



CITY OF VACAVILLE GENERAL PLAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

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

September 29, 2011
6:00 p.m.

Vacaville General Plan Update
Steering Committee Meeting #12
Creation of a Preferred Land Use Alternative, Part 3
East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area
Meeting Summary

Committee Member Attendance

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

Staff in Attendance

City Planner Fred Buder
Senior Planner Tyra Hays
Park Planner Hew Hesterman
Assistant Director of Utilities Royce Cunningham
Associate Civil Engineer Ozzie Hilton
Senior Civil Engineer Steve Sawyer
Deputy Director of Public Works Jeff Knowles
Associate Civil Engineer Chris Bailey
Joanna Jansen, DC&E
Tanya Sundberg, DC&E

1. Administrative Items:
 - a. Roll Call
 - b. Communications:
 - Community outreach notes
 - Meeting summary from last meeting and workshop
 - Letter and map submitted by owners of the property at the Northeast corner of Leisure Town and Elmira.
 - Locke Paddon community open letter
 - Letter submitted by Lagoon Valley Conservancy.

- c. Approval of Meeting Summary:
Committee Member Johnson moved, Committee Member Crim seconded to approve the summary notes of September 15, 2011. Motion approved 9-0.
- d. Approval of the Agenda:
Committee Member Woolsey moved, Committee Member Nadasdy seconded to approve the agenda. Motion approved 9-0.

2. Business from the Floor:
None

3. Status Update of General Plan Process and Land Use Alternatives:

City Planner Buderer provided a brief overview of comments received at community meetings and other outreach opportunities.

4. Overview of the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area Evaluation

Ms. Jansen provided a brief overview of the meeting and how it would proceed.

Ms. Jansen reviewed the three alternatives that are proposed for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area. Alternative A has the least development, Alternative B greatest development, and Alternative C in-between the two.

The following areas should be considered with each of the alternatives

- Water
- Wastewater
- Stormwater infrastructure
- Transportation
- Infrastructure cost and burdens
- Police service
- Schools
- Parks & recreation impacts
- Agricultural resources
- Biological resources

5. Public Comment:

- 5 speakers spoke in favor of Alternative A.
- 2 speakers spoke in favor of Neighborhood Commercial at the corner of Leisure Town & Elmira.
- The northeast corner of Elmira & Leisure Town should be zoned CN, Neighborhood Commercial.
- 1 speaker addressed proposed changes to Alternative C, stating that moving neighborhood commercial away from the Maplewood development would be ok, that new buffering is added adjacent to the Locke Paddon area, and that the plan exceeds the City's existing park standards.

- Regarding the Agricultural Buffer, some owners own land on both sides of this line and so would be able to record limits on uses in these areas even if beyond City boundary.
- A revised Alternative A was presented that would have the following benefits:
 - Parks could be sited in areas that promote pedestrian access, not near major roadways.
 - Keeping development south of Brighton Landing would avoid contact with the creeks and preserve natural habitat along the creek.
 - Do not place houses on prime agricultural land.
 - Don't include industrial lands in the ELT area – safety and compatibility issues.
 - Retaining more agricultural land would help reduce flooding impacts by reducing runoff.
 - Keeps the community park.
- Don't place commercial next to the existing Maplewood development.

- Need enough development to pay for infrastructure and to provide a good jobs/housing balance.
- Provide the City Council with a single plan for their review. The GP should look to the long-term, even beyond the next 20 years.
- The long-term vision for the community needs to be set today.
- The City should allow the Brighton Landing project to build and see how traffic LOS is affected. Thus, wouldn't be prevented from building more, but could do so in a phased manner.
- A wide variety of species inhabit the open lands in ELT, making Alt. A less of an impact.
- Alt C will have negative drainage impacts. Just the small Maplewood development had to be raised a few feet to prevent flooding. Increased runoff will affect all adjacent areas.
- Infrastructure for commercial development has to come through the East of Leisure Town Road area.
- Alternative A is better because it ensures compliance with ABAG regional projections, protects agriculture, and meets the economic projections for City's needs.
- Consider an overlay that would allow chickens on one acre parcels and rural road standards. Existing rural residential uses may conflict with new suburban uses.
- Determine how Vacaville identifies itself.
- Do not allow new development to create problems for existing rural residents.
- Keep the Locke Paddon area the way that it is.

7:32 break.

6. Steering Committee Discussion on the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area

a. Residential Uses

1. Should active adult housing be included in the East of Leisure Town Road growth area?

The consensus of the Committee was support for some adult housing, which could incorporate areas for RV parking, community gardens or other amenities. A villages concept, mixed use scenario would not be appropriate for this area. Generally preferred not to segregate a large senior project from other neighborhoods.

2. What mix of housing is appropriate for the East of Leisure Town Road Growth area?

It was the consensus of the Committee that they keep the existing policies from the existing General Plan, as best reflected in revised Alternative C.

3. Should there be Service Commercial uses in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area? Where?

It was the consensus of the Committee that the amount and location next to the railroad tracks in revised Alternative C would be appropriate and consider buffering from residential.

4. Should there be offices in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area? Where?

It was the consensus of the Committee that it would be appropriate to provide dental or medical offices, but not as part of a large town square.

5. Should there be industrial uses in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area? Where?

It was the consensus of the Committee that industrial uses would not be appropriate in this area.

6. How should Neighborhood Commercial be addressed in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area.?

The Committee expressed a concern about creating two shopping centers across from each other. It was noted that they do not want to create the potential for underperforming shopping centers in

the future. It was felt that Neighborhood Commercial would be an appropriate location for medical and dental office space.

Parks

7. Should the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area meet the neighborhood parkland requirements?

It was the consensus of the Committee that they should exceed the parkland requirements for neighborhood parks.

8. Should the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area meet the community parkland requirements?

It was the consensus of the Committee that they should exceed the park land requirements for community parks.

9. Is preserving agricultural land in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area a priority?

It was the consensus of the Committee that the revised Alternative C alt is the best option. It is important to allow pieces of agricultural heritage to continue in this area, as well as the Locke Paddon life style to continue. A buffer of rural residential/hobby farm areas next to Locke Paddon would be a good feature.

10. How wide should the Agricultural Buffer be?

It was the consensus of the Committee that the current width of the agricultural buffer be maintained.

11. Location

It was the consensus of the Committee that it is important to avoid taking from unwilling owners. Revised Alternative C is preferable, if allows maintaining control on land beyond the UGB.

12. How much additional traffic is acceptable with future development?

It was the consensus of the Committee that they support some development, such as revised Alternative C, acknowledging that the alternative would have impacts such as traffic.

13. How should the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area connect to Interstate 80 and other areas to the north?

It was the consensus of the Committee that there was support for revised Alternative C with no connection through Willow Road, while allowing the option to widen Leisure Town Road to 6 lanes in the future if necessary.

14. Should the bicycle and pedestrian network rely on dedicated bicycle and pedestrian paths, on-street bicycle lanes and sidewalks, or both?

It was the consensus of the Committee to include recreation bike lanes as well as trails. This mode of transportation should serve both recreational and transportation needs.

15. Is supporting transit in the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area a priority?

It was the consensus of the Committee that there should be transit support in this area.

16. What uses should be adjacent to the Locke Paddon Community?

It was the consensus of the Committee that rural residential, estate residential, and riparian corridor uses in Locke Paddon might extend into this area.

17. Should the Preferred Land Use Alternative be the same as the proposed plan from the Brighton Landing developer? If not, what should be included in this area?

It was the consensus of the Committee that revised Alternative C is appropriate for the Brighton Landing area.

18. Is it important that new development be arranged around a new town square or other central focal point?

It was the consensus of the Committee that a town square is not necessary in this area. The City should continue to focus on the existing town square, and not take away from the central focal point in Downtown Vacaville. Need gathering places such as parks, but don't want a town square in this area.

7. **Steering Committee Comments and Next Steps**

Ms. Jansen reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule. Committee Member LaBar requested that they be provided with a copy of the information that will be presented to the City Council.

8. **Adjournment: 10:00**