

Community Services Advisory Commission
Regular Meeting
Redding City Hall
777 Cypress Avenue
Redding, California
November 11, 2009, 3:04 p.m.

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

The meeting opened with the following Commissioners present; Susan Hinz, Adam McElvain, Judy Salter and Jason Waybright. Absent was Commissioner McCoach.

Also present were Council Member Mary Stegall, Community Services Director Kimberly Niemer, Support Services Director Gerry Kersten, Planning Manager Doug DeMallie, Community Project Manager Terry Hanson and Management Analyst Matthew McCallum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

CONSENT CALENDAR

The minutes from the meeting on September 1, 2009, the monthly Recreation Division Activity Report, the Convention Center Activity Report, the Convention Center Calendar, the Convention Center Capital Projects List were presented.

Commissioner Salter requested that the Recreation Division Activity Report include information on what is happening at the Martin Luther King Jr. Community Center and that the Convention Center Activity Report include information on the Center's marketing efforts.

Motion: To approve Consent Calendar. (Made by Commissioner McElvain, Seconded by Commissioner Hinz)

AYES: Commissioners Hinz, McElvain, Salter and Waybright

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Commissioner McCoach

CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION TO RENAME SOUTH BONNYVIEW BOAT RAMP AFTER JOHN F. REGINATO

Director Niemer provided a brief synopsis of the legacy of John Reginato, a pillar in the Redding community and the tourism and recreation world. His efforts led to the funding and construction of three boat ramps in the city of Redding, along with numerous other recreational amenities in the surrounding area. To recognize his contribution, staff is recommending that the Commission endorse a request from the Shasta Cascade Wonderland Association to rename the South Bonnyview Boat Ramp the John F. Reginato Boat Ramp.

Motion: To recommend the City Council endorse a request from the Shasta Cascade Wonderland Association to rename the South Bonnyview Boat Ramp the John F. Reginato Boat Ramp. (Made by Commissioner Hinz, Seconded by Commissioner Waybright)

AYES: Commissioners Hinz, McElvain, Salter and Waybright
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner McCoach

CONSIDERATION OF HEALTHY COMMUNITIES RESOLUTION

After discussion at the last Commission meeting, the commissioners directed staff to return with the unedited version of the resolution proposed by the Healthy Eating Active Living Cities Campaign, a partnership of the League of California Cities, the Cities, Counties and Schools Partnership, and the California Center for Public Health Advocacy. The staff report from the last meeting is attached for additional background information. Staff has edited the modified resolution to reflect comments received from Dr. Reece and the Shasta County Public Health staff.

The City of Redding has been active on a number of fronts in fostering and promoting physical activity and healthy living. This resolution brings together a partnership with the League of California's Healthy Eating Active Living Campaign and offers an opportunity to underscore the City's interest and commitment to these principles.

Commissioner Salter inquired whether the language in the Resolution would be strong enough to actually effect change when developments are in the planning stages. Councilperson Stegall observed that it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to also endorse this Resolution to the City Council.

Commissioner Salter inquired whether the next step in support of this resolution would be for the Commission to speak at the Planning Commission meeting? Director Niemer responded that the Commission is welcome to participate in that presentation. Commissioner Hinz concurred that this would be a good idea.

Commissioner Hinz question whether this topic should be raised during revision or modification of the subdivision ordinance. Director Niemer replied that it would be staff's recommendation to send this recommendation to the City Council in advance of that time frame. It will underscore the *Parks, Trails and Open Space Park Master Plan* which supports healthy community development. This resolution is part of the foundation which sets that direction.

Councilperson Stegall observed that the language in the city's mission statement supports this resolution. Commissioner Salter expressed concern that the wording is not strong enough. Director Niemer observed that by its very function, a resolution does not establish standards. The zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance and design standards are the place where the specific standards are laid out. Commissioner Hinz responded that it would be helpful if the Commission is consistent with this resolution in their recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Salter added that the Commissioners will discuss with Director Niemer the value of having a Commissioner accompany the Resolution to the Planning Commission.

Motion: Recommends the City Council adopt the Healthy Communities resolution. In addition, recommend that the Planning Commission jointly recommend this resolution be adopted by the City Council. (Made by Commissioner Hinz, Seconded by Commissioner Waybright)

AYES: Commissioners Hinz, McElvain, Salter and Waybright

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Commissioner McCoach

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST TO ADJUST PROPERTY LINE OF MEADOW CREEK PARK LOCATED AT 6433 OXBOW STREET (APN 050660009)

Director Niemer observed the Meadow Creek Park is a unique site in that a large specimen Heritage Oak tree which is more than 100 years old resides on the site, along with a significant drainage feature. The property next to the park recently changed ownership and the new owner are requesting an adjustment of the property line in order to be able to make some improvements to their home. Staff has reviewed the request and finds it reasonable to pursue. The property offers no necessary benefit to the park site.

The owners will be responsible for any administrative costs associated with this change and they will provide some compensation for the land. The Planning Division has already opined that the adjustment can comply with general plan consistency criteria.

The proposed property line adjustment is a common sense fix to address the wrongdoings of a prior property owner. Fortunately, the remedy does not negatively impact the park site and will provide a solid long-term solution for both parties.

Commissioner Hinz inquired into the process at the City Council level of adjusting the property line. Director Niemer responded that it will take a 4/5ths majority of the Council for this to change to be approved.

Motion: To recommend to the City Council approval of a property line adjustment at Meadow Creek Park located 6433 Oxbow Street. (Made by Commissioner McElvain, Seconded by Commissioner Hinz)

AYES: Commissioners Hinz, McElvain, Salter and Waybright

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Commissioner McCoach

PROJECTS UPDATES

Director Niemer provided updates on the following projects:

Martin Luther King Jr. Community Center

The after-school program is provided service to up to 24 students per week-day. The Rotary Club will be planting in the park next door this week-end. The Teen Night program has been very successful with approximately 30 teens participating. The computer lab is up and running.

Enterprise Park Under The Big Oak

This project involved a grant from Shasta First Five and a partnership with the Shasta College Heavy Equipment class and the Parks Division to create a fenced turf area. This created another area to provide outdoor classes for young children.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None.

DIRECTORS' COMMENTS

None.

Director Niemer and Commissioner Salter stated that they would recuse themselves from meeting during discussion of the next agenda item due to conflicts of interest.

CONSIDERATION OF PARKS, TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SALT CREEK HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION

Community Projects Manager Hanson recalled that this topic was continued from the September 1, 2009 meeting at the request of the developer, Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI). The Salt Creek Heights subdivision is a 440 unit complex, north of Hwy 299 west and borders the Sacramento River Trail and Salt Creek. The development, in order to proceed, requires re-zoning. These type of developments require city staff, the Planning Commission, the Community Services Advisory Commission and the City Council to look at General Plan policies along with the policies and goals of the *Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan* (Master Plan).

The Commission has reviewed this project previously in 2007 and in 2008 and at that made recommendations to the Planning Commission relative to park location and contributions towards trails. Those issues have evolved over time and the discussions concerning the developer's position regarding a contribution toward the trail has changed. They are no longer interested in financially contributing toward the trail system. Community Projects Manager Hanson provided a synopsis of the staff report outlining their recommendations.

Commissioner Hinz expressed appreciation for details provided in the staff report which helped her to understand the overall picture. She proceeded to inquire which of the recommendations listed on page four of the staff report might receive resistance from the developer. Community Projects Manager Hanson replied that the developer would be able to address that, but to the best of his knowledge staff recommendation #2 - that the developer pay a cash contribution of \$250,000, is in contention. Commissioner Hinz then queried whether the other Commissioners would like to resolve recommendations 1, 3, 4 and 5 first and then concentrate their energy on recommendation #2.

Commissioner McElvain responded that recommendation #1 corresponds with the Master Plan and that park location would be his preference. Regarding staff recommendation #2, he inquired of the developer how this has transpired over time and the changes involved. Regarding #3

Commissioner Hinz suggested opening the discussion regarding staff recommendation #2 "The developer shall pay a cash contribution of \$250,000 ..".

Gary Blanc of SPI responded that from their perspective the cash contribution is directly tied to the park location change which was made in 2007. City staff originally recommended the park be located on the east end of subdivision, closer to adjoining neighborhoods. SPI proposed a larger, less desirable park site on the western side of the development. Mr. Blanc advised that the compensation for moving the park so SPI's desired location was tied to building the Buenaventura Trail and that this compensation had nothing to do with a requirement to build a connection to the Sacramento River Trail. This money was offered by SPI as an enticement to change the park location. Community Projects Manager Hanson advised that the specific condition was for SPI to build the Buenaventura Trail. Mr. Blanc responded that this was not SPI's understanding, that they were never going to build the trail. That the city was going to use the CA Conservation Corps to rough out the trail and would then use funds from a grant to bring the trail to a gravel base, which

is the condition it is in today. Then SPI would widen the trail, put in additional drainage and then pave it. SPI was going to contribute up to \$250,000 to accomplish that and they were never conditioned to build the trail. In addition to that SPI was asked to dedicate 8 acres for a park free and clear of the WAPA lines, which is 48% more than is required, with no reimbursement, and were asked to dedicate 5 acres of WAPA easement to add on to the park and were asked to participate in the development agreement to then build the park. Those were the four stipulations for moving the park.

Mr. Blanc continued that as the project moved forward, SPI took a closer look at the western park location. They found that the park site would serve more people within the new subdivision and the difference in rough-grading costs between the two site was a savings of \$1.4 million for the western site. They realized there were many positives to having moved the park location. Which brought up the question, why should SPI have offered a financial consideration to move the park location?

Commissioner Waybright requested staff to respond. Community Projects Manager Hanson replied that the western park site location has been the Commission's choice since 2007 and is not something that staff is in contention with. This is an issue of two items: the park development (which is a goal of the General Plan and the *Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan*) and the requirements under the General Plan to ensure connectivity to and for residential developments in the community. This is a very large residential development. The intent of the Planned Development ordinance is to allow some creativity in exchange for perceived amenities to the community. The development is not addressing the affordable housing or housing density issues, so the amenities remaining to meet Planned Development goals are park development and connectivity. Staff's recommendation is based on the fact that a Planned Development has a greater responsibility to provide amenities for the general public.

Planning Manager DeMallie pointed out that when a developer is applies for a Planned Development they are typically seeking certain exceptions to a standard development. There is an expectation that in exchange for those exceptions that the project will be of a higher quality and provide more amenities than you would find in a standard subdivision.

Staff noted that the trail contribution of \$250,000 was in lieu of SPI constructing trail capacity improvements to accommodate the 1,000+ new residents the subdivision would add. The contribution was never intended to satisfy park development obligations, but to comply with General Plan and *Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan* goals of connection residentail neighborhoods to our trail system. Planned Developments commonly pay for offsite improvements (traffic, etc.)

Commissioner Hinz summarized her understanding that the \$250,000 is a result of the city building the trail rather than developer not participating in the build. That the compensation for not participating is the \$250,000. Community Projects Manger Hanson replied that going to a cash payment from the developer rather than having them participate in the construction was because the developer was concerned at the time they would face a longer process period and additional mitigations due to larger wetlands impacts related to the trail development. To avoid those additional requirements, the city agreed to allow a cash contribution.

Gary Blanc stated that is not true. SPI did not include the trail in their project because it was off-site and was not part of their development. At the time SPI was only participating in the construction, it was not their obligation. In addition, Blanc asserted the negotiation on the dollar amount was arbitrary and intended only to satisfy Director Niemer on the park site location.

Commissioner Waybright asked whether SPI would be more amenable to using the \$250,000 cash contribution slated for the trail for a different use. Gary Blanc responded that they are contending that the money should never have been offered in the first place.

Commissioner Hinz inquired whether there is some middle ground, considering the strong positions.

Mr. Blanc responded that SPI offered \$100,000 several weeks ago, but the city did not accept this change. As the developer, they have been asked to widen the sidewalks, provide sidewalks on both sides of the street instead of one, enhance an at-grade crossing and SPI would be willing to spend up to \$100,000 to construct these amenities, unreimbursed by park fees, in lieu of the \$250,000 payment. Commissioner Hinz asked whether these items are already agreed to? Mr. Blanc replied that the Park Development Agreement has not been signed and these are negotiable items. Community Projects Manager Hanson noted that the amenities outlined would not be in a Park Development Agreement but would be recommendations made by the Planning Commission.

Planning Manager DeMallie concurred with Community Projects Manager Hanson that there are two separate issues for the Commission to address. There are different requirements with regards to parks, sidewalk connections and trails on this project.

The first issue is that the project has the base standard obligation of dedication of park land. The project developer has proposed to exceed that base amount from 5.5 acres to 13.9 acres and also indicated a willingness to enter into an agreement to develop the park as the project builds out.

The second issue is the trails and sidewalk connectivity and the need to complying with the General Plan policies. What is the obligation of this project to meet the direction of those policies? Is the construction of an off-site trail. Is it connection to the existing trail via wider sidewalks? Is it widening of the existing trail or some contribution to that widening? It could be any of these or a mixture of them. What it boils down to is, what is a reasonable contribution? Given the scope and nature of this project, the Commission needs to determine what is proportionate and reasonable to this project?

Gary Blanc proceeded to comment that the Buenaventura Trail is heavily used by residents in the subdivisions south and east of the trail and opined that his subdivision should not bear the brunt of the cost. Mr. Blanc commented that they had concern with staff recommendation #5, as it conflicted with some proposed home sites. Community Projects Manager Hanson indicated the dimension of 175 feet was based on discussions with Planning Department staff.

Commissioner Waybright observed that there is much subjective opinion on who uses what amenities. He would be agreeable to change staff recommendation #5 to remove the exact amount of space required for the easement and then change staff recommendation #2 to the amount of \$125,000.

Commissioner Hinz concurred that this topic is subjective on various levels and that the park and the trail issues need to be separated.

Commissioner McElvain asked the developer if they would be amenable to the amount of \$125,000. Gary Blanc stated they would if they were reimbursed for the additional costs of widening the sidewalks and constructing the at-grade crossing.

There was some discussion by the Commission and staff as to when the \$125,000 cash contribution would be required. Ultimately the Community Services Advisory Commission left the timing of the payment to the Planning Commission. Community Projects Manager Hanson recommended to have the payment made with the recordation of Phase 1 of the subdivision.

The Commission decided to make the following recommendations to the Planning Commission

1. The developer shall make an irrevocable offer of dedication of eight usable unencumbered acres plus five acres encumbered by the WAPA power lines. This is to be an outright dedication with no compensation beyond full credit for Park In Lieu fees.
2. The developer shall pay a cash contribution of \$125,000. These funds are to be designated specifically for improvements to the existing Buenaventura Trail between Sunflower Drive and the Sacramento River Trail.
3. The developer shall provide a separated 6-foot-wide sidewalk connection along both sides of Road O. The developer shall also provide a 10-foot-wide concrete sidewalk along the west side of Buenaventura Boulevard from the proposed park site to the existing Buenaventura Trail trail head. These improvements will provide a direct link to the Sacramento River Trail. There shall be no vertical obstructions within 3-feet of the edge of the sidewalk along Buenaventura Boulevard. Any bus stops provided within or adjacent to these sidewalks shall have full separation from the sidewalk.

The City Engineer will be recommending enhanced safety features for an at-grade Sunflower/Buenaventura intersection. Such features may include: high visibility crosswalk striping and signing, street lights, curb extensions and raised concrete median island with pedestrian refuge area. The cost of these improvements are to be borne by the development with no contributions from the park fees generated by the project or the trail contribution described above in Recommendation #2.

4. Sierra Pacific Industries shall enter into a development agreement to build the park in two phases, as approved by the Community Services Advisory Commission. The Commission will establish both the scope of improvements and the approved budget. The scope and budget for improvements may be set as low or as high as the Commission chooses, except the budget may not exceed available Park Fee Credits generated from the project.

5. To protect the Salt Creek corridor as a valuable natural resource for fisheries and open space, the developer will make an irrevocable offer of fee dedication of a corridor along Salt Creek, consistent with the recommendations in the EIR. As an alternative, an easement for open space, public access and environmental restoration should be required.

Motion: To recommend to the Planning Commission the above outlined conditions. (Made by Commissioner Waybright, Seconded by Commissioner Hinz)

AYES: Commissioners Hinz, McElvain and Waybright

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Salter

ABSENT: Commissioner McCoach

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, at the hour of 4:45 p.m. Vice Chair Hinz declared the meeting adjourned.

Judy Salter, Chair