



CITY OF VACAVILLE GENERAL PLAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

City Council Chambers, Vacaville City Hall
650 Merchant Street, Vacaville

April 21, 2011
6:00 p.m.

Vacaville General Plan Update
Meeting #8:
Land Use Alternatives Review Part 2 (Growth Areas Alternatives)
Meeting Summary

Committee Member Attendance

Chairman Joe Niccoli
Vice-Chair Pamela Greaves
Frank Crim - Absent
Brett Johnson
Dawn La Bar
Shannon Nadasdy - Absent
Denise Suihkonen
Steve Wilkins
James Woolsey

Staff in Attendance

Community Development Director Maureen Carson
City Planner Fred Buderl
Senior Planner Tyra Hays
Acting Assistant Public Works Director Steve Sawyer
David Early, DC&E
Tanya Sundberg, DC&E

1. Roll Call:
2. Introduction of New Steering Committee Member – Chairman Niccoli introduced newly appointed Steering Committee Member James Woolsey.
3. Communications:
Revision to memo addressing new land use plan request from Tom Phillippi on behalf of the Jepson Ranch constituents.
4. Follow-up Items from Previous Meetings
 - a. Additional information about the residential land use inventory:
A memo was submitted to address concerns raised at the February 21st Steering Committee Meeting regarding residential land use inventory and how that number was determined.
 - b. Notice of Preparation comment letters – comments received as a result of the notice of preparation.

5. **Business from the Floor:**
Tom Phillippi, Phillippi Engineering addressed the land use database, requesting that the information provided be valid, noting concern that all the properties be addressed.

6. **Approval of Meeting Summary:**
Vice-Chair Greaves moved, Committee Member Johnson seconded to approve the summary notes from March 10, 2011. Motion approved 7-0.

7. **Status Update of General Plan Process:**

David Early, DC&E provided a brief overview of the General Plan Update process noting that they are at phase 5 of 9 phases. He added that this would be the time to provide guidance about which alternatives to study, then they can move into evaluation of alternatives.

8. **Citywide Land Use Alternatives Follow-up:**

Mr. Early noted that they would provide a presentation on all three alternatives, with one public comment period.

The Vacaville Golden Hills Business Park Policy Plan area was added to the Citywide land use alternatives memo, which was reviewed during Steering Committee Meeting #7 on March 10, 2011. This policy plan is being evaluated for the possibility of adding a General Commercial land use designation to a portion of the policy plan area.

The three additional shopping centers that were suggested for review at the last meeting are viable retail sites and alternate uses should not be suggested on those sites.

The existing Neighborhood Commercial designation is appropriate for the area across from the Peabody and Marshall Road area, no additional alternatives should be reviewed.

Committee Member Comments:

It was noted that at the last Community Services Commission meeting, it was suggested that the Peabody/Marshall area be designated as potential park land because there is a lack of parks in the surrounding area.

Committee Action:

Vice-Chair Greaves moved, Committee Member LaBar seconded to approve as written. Motion approved 7-0.

9. **New Growth Areas Draft Alternatives:**

Alternative A – Focused Growth: Provides the least amount of development. Is most likely to be consistent with the concepts of the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy. Intended to avoid extensive interchange and wastewater treatment plant improvements.

Alternative B - Compact Centers: Moderate amount of development. Includes a central town square in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. Active adult residential area located in the Northeast Growth Area.

Alternative C – Traditional Suburban: Greatest amount of development. Incorporates the proposed Brighton Landing Specific Plan. Land use map developed by the property owners group.

A lengthy discussion between the Committee Members and staff followed regarding Brighton Landing. The Committee members asked questions regarding agreements that the City may have made with the Brighton Landing Developer and concurrent processing of their application and the General plan update. Staff clarified the provisions of the memo of understanding between the Brighton Landing developer and the City, noting that the Brighton Landing project would require revision as needed to be consistent with the preferred land use alternative.

Alternative A – Focused Growth

East of Leisure Town Road – Has a large amount of agricultural land to the north and south. Provides pedestrian and bike paths.

North East Area - Emphasis on agricultural land, also large amount of industrial and technical space, maintain existing designations.

Alternative B – Compact Centers

East of Leisure Town Road – Includes a town square, mixed use development, high density residential, medium density, low density. Estate residential area adjacent to Locke Paddon, transition of this area to rural residential. Includes a higher amount of development overall. This also includes trail patterns with dedicated bike trails, and fingers of open space.

North East Area - Compact center approach, ag buffers in far northeast portion, maintain existing industrial. Would include some residential uses as well as industrial. Network of paths, pedestrian oriented centers, bike paths and trails.

Alternative C – Traditional Suburban

East of Leisure Town Road – Reflects ideas submitted by Jepson consortium and includes significant commercial areas along Leisure Town Road, five neighborhood parks and a pathway network.

North East Area - Extensive development of biotech industrial and commercial development. Small amount of residential development, low density residential, high density development, bike and pedestrian paths.

b. Public Comment:

Tom Phillippi, on behalf of the Jepson Ranch group, requested the following factors be taken into consideration during the land use alternative evaluation process.

- Reinststitute an open dialog between City staff and developers.
- Establish a baseline for traffic that could be supported in the area.
- Developing a residential projection using the midpoint of the density range is not feasible, suggested using the quarter point of the density range.
- Requested that the schedule for the General Plan process be continually reviewed.
- Regarding Brighton Landing, 700 single family lots is the amount needed to pay for improvements.
- Because of CFD 12, it is difficult to develop high density.
- Requested that all three land use alternatives include Brighton Landing as proposed.
- Create a balance with the amount of development that is needed to pay for infrastructure.

Break 7:45

Community Development Director Carson reviewed CFD 12, which is a policy adopted by the City Council. It provides ongoing funding for public safety, police and fire. She added that following the General Plan update, the policy would be revisited when the General Plan was adopted.

Regarding Brighton Landing and whether the plan should be shown in all three alternatives, the MOU between the developer and the City acknowledges that changes or modifications may be required as part of the General Plan update. If the eventual preferred alternative shows something different, the plan may need to be modified.

Mr. Phillippi acknowledged the potential for change to the Brighton Landing plan, but questioned why it would need to change.

Regarding including the Brighton Landing proposal in all three alternatives, Mr. Early responded that it would be a deviation from the approach that they have been given direction to provide three different alternatives. The land use alternatives presented provided development comparable to the Brighton Landing project.

Community Development Director Carson reviewed portions of the Brighton Landing memo of understanding (MOU) with the Steering Committee. The MOU contains specific language regarding the City's commitment to the Brighton Landing Developer.

Public Comment:

Seven audience participants provided the following comments:

- Have policies in place so they can take advantage of opportunities when they become available.
- UC Davis is considering a satellite campus in Vacaville.
- Ag land along I-80 is not the development opportunity Vacaville should be looking for.
- Developers dominate the process.
- Consider the economic impacts on current property owners when new homes are developed.
- Consider how entitlements impact the value of land.
- It is not desirable to have homes near railroad tracks.
- The taking of Ag land demands compensation.
- Consider the commitments the current General Plan has made to current residents
- The land use alternatives being considered violate current General Plan policies
- Ensure that development is viable.
- Provide a buffer between new and existing development along Maple Road.
- Encourage having options.
- Just because something is zoned a certain way doesn't mean it is feasible to develop that way.

Public comment closed.

Committee Comments:

- Ensure that property along I-80 has the capability to capitalize on future opportunities.
- Alternative A should contain the minimum number of homes (approx. 700 units) on the Brighton Landing project site to be consistent with the MOU.

Committee Action:

Committee Member Johnson moved, Committee Member LaBar seconded approved 7-0.

Community Development Director Carson reviewed the next steps in the process adding that this would be reviewed by the City Council on May 10th.

Adjourn 10:00 p.m.