Planning Commission meeting. The project shall be carried out in substantial compliance as depicted on the Tentative Parcel Map #5041 dated December 14, 2014 in the March 6, 2014, staff report, except as modified by these conditions of approval and with any changes necessary to meet city codes and specifications.
2. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Woodland, its agents, officers or employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul an approval of the subject application by the City, its legislative body, advisory agencies or administrative officers. The City will promptly notify the applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding against the City and the applicant will either, at the City's discretion, undertake defense of the matter and pay the City's associated legal costs, or will advance funds to pay for defense of the matter by the City Attorney.
3. Secure approval and satisfy requirements of all agencies of jurisdiction.
4. Upon approval, the applicant will be required to submit a final parcel map. Prior to official recordation of the legal description and revised lots, the Community Development Department must approve this map.
5. The applicant will be required to file a copy of the recorded instruments with the City of Woodland Community Development and the Public Works Department upon recordation of the revised parcels.
6. Applicant shall provide the Community Development Department with a check for the sum of \$25.00 made out to Yolo County to record the environmental document with Yolo County.

BUILDING

This project must meet all criteria and mandates for these City adopted codes or the most current code:

- A. 2013 California Building Code
 - B. 2013 California Plumbing Code
 - C. 2013 California Mechanical Code
 - D. 2013 California Electrical Code
 - E. 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards
 - F. The Code of the City of Woodland
 - G. 2013 California Historic Code
7. Other City and County Agencies (Health, Fire, Public Works, and Planning) may be required to approve the project prior to a building permit being issued.
 8. Any deferred submittals that are not a part of the initial permit application must be listed on the cover sheet of the plan at the time of application for the project.

9. All plans, computations and specifications to be prepared and designed by an architect or engineer licensed by the state of California.
10. A licensed architect or licensed engineer shall be responsible for reviewing and coordinating all submittal documents prepared by others, including deferred submittal items, for compatibility with the design of the building.
11. Comply with all aspects of the building code analysis as provided by Duane Thomson AIA, Architect in letter dated January 31, 2014. Below are two main conditions of that letter:
 - a. The stairway adjacent to the new party wall projects up and beyond the two roofs and the common wall and will need to be upgraded to a 2 hour wall.
 - b. There is a slight offset on the west wall at the new party wall which will require the fire resistance rating of the party wall to extend in both directions for four (4) feet. At building "A" this is not of concern as the masonry wall is solid for this distance, but for building "B" there is an existing door that will need to have a fire rating commensurate with the 2 hour wall fire rating.

DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING - Fees:

12. The Owner shall pay all required fees for processing final maps (technical check) with final map submittal.
13. The conditions of approval set forth herein include certain fees, dedication requirements, reservation requirements and/or other exactions. Pursuant to Government Code, Section 66020(d), these conditions constitute written notice of the amount of such fees, and a description of the dedications, reservations and other exactions.

The applicant is hereby notified that the 90-day protest period, commencing from the date of project approval, has begun. If the applicant fails to file a timely protest regarding any of the fees, dedication requirements, reservation requirements and/or other exactions contained in this notice, complying with all the requirements of Government Code, Section 66020, the applicant will be legally barred from later challenging such fees, dedications requirements, reservation requirements and/or other such exactions. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City does not waive any rights it may have to enforce any settlement agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other agreement with the applicant which authorizes the City to impose certain fees, and which may waive the applicant's right to challenge the imposition of some or all of the fees, dedication requirements, reservation requirements, and/or other exactions set forth in these conditions of approval.

Prior to approval of final map complete/construct

14. Applicant shall install separate metered water service connections with City approved backflow devices for each property. An existing connection that complies with City Standards may remain, as long as the backflow device and meter complies with standards. Locations of new services to be approved by the City.
15. Unless otherwise determined by the City Engineer, each property shall have a separate sewer service within its own property, with City standard clean outs. If the applicant wishes to use any existing services, City shall inspect locations and quality and applicant will bring existing services to City standard (or replace as necessary). This may include relocation/installation of clean outs. Applicant shall fund TV inspection of the sewer laterals when determined necessary by the City.
16. Should it be infeasible to separate the sewer, map shall preserve sewer maintenance rights between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 in a manner approved by the City.

17. Remove Asphalt patch at south edge of property and replace with sidewalk. Remove through the walk drain, or if still needed replace with City approved through the walk drain.

Construct with building permit

19. None

Site Design and Frontage Improvements

20. None

Easement Dedications, Right of Way, and map restrictions

21. None

General Conditions

22. If the final map is requested prior to the construction of required improvements, applicant shall prepare improvement plans for all work and obtain an encroachment permit for all work within the public right-of-way or public easements, or new utility connections and submit them to the Development Services Engineering Section and if improvements are more than \$50,000 applicant shall enter into an improvement agreement and post security in the amount of 100% performance bond, 50% payment bond and 10% warranty bond. This submittal is separate from the building permit submittal. All public improvements shall conform to the current City of Woodland Standard Specifications.

General Information and Applicable Ordinances

23. Prior to approval of improvement plans, the Owner shall pay all fees for plan check and inspection of offsite infrastructure improvements, as approved by City Council and defined in the City Fee Schedule. If Owner pays a deposit only at improvement plan submittal, the balance shall be paid prior to improvement plan approval by the City Engineer.
24. Final map shall tie into two City control network monuments in accordance with the City's electronic submission ordinance.



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 14-083 Version: 1 Name:
Type: Public Hearing Item Status: Agenda Ready
File created: 2/27/2014 In control: Planning Commission
On agenda: 3/6/2014 Final action: 3/6/2014
Title: SUBJECT: Petitions to Amend the General Plan and the Spring Lake Specific Plan

RECOMMENDATION: It is Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Hold a public hearing;
- 2) Review the four proposed Spring Lake Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments;
- 3) Provide input and direction on key policy questions concerning future application review, and;
- 4) Accept the proposals for further application processing.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: [Attach A - Spring Lake Amendment Map](#)
[Attach B - Spring Lake Central Application](#)
[Attach C - Heritage Neighborhood Commercial Application](#)
[Attach D - Heritage Residential Application](#)
[Attach E - Cal West Investors Application](#)
[Attach F - Summary Table of Amendments Proposed Changes in Land Use and Number of Housing](#)
[Attach G - Letter from CalWest/Optimistic Partners & Turn of the Century](#)
[Attach H - Letter from Pioneer Investors](#)

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
3/6/2014	1	Planning Commission	accepted	

DATE: March 6, 2014

TO: MEMBERS OF THE WOODLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: Ken Hiatt, Community Development Director
Cindy Norris, Principal Planner
Paul L. Hanson, AICP, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Petitions to Amend the General Plan and the Spring Lake Specific Plan

RECOMMENDATION: It is Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Hold a public hearing;
- 2) Review the four proposed Spring Lake Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments;
- 3) Provide input and direction on key policy questions concerning future application review, and;

- 4) Accept the proposals for further application processing.

PETITION SUMMARY

A total of four (4) (Spring Lake Specific Plan Amendments) applications have been received for processing. The proposed amendments affect a significant portion of the remaining planned but undeveloped area within the Spring Lake Specific Plan area. All amendments are proposed on lands that have had previous project approvals, zoning and corresponding General Plan designations identified. In some cases these modifications to residential zoning will not result in a General Plan modification, but in those cases where a significant land use change is proposed, such as a request to change commercial land use to a residential land use, it does result in a General Plan land use change. Further, assessment of overall residential density, unit mix and housing types as a result of these proposed changes is of key concern. A detailed summary table of the comparison of the existing and proposed changes by number of units and acreage is provided in Attachment “F”. That information is further summarized below to show the overall changes as a result of the combined amendments.

In summary, combined result of the petition requests would be:

- 1) Reduction in larger (1-3 DU/ac.) “estate” lots;
- 2) Increase in the in the moderate sized single family (R-3 to R-5) lots that range form 3-5 du/ac.;
- 3) Elimination of the small lots/attached for-sale or low density Multi-family (R-15; 10-15 du/ac.) designated land;
- 4) Increase in the allowed density of approximately 7.5 acres of multi-family from R-20 to R-25; and
- 5) Conversion of three (3) of the four (4) neighborhood commercial sites, totaling 9.5 acres to a single family designation.

As described in the attached letter from one of the Spring Lake ownership groups requesting the amendments, the adjustments are being requested in order to adjust to significant changes in housing and commercial markets over the past several years (**Attachment G - Letter from Cal West/Optimistic Partners & Turn of the Century**). The amendments would allow these properties to better respond to current market demand and improve the financial viability of these individual sites which is needed in order to allow for the continued development of the Spring Lake Specific Plan community in a timely manner. Continued development in the Spring Lake plan area will help fund the remaining planned infrastructure, parks, school, and other community benefits.

An additional consideration as part of this review is that by taking a broader view of the Spring Lake Plan and the proposed amendments, an opportunity is presented to assess the underlying principles of the plan. Evaluation of the existing components and assessment of modifications that would enhance the livability and long-term financial sustainability of the neighborhood. Such adjustments could include changes to the roadway design in favor of improvements to the future bike and pedestrian networks as well as incorporation of additional green building principles which have come into greater focus since the Spring Lake Specific Plan was approved in 2001.

BACKGROUND

When projects are approved a land use and zoning designation is identified for those parcels. These designations identify the type of development that may occur and the level of intensity, expressed as number units per acre. The Spring Lake Specific Plan identifies specific land use categories and densities that are then

shown on a “Plan” maps. These designations identify the expected type of future development, i.e., low density single family R-3 (1-3 dwelling units/acre) or higher density multi-family, R-20 (16-20 dwelling units/acre)

The Spring Lake Specific Plan, approved on December 18, 2001, established a land use plan and authorized the city to file an application for annexation with LAFCO. At the time of annexation, pre-zoning is required. Section 25-29-20 sets forth the procedure for pre-zoning and Zoning of annexed areas, and pursuant to Section 25-29-30, which requires that the zone shall be a classification that is in conformity with the General Plan. When the General Plan update was adopted in 2002, the area encompassed by Spring Lake was designated as Planned Neighborhood, which allowed a residential density from 1.0 to 25 du/gross acre. With each subsequent project specific approval, the Specific Plan designation has been formally established and the corresponding General Plan land use designation overlain on the General Plan Map..

The Planned Neighborhood Land Use Definition in the General Plan states the following:

All urban development under this designation will be approved pursuant to an adopted specific plan. As these specific plans are approved, the Planned Neighborhood designation shall be replaced through corresponding General Plan amendments with more specific land use designations. The overall average residential density for residential lands shall not exceed 7.0 dwelling units/gross acres.

Planning documents are often called living documents. This is the case as provisions have been built into local and state law that allow for amendments to various planning documents. To date, the Spring Lake Specific Plan has been amended nine (9) times since its original approval. However, this is the first time that such a large number of amendments have come forward at one time affecting a significant portion and key provisions of the plan. Therefore, staff feels that it is appropriate to apply the General Plan petition process in order to facilitate discussion of key plan provisions and policies that should be addressed as the proposed projects are further evaluated.

On February 17, 2004, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 4516-B outlining a process to allow initial consideration of an amendment to the General Plan through a Petition application. The process is intended to evaluate a proposed amendment for consistency with General Plan goals and policies and to identify possible development issues that may arise. The Planning Commission shall consider the merits of the initial proposed amendment and give direction as to whether the proposal should be considered for further application and processing, and if so, what issues evaluation should be incorporated into the more detailed project analysis. If accepted, then a formal application would be filed and necessary CEQA analysis would be conducted for each of the applications independently. Any action by the Planning Commission to accept a petition proposal does not imply that the project will be ultimately approved by the Planning Commission or City Council.

AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS

The following is a general summary of the proposed specific plan amendments **(A plan map identifying the location of each of the subject applications is provided in Attachment “A”):**

Spring Lake Central

This proposal is to amend the General Plan and Spring Lake Specific Plan for the 106.9 acre Spring Lake Central Project (Tentative Map #4805, approved in 2007). This property is located between Farmers Central Road and Parkway Drive, east of County Road 101. This site encompasses a fairly large portion at the center of the Plan area. It was originally designed with a mix of units and provided for higher density development along the neighborhood’s primary roadway and transit corridor **(See Attachment B - Application).**

The proposal continues to show a multi-family site but reconfigures the site layout and proposes an increase in the allowed density from R-20 to R-25. The primary modification is the proposed removal of the 5 acre Neighborhood Commercial site and replacement with single-family residential units. The proposed rezone will result in approximately 612 total units (an overall **decrease** of approximately 7 residential units if maximum densities are achieved) at an average overall density of 6.1 dwelling units per acre (**See Attachment F - Summary Table of Amendments**).

Heritage Remainder Neighborhood Commercial

This proposal is to amend General Plan and Spring Lake Specific Plan for the 2.10 acre site located at the southeast corner of Mickle Avenue and Centennial Drive (**See Attachment "C", Application**). The amendment proposes to rezone the 2.10 acre Neighborhood Commercial (NC) site to R-5 (Low Density Residential). The rezone will result in nine (9) **new** residential lots (**See Attachment F - Summary Table of Amendments**).

Heritage Remainder Residential

This proposal is to amend the General Plan and Spring Lake Specific Plan for the 60.29 acre portion of the Heritage Remainder Area (Vesting Tentative Map #4784, approved in 2006). The property is located at the northwest corner of County Road 25A and County Road 102, extending west along County Road 25A (**See Attachment D - Application**). The amendment proposes to rezone the 38.3 acres of R-3 (Very Low Density Residential) and the 1.22 acres of Affordable Housing (Medium Density Residential) designations to R-4 (Low Density Residential).

The proposal reconfigures the site layout, shifting the existing R-15 (Medium Density Residential) site immediately south of its current location and increases the acreage from 8.22 to 9.14 acres. The proposed rezone will result in 205 single-family and 138 multi-family units (an overall **increase** of approximately 57 residential units if maximum densities are achieved); an average overall density of 5.3 dwelling units per acre (**See Attachment F - Summary Table of Amendments**).

Cal West Investors

This proposal is to amend the General Plan and Spring Lake Specific Plan Amendment for 7.89 acres of the 45 acre site located north of Farmer's Central Road, between Highway 113 and Harry Lorenzo Avenue (**See Attachment E - Application**).

The amendment proposes to rezone the 5.89 acres of R-15 (Medium Density Residential) to R-8 (Medium Low Density). The amendment also proposes to rezone the existing 2 acre, Neighborhood Commercial site to R-8 (Medium Low Density) and reconfigure the existing 8-acre Park (Open Space). The park will slightly increase in size from 8.28 acres to 8.34 acres. The proposed rezone will result in 227 units (a **loss** of approximately 4 to 32 residential units); a density of approximately 6 dwelling units per acre, (**See Attachment F - Summary Table of Amendments**).

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Public notice advertising for the public hearing on this project was prepared by the Community Development Department in accordance with notification procedures set forth in the City of Woodland's Municipal Code and State Planning Law. Two methods of public notice were used:

- Legal notice was published in the Woodland Daily Democrat on or before February 23, 2014.
- Notices were mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the project site on February 21, 2014.

Copies of the factual staff report for the proposed project have been on file at since Friday, February 28, 2014.

KEY POLICY ISSUES

This review groups the four (4) proposed Spring Lake Specific Plan amendments for the purpose of providing a more comprehensive policy discussion of the cumulative effect of the requested changes. The purpose for a petition request is for the Planning Commission to determine whether the proposal for a General Plan Amendment has merit to allow submittal of an application(s) for a General Plan Amendment and subsequent specific plan and tentative map applications. This decision is independent of all future site plan and building design applications, which will be required prior to future development on the subject site. Technical studies and additional information will be required to determine the appropriateness of development in this area.

The Planning Commission should consider the following discussion points when evaluating this General Plan petition and policy issues:

Discussion

1. *Proposal to remove 9.2 acres of neighborhood commercial (NC) uses from the Specific Plan*

The removal of the neighborhood commercial development from the Specific Plan marks a more substantial departure from the Spring Lake Specific Plan (SLSP) than other site changes. A key land use component of the SLSP is the development of distinct neighborhoods, each with a defined activity/focal point, generally consisting of an 8-acre park, 10 acre-elementary school and a 2-acre commercial use. Originally, the commercial areas were intended to provide space for public activity and convenient access to daily services, similar to a city square in traditional communities. The parks will continue to act as neighborhood focal points, but would be less likely to attract residents from more distant neighborhoods without commercial uses. A specific issue for the City to consider is what effect the absence of commercial uses will have on the functionality and “sense of place” intended with these commercial nodes, particularly around the Village Center within the Spring Central Project. This was originally envisioned as the social and commercial “center” of the neighborhood with the intention of creating an vibrant, active place anchored by a small grocery store, cafe, and other daily service related uses. This activity center was complemented by the adjacent community park area. The other two-acre neighborhood commercial sites adjacent to the parks were intended to function as smaller neighborhood service commercial nodes with office uses and possibly residential unit(s) above with the goal of serving the routine daily needs of nearby residents.

Since the plan was approved, much has changed in the local, regional, and global economy that has significantly affected the viability of these smaller commercial sites. Since approval of the Spring Lake Specific Plan, several surrounding commercial areas have been developed, including the Bel-Air Supermarket Center, the Gateway Commercial Center with Costco and Target, and recently the Wal-Mart Neighborhood store in the County Fair Mall. Customers from Spring Lake, as well as elsewhere in Woodland or surrounding communities are more likely to visit the larger commercial centers located nearby due to the large variety of products and services. Internet commerce has also significantly changed, and will continue to shape how business is conducted - particularly with how products and services are delivered in the retailing, banking, and other consumer based industries. As a result, the Spring Lake area may lack a sufficient population density to support additional commercial uses and, therefore may no longer be viable as originally envisioned.

One additional issue related to the viability of the commercial sites is the underlying financing of the Spring Lake Plan. When the SLMP financing plan was developed, commercial uses were assumed to be very desirable

for development. To mitigate fee impacts to residential uses, higher fees were applied to commercially zoned land. This along with other economic issues discussed above, makes the small neighborhood serving commercial uses difficult to develop at this time. Rather than having the possibility of long term underutilized or vacant commercial land in Spring Lake, the Planning Commission is being asked to consider the possibility of allowing residential development in-lieu of commercial development on the neighborhood commercial sites.

To re-designate the Neighborhood Commercial area to another designation other than parkland would require the City to amend the Spring Lake Specific Plan Policy 2.43.1 (e):

Land designated neighborhood commercial in this Specific Plan shall remain as such unless it remains undeveloped by Plan build-out (2015), at which time, if demonstrated to be infeasible as zoned, it may be rezoned for park use only.

An assessment of this option may be considered and would need careful evaluation of land and development costs for the added parks as well as the on-going maintenance and operational costs of these amenities. Maintenance for any new park areas would be added to the SL Landscape and Lighting District paid for by the residents of Spring Lake.

It is recommended that the SLSP amendment consider:

- a) Possible park enhancements (e.g., a plaza, public art, shade structures, water features) that encourage and support community activity and events at the Central Park location.*
- b) Possible reconfiguration of the park in (Spring Lake Central) to better serve Spring Lake and provide for expansion with the build out of the Spring Lake Master Plan Reminder area.*
- c) Possible rezoning the 2-acre neighborhood commercial site adjacent to Jack Slaven Park.*
- d) Possible amendment SLSP Policy 2.43.1 (e) to allow the rezone of land designated as neighborhood commercial to residential.*

2. Proposal to modify the amount of land designated to various residential categories within Spring Lake

The net result of the requested amendments would be an increase in the number of acres/units in the mid-range single family categories of R-4 (3 - 4 dwelling units per acre) and R-5 (4 - 5 dwelling units per acre) while reducing the overall number of acres and units for Spring Lake residential multi-family land use designations R-15, (10 - 15 dwelling units per acre) and R-20 (16 - 20 dwelling units per acre), as well as reducing the single family designation for the lower density larger lot category of R-3 (1 - 3 dwelling units per acre). Combined, these requests would reduce the overall diversity of lot sizes and housing types within Spring Lake.

The applicants have indicated a need to modify the product type that is offered in Spring Lake in order to be responsive to the market demand for lots in the 5,000 to 8,000 square foot range. The possible result of these proposals could be the loss of variability of product type available in the plan area, in particular the smaller lot, alley loaded or townhome style of unit. One possible consideration that staff could evaluate would be the idea of allowing the possible reduction in the R-15 and R-20 multi-family for a specified period of time with a sunset clause. If areas where density reductions were approved but had not developed within a specified time frame, then the areas would default back to the previously designated land use. This would allow the continued development of the Spring Lake plan under the current economic conditions that are dictating these changes but give the city assurance that if development does not occur and market conditions change, that the previously desired, more “risky” housing products could still be achieved.

Further, the evaluation of product type and home design will become even more dependent upon adherence to the Spring Lake Design Standards, to ensure that a high quality home product is provided in every instance. Creative, high quality design for the homes in these areas should be further emphasized to ensure distinctive and identifiable neighborhoods within Spring Lake.

The result of the proposed changes would be a somewhat larger percentage of single family units, 73.7% as compared to multi-family units, 26.2%, for the plan as a whole. In addition, the total number of proposed units would be increased overall by approximately 27 units.

Based on the last plan amendments in 2012, the resulting combined mix of built and potentially developable units and acres was estimated as shown below:

Unit Type	Developable Units Current/Proposed	Percent of Total	Comments
Single Family R-3 to R-8 density	2,963 / 3,081	71.4% / 73.7%	
Multi-Family R-15 to R-25	1,186 / 1,095	28.6% / 26.2%	Includes R-15 Cluster Units
Total Units	4,194 / 4,176		
Total developable Acres and net plan Density	684.9	4,149/684.9 = 6.05 net density 4,176/684.9 = 6.09 net density	

It is recommended that the SLSP amendments consider:

- a) *Whether the proposed modifications represent a significant change to the overall plan intent with regard to the single family to multi-family ratio of 71% to 29%.*
- b) *Increase emphasis on residential design standards and criteria.*
- c) *Providing enhanced neighborhood amenities, including improved bike and pedestrian paths / connections.*
- d) *Allowing a reduction of R-15 and R-20 categories, but have those reductions “sunset” after specified amount of time.*

3. Proposal to modify the requirement of providing corner lot duplex units in the R-5 category within Spring Lake

The proposal is to replace the corner lot duplexes with smaller detached units. The applicant proposes requiring the corner lots be built out with a maximum square footage of 1,900 square feet (**See Attachment H - Letter from Pioneer Investors**).

The Spring Lake Specific Plan has a requirement at 50 percent (50%) of the corner lots in the R-5 category be duplexes or half-plexes. The corner duplex/half-plex units may be shifted to mid-block locations, but there may be no more than one duplex or set of half-plexes (2 unit's total) on one side of any given block. This requirement was included in the Plan to further increase housing mix and provides increased affordability "by

design" rather than by price restrictions. The duplex requirement also was intended to have a diverse range of home sizes and prices integrated into each neighborhood rather than concentrated in certain areas.

It is recommended that the SLSP amendments consider:

- a) *Providing flexibility for smaller detached units to allowed to satisfy the requirement corner lot duplexes in the R-5 land use category.*

4. *Proposal to revise the methodology for funding affordable housing*

During the last several years, the ability of cities to provide affordable housing has become increasingly difficult. The loss of Redevelopment funding has created a significant impediment to construction of new affordable rental units. Also, the tightened lending practices resulting from the housing crash has made it increasingly difficult for low income families to qualify for home loans. At the same time, housing prices have dropped dramatically resulting in a smaller margin in the sale price of an equity restricted for-sale affordable unit and a market rate unit making these appreciation restricted units less desirable for prospective buyers and more risky for lenders.

Currently Spring Lake requires any developer of a for-sale residential project to make at least 10% of the Dwelling units affordable to and occupied by qualifying Low-Income Households. The cost to facilitate a limited number of households into single family housing is very high and in many cases the city has lost the available unit for our inventory when qualified buyers cannot be found.

Overall key issues include:

- 1) A continued need for quality multifamily affordable housing projects,
- 2) A decline in the financial capacity of affordable first time homebuyers,
- 3) Challenges in assisting affordable first time homebuyers purchase new affordable homes,
- 4) Difficulties in ensuring that new affordable homes do not convert to market rate units,
- 5) A need to have first time homebuyer funds available on more than a cyclical basis in order to assist affordable first time homebuyers purchase resale homes throughout Woodland.

As a result, the City is suggesting that consideration and evaluation be given to the idea of accepting in-lieu fees for the single family 10 percent requirement and then utilizing those fees to assist with the development of new multi-family type product that serves the greatest need.

Spring Lake Affordable Housing program allows for projects of less than 50 units where the City determines that it is not feasible or suitable for the on-site affordable units to be built. Staff is considering an amendment to the SPSP and the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance to expand this provision for payment of an "in-lieu" fee to allow all for-sale residential project to pay in-lieu fees to satisfy the 10% for-sale affordable requirement.

It is recommended that the SLSP amendments consider:

- a) *Evaluate amending the Spring Lake Affordable Housing Plan the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance 6A to allow "in-lieu" fee for the 10% allocation share for single family housing (R-15 & below)*

5. *Are the amendments compatible with the goals and policies of the Spring Lake Specific Plan?*

The land use concept for the Spring Lake Specific Plan is to replicate the ambiance of the City's original residential neighborhoods. The Plan area is to have attractive tree lined streets with curbside planting strips. Neighborhoods with homes facing the street, generous windows, and functioning porches are key organizing elements of the plan. Parks and elementary schools are conceived as focal points for the Plan Area's neighborhoods. The emphasis is on walkability and neighborhood interaction.

While the Spring Lake Specific Plan should be adapted over time to respond to changes in social, environmental, and economic conditions, do the proposed amendments significantly alter the underlying vision of the Spring Lake Plan and if so, are they justified and what new concepts should be applied to ensure the long-term livability and of the neighborhood. The Specific Plan is based on 18 planning principles and each proposal will be evaluated for consistency with these principles and to assess to what degree the vision of the Spring Lake Specific Plan is still retained.

It is recommended that the SLSP amendments consider:

- a) *An evaluation for consistency with the Spring Lake Planning Principles*
- b) *Requiring greater architectural distinctions in future developments*
- c) *Universal access / design features*

6. *Are there environmental issues to address for CEQA compliance?*

The environmental impacts of the Spring Lake Specific Plan were evaluated as part of the Turn of the Century Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH 99022069), approved 8/15/2000, Resolution #4215. The SLSP requires that each development application include certain project-level and property-specific technical analyses to demonstrate consistency with the performance thresholds and requirements of the TOC FEIR Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

The guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15162, note that once an EIR has been certified, no subsequent EIR is necessary unless changes to the project, changes in circumstances, or new information results in identification of new or more severe impacts than previously evaluated. Staff does not believe that the changes to the Specific Plan as previously discussed constitute a substantial change and in fact, removing the commercial land uses from the project may result in fewer vehicle trips than depicted in the EIR.

Since the EIR was certified, California has taken a number of steps to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) which are responsible for causing climate change.

It is recommended that each project, as they are developed, take necessary steps to ensure compliance with CEQA and reduce its environmental impact.

It is recommended that the SLSP amendment consider:

- a) *Enhancements to guidelines and standards relating to sustainability and energy efficiency as appropriate.*
- b) *In particular, that the proposals could exceed the SLSP energy efficiency policies for single-family residential units by establishing new homes exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards by a certain percentage.*
- c) *In particular, that the City could encourage a higher target for solar and alternative energy systems*

(The SLSP currently requires 5% of single family units to have alternative energy systems), or encourage/require all houses to be pre-wired for rooftop solar, decreasing the time and cost needed for future installation.

- d) In particular that the project sponsor could also promote the use of alternative-fuel vehicles by pre-wiring single-family homes for electric vehicle chargers. Multifamily units could also be encouraged or required to create a designated parking spot for electric vehicles with a built-in charger.*

Possible Additional Plan Modifications:

Staff is aware that there may be possible additional plan modifications proposed in the future. In general, modifications may be considered in order to create a more affordable and marketable product for production builders, to further goals of the City to increase densities where possible, to further City fiscal stability, as well as support to sustainability goals. Higher density development more generally achieves those goals. Further, a re-evaluation of some of the significant infrastructure improvements in the plan area will be assessed as part of the project evaluations to determine consistency with complete streets concepts, including enhanced multi-modal facilities such as increased bike and pedestrian linkages and safe routes. In some cases the goals of the Specific plan, including such features as multiple small schools, infrastructure improvements, and commercial distribution may have been based on an economic model that is no longer viable or relevant almost 15 years later.

SUMMARY

The Spring Lake Specific Plan was adopted in 2001, and since then the development landscape has changed significantly. A Specific Plan is a living, breathing document that establishes goals and policies, and must adapt to changing situations, while implementing the vision set forth in the Specific Plan. The concept for the Spring Lake Specific Plan is to replicate the ambiance of the City's traditional neighborhoods. The Neo-traditional streetscape principles are an important part of the Specific Plan vision with parks and elementary schools as focal points for the Plan Area's neighborhoods. The emphasis is on pedestrian convenience and neighborhood interaction.

These four (4) petitions are before the Planning Commission in order to obtain input and direction from the Planning Commission concerning key policy issues that should be evaluated as part of any future application analysis. Should the Commission accept the petitions, with the Commission's input and direction, further policy analysis will be conducted.

RECOMMENDATION

The petitions before the Planning Commission are requesting acceptance to proceed with a General Plan Amendments and subsequent specific plan amendments, to consider changing the land use designation within the Spring Lake Specific Plan area.

It is Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

- 1) Hold a public hearing;
- 2) Review the four proposed Spring Lake Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments;
- 3) Provide input and direction on key policy questions concerning future application review, and;
- 4) Accept the proposals for further application processing.

Acceptance of the petitions does not imply that the Planning Commission will ultimately approve the project.

Necessary environmental and technical studies will have to be addressed and resolved for the project to move forward.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider acceptance of the petition by making an affirmative motion and the appropriate findings to accept or not accept the petition for a General Plan Amendments as follows:

Motion 1: I MOVE TO ACCEPT The Four (4) Spring Lake General Plan Amendment Petitions For Further Processing Subject To The Following Findings And Conditions.

Findings

- The filing of this petition is consistent with the City's approved process for consideration of General Plan Amendments.
- Acceptance of the petition does not imply that the Planning Commission will ultimately approve the project.
- The any necessary fiscal analysis, environmental and technical studies, project review, and land use issues will have to be addressed and resolved as the project moves forward through the entitlement review process.

-OR-

Should the Commission decide to deny the petitions, the motion should be made as follows:

Motion 2: MOVE TO DENY The Four (4) Spring Lake General Plan Amendment Petitions For Further Processing Subject To The Following Findings (SPECIFY).

Attachments:

- A. Location of Amendments
- B. Spring Lake Central Application
- C. Heritage Neighborhood Commercial Application
- D. Heritage Residential Application
- E. Cal West Investors Application
- F. Summary Table of Amendments
- G. Letter from Cal West/Optimistic Partners & Turn of the Century
- H. Letter from Pioneer Investors