



MENDOCINO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING HELD ON: March 24, 2011

LOCATION: Mendocino County Board of Supervisors Chambers
501 Low Gap Road, Room 1070
Ukiah, California

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Little, Calvert, Nelson, Holtkamp, Hall, Ogle

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Warner

PLANNING & BLDG SVC STAFF PRESENT: Ignacio Gonzalez, Director
Roger Mobley, Chief Planner
Jessica Stull-Otto, Planner II
Gary Pedroni, Planner
Adrienne Thompson, Commission Services Supervisor

OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS PRESENT: Tom Peters, Department of Transportation

1. **Roll Call.**

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. Commissioner Warner was absent by prior arrangement.

2. **Determination of Legal Notice.**

The Clerk advised the Commission that all items had been properly noticed.

3. **Director's Report and Miscellaneous.**

Mr. Gonzalez was not present for the Director's Report.

4. **Regular Calendar.**

4a. **PROJECT TITLE: DRAFT UKIAH VALLEY AREA PLAN (UVAP) (CONTINUED FROM 3-17-11)**

PROJECT APPLICANT: COUNTY OF MENDOCINO

PROJECT LOCATION: The project is situated within the unincorporated area of Mendocino County extending from immediately north of the Highway 101/20 interchange north of Calpella (excludes Redwood Valley area), southerly to 2+ miles south of the Highway 253/101 interchange, and approximately from ridge top to ridge top east and west of the Ukiah Valley.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The County proposes to adopt the 2007 Ukiah Valley Area Plan (UVAP) as an element of the Mendocino County General Plan. The draft plan tentatively approved by the Board of Supervisors as "the project" includes Open Space & Conservation, Historic & Archaeological Resources, Health & Safety, Parks & Recreation, Community Design, Circulation & Transportation, Water Management, Energy & Air Quality, and Land Use Elements. Noise and Housing Elements are not included, but are part of the County's General Plan and will apply to the UVAP planning area.

PROJECT COORDINATOR: ROGER MOBLEY

Mr. Roger Mobley, Project Coordinator, suggested an approach to the Commission for policy review of each chapter of the UVAP. He noted after the Commission had discussed the goals and policies, they could begin the land use discussion and take public comment on the plan. He encouraged the Commission to review the plan as an opportunity to provide flexibility for growth and long term development. He noted that the full buildout contained in the preferred plan was only the theoretical capacity available and any development would be market constrained due to the economy. He commented that the policies in the plan acted as mitigation measures and discussed the Mixed Use

designation in the plan. Mr. Mobley discussed the staff report that had clarified that 24 acres and 480 units of multifamily housing were needed to satisfy the Housing Element and noted that the City of Ukiah had stated intent to annex the Brush Street Triangle to provide water and sewer. He commented that the only concern with annexation was insuring that the County received credit for the housing units that would be transferred to the City. He also noted that the Masonite site offered the greatest potential for mixed use development with existing infrastructure and suggested the possibility of an overlay zoning of mixed use that would allow the industrial zoning to remain. Mr. Mobley noted that if the Commission preferred the designation of an overlay mixed use zoning that would be appropriate to include in the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Hall asked if the overlay was the same as changing the definition of mixed use.

Mr. Mobley noted that an overlay allowed the property to have two separate zoning designations that were developable; heavy industrial or mixed use.

Commissioner Holtkamp asked if portions could be developed as either designation, so that one area could be industrial and another section could be mixed use.

Mr. Mobley noted there could be any combination of development with the larger site.

Chairman Nelson noted the variations between the mixed use designations on the map, noting that the Brush Street parcel only allowed 10% multifamily while Masonite was designated for 40% and did not understand the logic of the combinations.

Mr. Mobley thought the intent was to provide a combination of uses with specific percentages.

Commissioner Holtkamp asked how the overlay would work since heavy industrial was prohibited with the mixed use Masonite designation.

Mr. Mobley noted the overlay would allow two courses of development with the size for a combination of uses on the property.

Commissioner Little asked if there would be a priority to either type of development with the overlay zoning. He asked how a project could be determined to be appropriate for the site if either industrial or mixed use was available and both projects were submitted for review.

Mr. Mobley noted other jurisdictions have used overlay zoning and generally, whichever project is submitted first is developed. He noted the Masonite site was large enough that both uses could be accommodated.

Commissioner Little offered an example where a 50-unit residential complex was developed in the center of the property and noted such a development would exclude any other use, especially industrial, and asked if there was some way to analyze the impacts of development on one area of the parcel and the remainder of the site.

Mr. Mobley noted that development on the site would best be approached with a conceptual master plan. He noted that any proposal on the site would be subject to intensive review and built into the mixed use ordinance for design review.

Commissioner Ogle commented that it was apparent no industries were interested in moving to Mendocino County with its lack of transportation, housing, airlines, etc. and thought that Masonite was a blight that could be seen from the freeway.

The public hearing was declared open.

Judy Pruden, City of Ukiah Planning Commission, noted she had participated in writing portions of the UVAP and discussed population growth and the vision to retain agricultural properties, protect view sheds, and conserve the natural beauty, water, air quality and quality of life in Mendocino

County. She stated that the North State Street mixed use designation had not been proposed during any of the previous meetings and was one person's idea. She hoped that the Lovers Lane agricultural lands would be preserved and felt the County could not afford the indebtedness that would result from plan adoption. She supported Alternative C and felt it was a logical policy document, stating that the 41 land use changes should be rejected. She also thought the variations of mixed use were confusing and read the definition of mixed use from the General Plan. Last, she commented that there must be a tax sharing agreement between the City and County and felt it was logical to annex Brush Street into the City for future development.

Carol Myer, local business owner, felt that Measure A was not a vote over keeping Masonite industrial, but was a vote to keep the people in the review process and not bypass CEQA. She was concerned that without the mixed use zoning, Masonite would remain undeveloped and continue to sit as an eyesore on North State Street.

Alan Nicholson encouraged the Commission to look at the big picture and see that the issue was not enough infrastructure. He felt the County could not afford the service demand for future development and stated that the mixed use designation was good "boiler plate" information, but was inadequate and did not consider the implications of change. He felt the plan did not follow the vision of villages or keep with smartgrowth principles. He asked the Commission to remove Masonite and Lovers Lane from the list of 41 land use changes and adopt Alternative C.

Robin Collier felt that Measure A was about fear, not keeping Masonite industrial. She thought DDR made mistakes, but felt no industry would come to Mendocino County. She also thought there was sufficient industrial property available without the preservation of Masonite and thought the community needed a mixed use influence. She suggested the Commission adopt a UVAP that could be a vision of the County.

Todd Schapmire, commercial real estate agent, commented that the Valley needed jobs and economic development. He stated it would be wonderful if everyone could have high paying jobs, but stated at this point, it wasn't worth being picky and any job would help. He felt Masonite was a political issue, and thought the community should be realistic about the site, stating that industry was not knocking down the doors to come into the County. He urged the Commission to move forward and supported the preferred plan with full buildout.

Don Strickland, local business owner, noted the County needed economic vitality. He stated that there were no professional jobs for young people to stay in the area and make a living.

Steve Scalmanini asked staff to clarify what infrastructure existed at Masonite.

Mr. Mobley noted there was water on site with wells and ground water.

Mr. Scalmanini asked if any of the wells had expired by nonuse and asked how sewer connections would be provided.

Mr. Mobley was not sure if any wells had expired and thought some information could be garnered from the Water Assessment. He was unsure of how the sewer connection would be processed.

Mr. Scalmanini felt there was nothing on site to support water or sewer at Masonite and commented that the industry that should move to Masonite is the batch, asphalt plant (Harris Quarry) at the top of the Willits grade. He felt moving the asphalt plant would be the perfect solution to the issues created on the grade with big rigs crossing 101 and stated the site was set with high pressure gas line that could accommodate industry. He also stated that when DDR had purchased the property, another local buyer had submitted an offer, which could be a viable industry in the County. He stated that the comment that no industry was interested in the County was not true and felt the 41 proposed land use changes should be removed from the plan.

Lisa Hillegas, Legal Services of Northern California, noted that after the last meeting she had met with staff and identified 5 sites in the memo prepared by Mr. Mobley. She stated the most viable

development could occur in the R3 or mixed use zone and thought the UVAP could meet the objective and provide more than enough land for multifamily without having to scramble in the future to rezone more land. She asked the Commission to focus on sites that have water and sewer now and are close enough to develop as their primary goal and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors as soon as possible so the rezonings could occur later this year.

Commissioner Little asked how many affordable units were included in the Gardens Gate subdivision.

Ms. Hillegas noted that Garden's Gate had received a density bonus and thought that 18% of the development was set for affordable to moderate income homes.

Commissioner Little asked if the units from Gardens Gate had been included in the 480 units the County would need, or if they should be subtracted from the figure.

Ms. Hillegas stated the 480 units were in addition to what was proposed at Garden's Gate.

Lisa Yoshida, Rural Communities Housing Development Corp. (RCHDC), asked the Commission to keep their project on the list as part of the 41 land use changes. She commented that 51 units would be constructed in the first phase of development and noted they would prefer the R3 designation as indicated on the map.

Commissioner Ogle clarified that RCHDC owned parcel 29.

Pinky Kushner urged the Commission to reject all 41 land use classifications, stating they would provide "entitlements" to the property owners and cause problems for the County. She stated Masonite should remain industrial and stated the County should be out looking for an industry to move to the site. She thought a prosperous business would be if the County formed a partnership to develop energy on the site and noted solar panels could be installed on all the concrete surfaces of Masonite. She also noted a new method of burning garbage to create energy without causing air pollution.

Judy Pruden offered a clarification on Brush Street that the RCHDC property was bracket on both sides by City of Ukiah properties. She also commented that developments need a recreational component because it was ludicrous to have 40+ residential units and no park areas.

[Break 11:23 AM – 11:32 AM]

The Commission began discussing the sections of the UVAP.

Commissioner Ogle noted the Table of Contents should have page numbers and suggested the document be numbered as a whole, not as each section.

Chairman Nelson commented that Section 2 had several good references about the importance of preserving agricultural land.

Commissioner Ogle commented on Section 2, page 7, vision 3, protected was misspelled and asked how a community could grow upward and conserve and enhance the views of the western hills.

Mr. Mobley thought the intent was to develop upwards to increase intensity of development on a site to remain compact and stated how that development would impact the viewscape would have to be analyzed at that time.

Commissioner Ogle noted there were typos throughout the document and asked on Section 3, page 5, for clarification about the difference of mixed use and mixed use general.

Mr. Mobley noted the appendix contained a better description of mixed use and felt the overall definition was that contained in the General Plan. He commented that the new mixed use designations have not been developed yet and would be part of the implementation.

Commissioner Little suggested a new Goal and Policy for Section 3, page 18; Goal, "Provide that industrial zoned areas are protected to provide opportunities for future jobs and economic development." Policy 1, "Develop a notification process to insure adjacent land owners in the community are informed of likely impacts associated with industrial development" Policy 2, "Develop and implement an ordinance which supports industrial development."

The Commission agreed to add the new goal and policy language.

Commissioner Little asked for clarification on Section 4, page 9, design guidelines and asked how the review would be conducted, by formation of a committee or Planning staff.

Mr. Mobley noted the implementation had not been fully developed, but thought an appointed group of community members, or in house review were likely.

Ms. Pruden explained the City of Ukiah's process for commercial guidelines.

Commissioner Calvert asked if the pictures in Section 4, pages 5 and 6 were of Ukiah.

Ms. Pruden noted the pictures were not of Ukiah.

Commissioner Calvert objected to using non-Ukiah pictures and asked that they be removed unless illustrating a point.

The Commission agreed to remove non-Ukiah pictures.

Commissioner Holtkamp commented on Section 4, page 9, parking requirements and permeable paving; she suggested adding information about parking lot drainage, under CD1.1d and CD1.2d.

Mr. Mobley noted the information was addressed in Section 6, page 15.

Commissioner Holtkamp thought if something was required, it should be mentioned.

Commissioner Little commented on Section 5, page 19 , under CT3.2d mitigation impact fees, that the source was not identified and stated the traffic nexus study was significantly flawed and should not be used.

Mr. Mobley agreed and noted he had submitted comments to Leonard Charles about the study and found the table is misleading.

Commissioner Holtkamp commented on Section 5, page 8, Table 5.2 that the through road connection from Oak Knoll to Stipp Lane or Highway 253 had been removed by Commission Action on the Gardens Gate subdivision and the goal should be changed.

Chairman Nelson commented that he believed a through connection was a future goal since the adjacent lands were all zoned SR and could be developed further. He supported keeping the reference in.

Commissioner Holtkamp noted she would be willing to leave the connection in as long as it was stipulated that when the road was created, a second exit for the Oak Knoll residents is made.

Commissioner Calvert agreed to keep the language in and add another exit for Oak Knoll and Spanish Canyon.

Mr. Mobley noted the connections were only "conceptual" at this point and would not be completed without future development.

Chairman Nelson asked staff to write a policy to add to Section 5, stipulating the creation of an exit for Oak Knoll residents when a through road is created.

Commissioner Calvert asked the definition of hook ramp on page 16.

Mr. Mobley noted it was a Caltrans term and thought it meant a shorter ramp that was not a full interchange.

Commissioner Calvert suggested removing "hook" to reduce design limitations or ramp improvement.

The Commission agreed to delete "hook" on page 16, Section 5.

[Lunch 12:10 PM – 1:01 PM]

Commissioner Ogle commented on Section 6, page 14, WW2.2a, proof of water standards that they were a great idea and asked how the Valley wide standards would be initiated and implemented.

Mr. Pedroni did not think implementation would be difficult or expensive since those standards had been adopted in the Coastal Zone. He noted a template would come before the Commission as part of the zoning code update before it was applied to development and should not create an extra layer for the developer.

Chairman Nelson noted he did not want to place extra cost on an applicant and asked if it was necessary to have all areas of the County in the water standards.

Commissioner Little noted that if inland water standards similar to the Coastal Groundwater maps were adopted, areas would be identified that do not require additional studies and, therefore, would not place further burden on the applicant.

Mr. Pedroni agreed that there were marginal or critical water areas on the map and there may be additional information in the Water Assessment.

Commissioner Calvert asked if WM 2.2a could be deleted and have WM2.2 for water standards.

Commissioner Little felt 2.2a should be kept because it provided more protection to neighbors.

Mr. Mobley noted that 2.2a was a policy implementation action.

The Commission agreed to keep both water policies; however Commission Calvert reserved the right to revisit the discussion.

Commissioner Holtkamp commented on Section 6, page 12 WM1, to maintain an increased water supply, and thought something should be added to budget money to accomplish the goal.

Mr. Pedroni thought that "maintain" referred to keeping the levels as they were, not maintenance for infrastructure.

Commissioner Holtkamp commented that a higher priority should be given to maintaining what already exists in the County versus new developments. She noted page 15, 4.1c Best Management Practices and impervious paving should be congruent throughout the plan.

Commissioner Hall commented on page 12 and 13, Russian River and groundwater underflow, that it was the jurisdiction of the State Water Board and that should be reflected 1.1c and 2.1. He also noted on page 6.10 of the Water Assessment that it states the current water is insufficient to implement any of the UVAP Alternatives through 2030.

Mr. Pedroni commented that the italics may be confusing in their present location, but felt the information was supportive and descriptive to the frame of the policy and could be moved to the introduction before the goals.

The Commission discussed how to word policy language to require a determination of groundwater.

Commissioner Little commented it may be prudent to send the recommendation to the Board and if they think the language is important, let the Board add a policy.

Mr. Pedroni noted the Draft EIR contained baseline information on the water districts, and noted that further analysis would be completed at the project specific level.

Chairman Nelson discussed urban runoff versus agricultural runoff and noted page 13 states oppose development projects that would increase the cost of agriculture.

Commissioner Holtkamp discussed water conservation on page 7 and noted those individuals that have conserved and have cut back are not recognized over time for their investments and thought there should be a way to prevent further reductions to those individual's.

Commissioner Ogle noted something similar to electric baseline rates could be used.

Mr. Mobley noted the County was not involved in restrictions imposed by water purveyors.

The Commission agreed to move the italics before the goals.

Commissioner Holtkamp discussed Section 7, page 9, EA1.1b offer incentives, and asked what could be offered since the County had no funds.

Commissioner Calvert suggested changing the language to "take advantage of programs".

Mr. Mobley noted there were nonmonetary incentives, such as expedited processing or reduced fees that could be given as incentives.

Commissioner Hall noted something was missing in the numbers from Section 7, page 10 policy 1.3a, that EA2 had not been included.

Mr. Pedroni stated staff would check the numbering and report back.

Commissioner Calvert noted the picture on page 5, Section 8 of the flooding at Talmage Road was very poor quality and could probably be replaced by a more recent photo of Hopland from 2005-2006.

Commissioner Little commented on page 9 in Section 8, that CalFire does not have a responsibility for structure fires and to delete "structural fire" from the sentence; on the next sentence he suggested that "assisted by flying tankers maintained at Ukiah Municipal Airport" be deleted. For the next sentence, Commissioner Little suggested adding "in addition the County mutual aid and state master mutual aid agreements provide access to additional emergency service assets" after these 4 agencies have mutual aid agreements... On the next sentence that begins Mendocino County Office Emergency Service..., he suggested changing "emergency" to "disaster" and adding "planning and" before coordination. Commissioner Little suggested adding another bullet on page 16, HS1.3a for Funding, and asked what a Valley wide emergency response team was in HS1.4b and if it was necessary.

Mr. Mobley suggested deleting HS1.4b.

Commissioner Little asked what the public service master plan entailed on HS1.4d, page 17 and if it pertained to County Departments or Special Districts.

Mr. Mobley thought the intent was for the County Departments to update their emergency manuals.

Commissioner Little suggest inserting "County" between individual and department for clarification.

Commissioner Calvert noted the hazard map on page 7 was an excellent map full of useful information.

Commissioner Ogle discussed Section 9, page 6, last paragraph and asked what "Ukiah Reach" meant or if it way a typo.

Mr. Pedroni noted it was a term for a river within the reach of the City.

{Mr. Gonzalez arrived at 1:41 PM}

Commissioner Ogle discussed page 17, OC3.3a, Williamson Act, and asked if the County should still be encouraging the creation or renewal of Ag Contracts.

Chairman Nelson noted State funding had been reduced, but not eliminated altogether.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that it was apparent the State would like to eliminate funding, but for now he suggested adding "until such time as State funding is eliminated" to the end of the sentence.

Commissioner Hall discussed Section 9, page 12, OC1 and suggested adding sustainable after replenishment and before use; page 13 OC1.1d, second bullet riparian management systems and suggested "adjacent" be deleted and asked if OC1.2 would be added to the gravel mining act.

Commissioner Calvert asked if removing adjacent would preclude development of a bridge and was fearful of removing words.

The Commission agreed to keep OC1.1d as is.

Mr. Gonzalez commented that the policies would not be added to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.

Commissioner Hall discussed page 16, Section 9, and thought the Ag Land Conversion Criteria and rules for change on OC3.1b were important.

Chairman Nelson also pointed out on page 6 that the plan says development should preserve open lands that absorb water, on page 11 that ag lands provide an economic benefit and provide a pastoral quality that defines the character of the Valley and on page 12 that more comprehensive measures to protect ag lands and preserve stability and longevity.

Commissioner Ogle asked about the transfer of development rights on page 12.

Mr. Pedroni noted it was addressed in the current General Plan, but the level of transfer of development was not discussed.

Mr. Mobley thought it was simpler to define as "allowing transfer of development rights to allow viable agriculture".

Commissioner Little discussed Section 10, page 9, HA 2.1c, and asked who performed the tribal notification and how that occurred.

Mr. Pedroni noted notification was common for discretionary permit and was provided by Planning and Building.

Commissioner Little noted there was no limitation to discretionary projects and asked if the County was requiring land owners or developers digging in their yards to notify tribes and have a cultural monitor on site.

Mr. Pedroni felt the intent was discretionary projects.

Commissioner Little suggested adding "discretionary projects are" to the first sentence and deleting "excavation is".

[Break 2:10 PM – 2:21 PM]

Commissioner Calvert noted Section 3, page 16 references the CLUP, but it is not typed out anywhere in the chapter and suggested a glossary of acronyms be provided in the document. She also asked that a "user friendly" font be used for the section numbers.

Chairman Nelson brought up an earlier discussion in Section 3, page 6 regarding Table 3.1 and asked how the different percentages of mixed use came about.

Mr. Mobley noted the zoning design could be clarified better upon adoption and commented that the descriptions at the end of the document reflect what was intended.

Chairman Nelson asked why mixed use Lover Lane, North State Street, Brush Street, etc were all different and how that was determined.

Mr. Pedroni suggested that the previous meetings and workshops "tailored" each individual site to a specific mixed use as an advantage so that each site was different.

Chairman Nelson thought that level of specificity was too much and actually restricted development.

Commissioner Ogle asked if the land use changes were discussed with the owners and who had selected the yes, no, portion of the list.

Mr. Mobley noted the bottom of the list offered some information and each Alternative was a "step down" in development from the previous choice.

Commissioner Ogle asked how much each property owner was involved in the decision.

Commissioner Little described what he could remember from the process, that each proposal was requested by a land owner, then the Commission had workshops to whittle down the applications, which were then submitted to the public hearing process to create the list that the Board approved in 2007 to go forward with the UVAP.

Mr. Gonzalez agreed that to his understanding, each land use change had gone through workshops, Planning Commission and Board meetings to come up with the preferred project, Alternative A and B, which were established in 2007 by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Little suggested accepting the preferred project in regards to classification of parcels and then if the Commission wished to review particular parcels individually, they could remove those individual parcels.

Commissioner Little made a motion to accept the preferred project, with the opportunity for the Commission to remove or amend the zoning designation of any of the 41 Land Use changes if they chose, seconded by Commissioner Ogle and carried by a voice vote of (5-1), with Commissioner Hall dissenting.

The Commission noted that by choosing the preferred project, 6 land use changes had been removed.

Commissioner Holtkamp had questions on parcel 20, 21, 22, 28, 29 and 40.

Commissioner Hall noted parcel 40 was the pumpkin patch.

The Commission agreed to leave 29 and 40 and noted that 28 was a second option for parcel 27, but preferred 27 as mixed use.

Commissioner Holtkamp did not object to leaving parcel 22, but thought 21 should be removed, with its prime ag soils and also suggested removed parcel 20.

Commissioner Little suggested excluding parcel 20 from discussion until the end noting it could take time.

Commissioner Hall suggested removing parcel 30.

Chairman Nelson remembered the previous discussion to include the parcel, that there were no agricultural operations on the property and it was adjacent to Rogina Heights, Deerwood, and El Dorado. He noted he would prefer to develop parcel 30 and keep the prime ag soils of parcel 21.

Commissioner Little also recalled the lengthy discussion, which was controversial, and ended in the 2007 Planning Commission choosing RR1PD, so there would be some input over the development.

The Commission decided to leave in parcel 30 and remove parcel 21.

Commissioner Hall asked about removing parcel 3.

Chairman Nelson suggested leaving it in since it was sandwiched between the highway and the river.

Commissioner Holtkamp and Calvert agreed, noting it was adjacent to downtown.

The Commission decided to leave in parcel 3.

Chairman Nelson was concerned that parcel 25, mixed use brush street triangle, and such low percentages of multifamily and noted if that density was higher, it could take pressure of other area.

Commissioner Little noted the letter from the City of Ukiah stating their plans to annex Brush Street and stated the zoning designation, ultimately wouldn't matter.

Mr. Mobley noted upon annexation, the County's zoning would disappear.

Ms. Pruden spoke about the issue and noted the parcel had been identified in the City's sphere, but would require processing by the Local Agency Formation Council (LAFCO) to demonstrate adequate levels of service and that a tax sharing agreement must still be created. She did not anticipate annexation before 2012.

The Commission discussed adding more mixed use density if Brush Street was annexed.

Mr. Mobley commented that the EIR had been developed according to the percentages in the plan and any increase would require amending the EIR.

Mr. Gonzalez agreed that the Commission could not add densities without redoing the EIR. He suggested leaving the zoning as indicated in the preferred project, which would not preclude the City from annexing the parcel.

Commissioner Holtkamp asked if the County would have enough housing to satisfy the settlement.

Chairman Nelson noted that if Masonite was included, there would be 48 acres available for the housing settlement.

Commissioner Little asked Ms. Hillegas if the County would get credit for Bush Street if it was annexed by the City.

Ms. Hillegas noted that if the County lost land, the amount of acres and total units would be lower.

Chairman Nelson reiterated that the requirement for the County would be less when Brush Street was annexed.

The Commission agreed to keep parcel 25, 27, 37 and 13.

Commissioner Little discussed his understanding of the Masonite site and vote on Measure A. He felt it was not against making the site commercial or mixed use, but about rejecting a proposal to go outside of the process. He stated that he would be comfortable leaving the site industrial if an operation would move to the site and not be opposed by the City and community. He suggested that any industry that attempted to move to the site would be met with opposition, both public and government and stated that he would hate to see the property sit there vacant for the next 30 years waiting for the "perfect project" to fill it up. He felt it was important to keep the options open and would prefer that the property remain industrial; however he recognized that staff's proposal of a mixed use overlay would leave the options open to the community. He stated that if the option to generate sales tax was excluded, there would be no funds to maintain any services.

Commissioner Calvert asked staff to explain the overlay process again.

Mr. Mobley discussed how the two separate zonings could be applied and that either use could be pursued. He stated an ordinance would be created so that a conceptual master plan was required so that any development would fit in the site and exist cohesively with the community.

Commissioner Calvert asked if priority was give to industrial or mixed use.

Mr. Gonzalez noted the development would require a plan to integrate the development and insure there was no conflict between uses.

Commissioner Holtkamp thought the parcel needed to stay solely industrial. She noted industries such as Masonite had produced jobs greater than that of retail shops which were "champions of the working poor". She was not convinced that mixed use was a good idea felt the site offered the potential for no new impacts from development since it had infrastructure and was already paved.

Since some Commissioners needed to leave early due to weather conditions, Chairman Nelson asked if the Commission would like to proceed with a smaller hearing body or continue the discussion to the next meeting.

Ms. Pruden cautioned the Commission on thinking that an ordinance would solve the problem and keep comprehensive planning in place. She noted that Airport Park Boulevard had been created by ordinance and was the "worst design default planning" that she had seen.

{Commissioner Hall left at 3:50 pm}

Upon motion by Commissioner Calvert, seconded by Commissioner Ogle and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), it is ordered to continue the Planning Commission Meeting to April 21, 2011.

5. **Matters from Staff.**

There were no matters from staff.

6. **Matters from Commission.**

There were no matters from the Commission.

7. **Approval of Minutes.**

Commissioner Ogle submitted corrections previously by email to the March 3, 2011 Planning Commission Minutes.

Upon motion by Commissioner Holtkamp, seconded by Commissioner Ogle and carried by a voice vote of (5-0), the March 3, 2011 Planning Commission Minutes are approved.

8. Matters from Public.

No one was present from the public who indicated a desire to address the Commission.

9. Adjournment.

Upon motion by Commissioner Calvert, seconded by Commissioner Ogle, and unanimously carried (5-0), IT IS ORDERED that the Planning Commission hearing adjourn at 3:52 p.m.