



CITY OF VACAVILLE GENERAL PLAN  
STEERING COMMITTEE

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

October 10, 2011  
6:00 p.m.

Vacaville General Plan Update  
Steering Committee Meeting #14  
Creation of a Preferred Land Use Alternative, Part 5  
Northeast 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

Community Development Director Maureen Carson  
City Planner Fred Buder  
Senior Planner Tyra Hays  
Park Planner Hew Hesterman  
Public Works Director Rod Moresco  
Assistant Director of Utilities Royce Cunningham  
Associate Civil Engineer Ozzie Hilton  
Senior Civil Engineer Steve Sawyer  
Deputy Director of Public Works Jeff Knowles  
Joanna Jansen, The Planning Center I DC&E  
Tanya Sundberg, The Planning Center I DC&E

1. Administrative Items:
  - a. Roll Call
  - b. Communications:
    - Meeting summary notes for October 6, 2011.
    - E-mail from Chris Campbell
    - Letter from Regina Koehler
    - Items prepared by Committee Member Johnson regarding Vacaville Unified School District properties.
  - c. Approval of Meeting Summary:

September 29, 2011 & October 6, 2011

Committee Member La Bar moved, Committee Member Greaves seconded to approve the summary notes of September 29<sup>th</sup> & October 6<sup>th</sup>. Motion approved 9-0.

d. Approval of the Agenda:

Chairman Niccoli suggested that as part of Item 7, Vacaville Unified School District Properties, that each site have an overview of the properties, public comment, then discussion.

Committee Member Woolsey moved, Committee Member Greaves seconded to approve the agenda as amended. Motion approved 9-0.

2. Business from the Floor:

Council Member Curtis Hunt, on behalf of the City Council thanked the Committee for their time and effort on the General Plan Steering Committee.

Tom Phillippi, Phillippi Engineering, on behalf of the Jepson Land Owners Group provided a revised map of the entire growth area that reflects the changes made as a result of the suggestions received at these meetings. He also thanked the Committee for the work on the General Plan Steering Committee.

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

Joanna Jansen, DC&E reviewed the completed tasks, and summarized the alternatives evaluation.

4. Overview of the Northeast Growth Area Evaluation

Ms. Jansen, looked at three overall alternatives. Alternative A proposes the least amount of development, Alternative B, medium development, and Alternative C, the most amount of development in the area.

Reviewed the three alternatives that address the following items.

Water

Wastewater

Stormwater

Transportation

Infrastructure costs and burdens

Market Viability

Police

Fire

Schools

Parks & Recreation

Agricultural Resources

Biological Resources

Cultural Resources

Committee member LaBar asked whether an updated analysis of revised Alternative C would be provided. Committee member Wilkins asked whether the estimate of police officers was too low for Alternatives B & C. Staff explained that further analysis would be done during the EIR phase and that the estimates provided were confirmed from the various departments affected (Police & Fire).

5. Public Comment:

Eight participants provided the following input:

**Tom Phillippi**, representing the Jepson Ranch Property owners provided a revised map explaining the modifications, some of which include:

- Changing some highway commercial to business park.

- Expanded low density residential and added general commercial and high density residential to the JLM Ranch site. Both of these steps were done in an attempt to reduce trip generation

- North of I-80 the plan has been changed to add Low Density Residential, and a strip of General Commercial along I-80.
- Realignment of Orange Drive to eliminate the Willow Road connection.
- Add rural residential and low density residential to buffer the technology park.

Mr. Phillippi stated that he believes the Fairfield Train Station project will cause traffic impacts in the area to be worse. He has made some changes to the plan in order to reduce traffic generation from the Jepson Group's plan. He does not believe that the traffic generated by their plan will cause need for two new freeway interchanges. He proposes two large roundabouts or traffic circles to mitigate traffic levels and reduce need for costly roadway improvements.

**Nancy Kivelson**, landowner in the Northeast Growth Area: commented that the map of agricultural lands is not accurate. She also believes the development assumptions are too high – that the Alternative Evaluation Workbook estimates 30% site coverage but as a developer she is never able to get more than 25% coverage. She believes the estimates are over-stated by 20%. Some properties that have a farmland designation have not be farmed for many years. The inventory of square footage and traffic impacts should be calculated at 20% rather than 30%. Build out of commercial will be substantially less that what is projected

**Tom Phillippi** added that the Revised Alternative C would also include a Park on land that is now shown for Office, in order to reduce trips.

**Regina Koehler, Lewis Road resident:** Glad to see a new designation on the former racetrack property. Agrees with Business Park as a designation in this area. Does not agree with Alternative B that places many properties in a large Agricultural Buffer area. Does not like the prior Industrial designation of Alternative C.

**Eunice Hulse, Locke-Paddon resident:** Noted that the Project Manager for the Fairfield Train Station project has stated that cities could hope for no better than LOS D once the train station project is built out. The Revised Alternative C has Orange Drive too wide to be placed next to Low Density on the JLM Ranch property. The Revised Alternative C does not address existing rural residences on the west side of Willow Road. She believes there should be a 1-acre minimum lot size on the north side of Locke-Paddon. She believes Alternative A is the most logical choice – less traffic, less impact on schools, infrastructure, freeways.

**John Holbrook, Katileba Lane resident** in East of Leisure Town Growth Area: States that both Alternatives B & C would require development of the whole ELT area to support infrastructure costs. Existing development is going very slowly (like North Village). Growth in the Northeast Area would be leap-frog development. Concerned about financing of infrastructure. The Northeast Area should not be developed. It will create a financial hardship on the rest of the City.

**Jan Whitley, Willow Road resident:** Concerned about development just north of Locke-Paddon. They have agricultural operations in Locke Paddon which operate all night and will impact any new residents to the north. She is opposed to the proposed trail right next to her property because it would create an isolated space open to the public, within 25' of her house.

**Ellen Fawl, Locke-Paddon resident:** Traffic on Willow coming from Orange Drive will be bad. The Plan needs to include traffic treatments at this entrance to Locke-Paddon in order to mitigate this impact. There is a potential conflict with agricultural traffic and new city-related traffic in this area. This General Plan will leave our mark on the community. This is an opportunity to define what makes Vacaville special. Specifically requests: Provide an interface with Locke Paddon that does not include business or commercial. No business or commercial directly adjacent to Locke-Paddon. We have an over-supply of this type of land in Vacaville. Estate Residential should be placed next to Locke-Paddon, with 1-acre minimum lot sizes. West side of Willow should also be Estate Residential.

**Jim Gillam, representing JLM Ranch:** Thought business & professional uses would have less impact on Locke Paddon neighbors. Thought trail would be a good amenity but could remove if desired. The

Willow connection at that point is not needed for their property. Would like to retain Low Density Residential, instead of changing to Estate Residential, but must talk with the owners.

**Curt Hilbers, landowner on the north side of I-80:** Likes Revised Alternative C. Agrees that he will not be able to develop at 30% coverage.

**Tom Phillippi:** Can change the west side of Willow Road to Rural Residential if ok with those owners. He believes Revised Alternative C will result in LOS A or B in 20 years since the whole plan will not build out in that time frame.

**Jan Whitley:** Need a better buffer between her residence and the adjacent commercial areas.

Traffic Engineer Knowles reviewed the cumulative affects of the latest proposal and the potential LOS associated with development. He explained that build-out of the existing General Plan will result in traffic congestion, plus now the Fairfield Train Station will add to that. Build-out of the original Alternative C would require 2 new freeway interchanges. We won't know impacts of Revised Alternative C until the EIR is prepared. It will be bad traffic, but less bad than the original.

Question from Steering Committee regarding use of traffic circles. Jeff Knowles explained we can analyze these also. A concern is that the Steering Committee will select a preferred plan but may find that the desired traffic LOS can not be achieved with that plan. This could result in greater problems in older parts of town.

Question regarding calculating build-out: The General Plan must be consistent between land use designations and traffic mitigations. Could consider a policy to reduce the allowable maximum build-out.

6. Steering Committee Discussion on the East of Northeast Growth

a. Residential Uses

Should housing be provided in the Northeast Growth Area, if so, where?

Alternative A – Yes, housing should be provided near existing infrastructure.

Alternative B – Yes housing should be provided as a new neighborhood near the Meridian Road interchange.

Alternative C – Yes housing should be provided both north and South of Interstate 80.

Consensus of the Committee was revised Alternative C: Yes, housing should be provided both north and south of Interstate 80. It was noted that they need to address public safety as part of the draft EIR. One member concerned that either no housing be provided or that it should all be in the Vacaville Unified School District. Two members expressed concern that an appropriate buffer be provided along the edge of Locke-Paddon.

Would you like to see a new active adult housing in the Northeast Growth Area?

Alternative A – No, don't restrict any housing to a particular group.

Alternative B – Yes, designate the entire residential neighborhood for active adult housing.

Alternative C – Yes, the high density residential site along Meridian Road should be a new active adult community.

Consensus of the Committee was Alternative A, no don't restrict any housing to a particular group and do not provide any designated Active Adult areas in the Northeast area.

b. Non-Residential Uses

Should there be technology park and R&D uses in the Northeast Growth Area? If so how much land should be designated for this use.

Alternative A& B – Yes, provide enough land for two major technology R&D uses of Genetech size.

Alternative C – Yes, provide vast amounts of land for possible technology R&D uses.

Consensus of the Committee was ~~be~~ Alternative C – Yes, provide vast amounts of land for possible technology/R&D uses. Ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to support sewer demands.

c. Character

What is your vision for the character of the Interstate 80 corridor through the Northeast Growth Area?

Alternative A – Primarily Agricultural

Alternative B – Some retail technology park, and residential development with the rest agriculture.

Alternative C – Primarily commercial.

Consensus of the Committee was revised Alternative C – Primarily commercial. The area should comply with the City Gateway Plan. The City Gateway Plan could provide specifics of how this area could be developed. There should be no soundwalls along the freeway.

d. Locke Paddon

What uses should be adjacent to the Locke Paddon community?

Alternative A – Highway Commercial/High Density Residential, technology park, and agriculture with a narrow neighborhood park.

Alternative B – Agriculture and Highway Commercial.

Alternative C – Low intensity commercial, low density residential and business park.

Consensus of the Committee was revised Alternative C, Low intensity commercial, low density residential, no business park near residential.

e. Agricultural Resources

Is preserving agricultural land in the Northeast Growth Area a priority?

Alternative A – Yes, preserve the majority of the area in agriculture use.

Alternative B or C – No, this area is within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and is a good location for new homes and businesses. Most of the agricultural land should be developed.

Consensus of the Committee was revised Alternative C- No, this area is within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and is a good location for new homes and businesses. Most of the agricultural land should be developed.

Should the Agricultural Buffer be applied next to residential uses only, or also next to businesses?

Alternative A or C – the agricultural buffer should only be applied next to residential uses.

Alternative B – The Agricultural Buffer should separate agricultural uses from any urban development, including both residences and businesses.

Consensus of the Committee was Alternative A or C – the Agricultural buffer should only be applied next to residential uses. .

Break 8:50

g. Traffic

How much additional traffic is acceptable with future development?

Alternative A & B – Keep the traffic levels near what is currently projected to occur under the current General Plan.

Alternative C – Allow traffic levels to increase more significantly than Alternative A & B compared to the existing General Plan.

Consensus of the Committee was Alternative C – Allow traffic levels to increase more significantly than Alternative A and B and when compared to the existing General Plan. Mitigation will be identified during the review. Support adding mitigation within the existing City too.

h. Roadway Configuration

How should the Northeast Growth Area connect to the East of Leisure Town Road Growth Area and other destinations to the south of Interstate 80? Note that any of these options could be incorporated into any of the alternatives.

Alternative A – No north south connections.

Alternative B – Provide new two-lane collector roadway along the southeastern edge of the Northeast Growth Area and the eastern edge of the Locke Paddon Community, shown in Alternative B.

Alternative C – Provide new two-lane collector roadway that connects to Willow Road through the Locke Paddon community, as shown in Alternative C.

Consensus of the Committee was revised Alternative C - Provide new two-lane collector roadway that connects to Willow Road through the Locke Paddon community, as shown in Alternative C, but include mitigation.

i. Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation

Should the Northeast Growth Area include a network of bicycle and pedestrian pathways and trails?

Alternative A & B – Yes, provide designated bicycle and pedestrian pathways and on-street bike lanes through the developed areas.

Alternative C – No, dedicated bicycle or pedestrian pathways are not needed in this growth area. Rely on City standards to ensure the minimum bike lane and sidewalk requirements are met.

Consensus of the Committee was Alternative A & B – Yes, provide designated bicycle and pedestrian pathways and on-street bike lanes through the developed areas.

j. Transit

Is supporting transit in the Northeast Growth Area a priority?

Alternative A – No, the amount of development proposed in this area does not need transit service.

Alternative B – Yes, development should support transit, but does not need to be at the high density allowed in Alternative C.

Alternative C – Yes, development should support transit.

Consensus of the Committee is Alternative C – Yes, development should support transit.

7. Vacaville Unified School District Properties – Continued from October 6, 2011

- a. Downtown VUSD Properties  
(VUSD Former district Office & Muzzetta M. Thrower Alternative Education Center)

This item was reviewed at the October 6, 2011 Steering Committee Meeting. It was noted that there was general support for mixed use, but there would need to be a definition of what mixed use would be, while maintaining flexibility so that a non-conforming use were not created. At this meeting, five Committee Members recommended Alternative C - Consider changing the designation to Mixed Use with a Public Park Overlay. Two Members recommend maintaining the existing land use designations and applying a Mixed Use Overlay.

- b. Rice-McMurtry Properties  
Alternative A – Maintain existing Junior High School designation.  
Alternative B – Residential Estates and Elementary School.  
Alternative C – Residential Estates with Public Park Overlay and Elementary School

Staff recommends Alternative C – Residential Estates with Public Park Overlay and Elementary School.

Public Comments: None

The consensus of the Committee was for a Public Park Overlay. Two members recommend that the entire site maintain its current land use designation of Junior High School, and contain Public Park Overlay. The remaining Members neither specified what the underlying land use designation should be, nor if the Public Park Overlay should be applied to both parcels. Staff believes it was the Committee's intent to recommend that the Public Park Overlay be applied to both parcels.

- c. Elm School Site  
Alternative A – Maintain existing Elementary School designation. This would allow the current VUSD uses to remain on site. Later, VUSD could submit a request for development, and submit a General Plan Amendment at that time.  
Alternative B – Low Density Residential which is consistent with the surrounding land uses.  
Alternative C – Medium Density Residential and a small public park on the property. The residential development would be clustered to allow a park.

Staff recommends Alternative A – Maintain the existing General Plan designation of Elementary School.

Public Comments: None

Five Committee Members recommend Alternative A - Maintain the existing General Plan designation of Elementary School, but wanted a Public Park Overlay added. One member recommends that the land use designation remain Elementary School without an Overlay. Another Member recommended a Public Park Overlay but did not specific the underlying land use designation.

- d. Jepson Middle School  
Alternative A – Maintain existing Junior High School use.  
Alternative B – Low Density Residential  
Alternative C – Low Density Residential with Public Park Overlay

Staff recommends Alternative B – change the designation to Low Density Residential.

Public comment – None

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Johnson provided extensive information regarding the School District and the provisions of the Naylor Act which provide a mechanism to acquire park land. He felt that the School District should have participated in discussion with the Steering Committee regarding all of their surplus property.

Five Committee Members recommend Alternative A - Maintain the existing General Plan designation of Elementary School, but wanted a Public Park Overlay added. One member recommends that the land use designation remain Elementary School without an Overlay. Another Member recommended a Public Park Overlay but did not specific the underlying land use designation.

8. Steering Committee Comments and Next Steps  
reviewed upcoming city council study sessions and what items would be covered.
9. Adjournment: 10:15 p.m.