



MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING VIRTUAL PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

TUESDAY, February 9, 2021
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER
7:00 P.M.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Gavidia

2. ROLL CALL

Chair Chippero, Vice Chair Denslow, Commissioner Altwal, Commissioner Gavidia,
Commissioner Miller

3. PRESENTATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

A. PRESENTATIONS:

None.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Chair Chippero:

- Welcome to Commissioner Ed Miller

Commissioner Miller

- Provided a short background in current works

4. ACCEPTANCE OF THE AGENDA:

Approved by consensus

5. PUBLIC COMMENT (Non-Agenda Items):

No public comments

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. MINUTES:

October 27, 2020

November 2, 2020

November 24, 2020

December 8, 2020

December 22, 2020

January 12, 2021

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of October 27, 2020.

Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of November 2, 2020
Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of November 24, 2020
Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of December 8, 2020
Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of December 22, 2020
Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of January 12, 2021

Commissioner Miller:

- Did not participate or vote because he was not on the Planning Commission at the time of these meetings.

Motion and vote 3-1: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of October 27, 2020

Motion and vote 3-1: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of November 10, 2020

Motion and vote 3-1: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of November 24, 2020

Motion and vote 3-1: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of December 8, 2020

Motion and vote 3-1: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of December 22, 2020

Motion and vote 4-0: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of January 12, 2021

Chair Chippero:

- No comments on subject matter

Vice Chair Denslow:

- December 8th minute corrections
 - o Page 10 – concerns of traffic and noise
 - o Public Comment from Dan Hummer – Why no EIR
 - o Altwal feedback – packet, clarifying that email communications that were dated were not forwarded to Planning Commission timely
 - o Page 11 –
 - Passive and Active Open Space and how CMC 17.28 applied to this project
 - o Page 12
 - Don't recall saying there were a lot of conditions – belongs to Bassam
 - o Why we are not getting more affordable housing units
 - Clarify that the question was about the other ADU's and why they are not counted for affordable
 - o Other 2 comments of note
 - Matthew provided a good explanation of traffic analysis
 - Comments/concern of Sensitive Use Ordinance was forcing this project to be more dense
 - o Matthew Section
 - Page 13 – Application is not affordable housing application and does not follow subdivision D
 - Clarify with recent discussion that subdivision J was followed

Commissioner Altwal:

- November 2nd is actually November 10th
- November 24th was cancelled
- Each one separate for reasons stated at last meeting
- A lot of comments but will not provide
- Will not vote on minutes that old
- Cannot watch video every time
- Do I always go first, is that the new rule?
- January 12th
 - o In my comments it was 5 meetings not 4 meetings
 - o I going to repeat what I made that comment ... no I canceled it

- That's fine, that's it (in reference to the January 12th minutes)

Commissioner Gavidia:

- City went with action minutes and this is more than action minutes

Commissioner Miller:

- No Comments

Director Feske:

- Confirmed video for December 8th is not available

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

8. ACTION ITEMS

A. Stranahan Parking (Commissioner Altwal)

Recommendation: Receive, and File

Optional Recommendation: Draft a memorandum to the City Council

Action: Bring back to next Planning Commission meeting

Public Comments:

- No public comment

Chair Chippero:

- Interpretation of Director Feske was that we would use Regency pilot program as the model to move forward because there is nothing in writing
- We are not here to set policy, here to interpret

Vice Chair Denslow:

- I hear a citywide study and processes (asking a question)
- The agenda is a code amendment
- Sounds like you (Commissioner Altwal) are asking to codify the process for permit
- Each situation has unique steps for the process
- In favor to ask City Council to codify process, beyond that is not applicable
- Write memorandum to help people engage in the process
- Like concept as a city being more proactive
 - See these in advance
- Recalled that City Council removed the condition by the residents not wanting it

Commissioner Altwal:

- Past Planning Commission meeting, specifically the Olivia project some of us were not very comfortable with the parking
- Some of us could not vote against the rules and regulations because the rules and regulations have been accepted
- I did notice it was a big issue for the neighborhood
- I went ahead and did some studies
- Does not apply just for Stranahan
- Could apply for any neighborhood
- I did some studies in similar cities
- I strongly suggest that we as a city have a kind of study if a certain neighborhood would require some parking permit
- Instead of treating every neighborhood at every time with a different set of rules
- Have a set of rules

- Copy and pasted from other cities, did not create on my own
- The whole idea is if a neighborhood wants a parking permit, they actually have to initiate and apply for a parking permit
- After that it goes to the city to study, then commission, then city council
- Specific items most likely is Why? and what kind of study? Is it justified? What hours?
- Stranahan suggest night parking because that is when the residents are there, but no reason to have parking from 10 to 12 like Regency
- These items can come back to the city and the planning commission and staff to study them
- Instead of having each area with its own parking and being proactive
- It's up to the citizens if they want to pick it up or not
- I think we as a city should have, I don't know
- Last time I asked the answer to me was we do not have and Regency was like shooting from the hip
- Staff can clean it up
- Send it to the city council to discuss it
- I don't know if anyone from Stranahan knew about it
- Not going into details, this is the main idea behind it
- I had asked if there was something before and Mr. Feske told me no and now there is so I have 2 different answers
- This is more than an example, I went item by item
- I don't recall city council removed the condition
- The whole idea is to have general idea rather than a specific area
- Have the ability to ask with rules and regulations
- Have not seen the Regency to compare, I doubt it is this comprehensive
- Envision at the city of clayton level
- Should not have mentioned Stranahan, any neighborhood
- Point is that we should see it, discuss it and vote on it
- Proactively work on code in general, Regency is a specific
 - o If we address proactively and not reactively and spend a lot of time and materials
- Finances
 - o Signage and threat of parking is enough to deter parking, especially at night
 - o Option to call a towing company
- These are all details that the City Council, maybe us study
- Proactive on the books to solve the problem
- Send a note – comments - motion to City Council to maybe discuss
- Other Cities have gone through this
- Don't want to go through the suffering
- Something that is proactive
- Not asking for citywide study
- Want a process to parking
- Have something in the books – preemptively
- I can do, I have already done ¾ done code
- Trying to be proactive before issues
- Good to know - allegedly (comment after towing public street versus private street)
- It is not setting policy
- Direct response by an initiative by the Director
- This is just an example
- Memorandum to add parking to our code

Commissioner Gavidia:

- This sounds like we are trying to set policy, is that the role of the Planning Commission

- or the Council?
- Add to Commissioner Miller comment of where the traffic will go
 - o all of downtown would have to be blocked off
- Respectfully we are saying this is not setting policy, but I see something that looks like an Ordinance.
 - o Ordinances come from somewhere else and to us for review
- Great suggestion
- As a citizen and gather signatures from Stranahan stating we need this and why do this as whole
- Is this our role, is it better as citizens?
- Regency was 'nasty' because the council ignored them
 - o There is more responsiveness now

Commissioner Miller:

- My understanding is that Commissioner Altwal is asking if rules and regulations can be studied and drafted
- My understanding is that Director Feske is that Regency parking project is designed to exactly that
- Draft something very specific very close to final language
- Not resources within Police to enforce
- Is the Regency pilot program proceeding or potentially proceeding in a way that the city council will end up drafting code based on the findings?
- Hard time to selling a project that does not have parking
- Value to citizens having it codified
- Use of private towing and billing back
- Echo Commissioner Gavidia – where will the traffic go?
- I don't see as our responsibility to set policy that is up to the Council

Director Feske:

- Stranahan permit parking was removed as a condition by the city council
- Permit parking process has been established through the Regency permit parking pilot program
 - o Established regulations in place to be used as standards for any parking situation
- Sample code is from other sources, we do not have a parking enforcement division
- Example memorandum is for format and style, Planning Commission should draft their own
- Regency pilot program was in direct response to the complaints
 - o Permanent program shrank the area
 - o This is the model the council wants to use
 - o Council was asked if they wanted to codify and they declined
 - o My interpretation from that is that the Council wants to leave it on a case by case and use the Regency program as the model of enforcement
- Police Department does not have a Parking Enforcement Division
- Towing is limited on public streets under specific situation like red curb, cannot just tow vehicles on public streets
 - o Private roads can be towed for any reason up to the owner of the road.

9. PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS AND UPCOMING AGENDA DEVELOPMENT

Chair Chippero:

- Rotation to report to the City Council

Vice Chair Denslow:

- Anyone who has passion about the minutes to bring it up to council as a citizen
- Meetings like the housing project deserve more details
- Previously minutes were at the next meeting
- Received concerns about the video online – that is the priority

Commissioner Altwal:

- Meeting minutes presented at the next meeting
- Are meeting minutes an essential part?
- My point is about time and not content
 - o Content is something else
 - o Talking about time, so it is fresh in our minds
 - o Not talking about content
- That is not my experience

Commissioner Gavidia:

- This was a contentious issue with City Council
- I have seen action minutes samples that have even less than what we get
- City uses action item minutes
- Bring up to Council for discussion

Commissioner Miller:

- Required by the Brown Act
- Adopted action minutes? What is the other option?
- Time and content are related – it takes time to detailed minutes hence they are late

10. ADJOURNMENT

8:34PM