

# Woodland General Plan Steering Committee Meeting #4: Development Scenarios

---

*May 12, 2015*

## **SUMMARY NOTES**

### **Public Comments:**

1. Taxpayers Association rep: Isabel Isherwood, FEMA mapping includes properties that do not actually flood. Flood insurance is very expensive especially on top of property taxes. The city should build levees.
  - a. D&B note: This is a policy item for the plan and doesn't really affect the scenarios per se
2. Kathy Harriman: Yolo County Historic Society. People representing special interests, especially those that don't live in Woodland, should identify themselves. Also, she supports historic preservation.
3. Dan Dowling: Owns land on south, north, and east of town. Woodland is sabotaging its downtown by allowing so much development to occur on the periphery. Davis has done a much better job. Allowing growth on the east would detract.
4. David Storer/Knaggs family representative:
  - a. Need to have updated population base numbers (Annual Department of Finance numbers referenced)
  - b. Need to distinguish between direct fiscal impacts to the city versus developer-borne costs for the scenarios
  - c. In favor of North area/scenario 3 – close to DT, best generator of jobs, best assessed valuation, least prime agricultural land loss
  - d. Provide clarification on how much prime farmland is in each of the actual specific plan areas (numbers given combine SP areas – need to differentiate)
  - e. No policy constraints on growth; should be market-based
  - f. Land north of I-5 in north area should not be considered.
5. Chas Roberts, Conaway representative:
  - a. Some impacts are not unique to SP-2; Scenario 2 includes some of SP-1 area too (such as prime ag land in the MPRA); please split out impacts between specific plan areas. There is no prime ag land in SP-2
  - b. Developer would bear cost of odor mitigation, as well as many other costs
  - c. Want to have flexibility to respond to market at any time; no triggers; He feels that no developer will be willing to invest with a future development trigger that requires 80% of building permits in an area before new area can be considered.

- d. SP-2 benefit is that it requires flood protection before it can proceed and promotes infill of vacant industrial space
  - e. 900 acres already annexed
  - f. SP-2 has sewer and water benefits. City stands to benefit because of its land ownership
  - g. Surface water contribution
6. Jenny Lilge: Resident.
- a. Need to look at what is best for children.
  - b. In favor of slower growth. Borders have gotten larger resulting in loss of sense of community; preserving community character. Preserve the Downtown Core. The east area is too far out. Think of families driving all over town.
  - c. Also, can't guarantee that jobs will arrive. The residential is likely to occur and the non-residential is unlikely to occur.
7. Luma Shulman, PCP representative: Have a good relationship with City. They want to stay a long time and would be open to moving their sprayfields operations elsewhere in order to avoid future ag/urban conflicts.
8. Al Aldreti. Woodland Chamber: Maintain flexibility in GP; all the scenarios have pros and cons; don't pick just one scenario; put in flexible policies, keep the General Plan general.
9. Joe Romero Jr., Park and Recreation Commissioner: Supports Scenario 2: preserve ag land, relocate train tracks, profit for City from sale of 900 acres
10. Mike Beeman: owns land in MRPA. MRPA is in scenarios 2, 3, and 4; in the previous General plan approved in 1996 the MPRA was planned to be next; let's respect that.
11. Melanie Matthews, Turn of the Century/SLSP property owner representative and SL resident. Echoes Beeman. Finish what we started with SL. The MPRA is preplanned with \$18 mil of oversized infrastructure from SLSP. Connections ready to go. Need orderly growth. MPRA should be next – no current constraints to development and does not have a flood problem. Better leverages fiscal resources because of existing infrastructure, and fire, police and schools.
12. Arthur Beauchamp: Woodland resident.
- a. Guiding principles: Scenario 1 seems best. Infill priority helps the poor, with some of 3 or 4 thrown in. Infill priority helps retain the core of Woodland: "great bones" Does not require expensive sewer plant and uses least water.
  - b. Don't need to wait for flood solution. Allows decent job growth. Flood solution is important, but we need to be able to move forward without it.

**GPSC Member Comments:**

- 1. Mel Lasoya –
  - a. Would like to see better numbers for farmland and costs added for police and fire. (Sophie directed committee to police and fire numbers in the Development Scenario Document and committed to bringing back detailed ag loss numbers.)

- b. Even when developers pay for something there are still ongoing City costs and developer costs get passed on to future residents.
2. Evelia Genera:
- a. would not support scenario 1 or any of them unless they come with some kind of flood control. That is the highest priority – to protect people who are already in the city and impacted.
  - b. Can sympathize with the infrastructure problem in MPRA and Spring Lake.
  - c. Support a vibrant downtown. Wants to see a study on sustainability.
  - d. We need aesthetically pleasing gateways into town. I-5 is not a nice gateway.
  - e. Some combination of scenarios.
3. Michael Brady:
- a. Wants a GP that can accommodate growth and an EIR that allows as much tiering as possible. EIR should study all scenarios.
  - b. Flexibility; let the market dictate.
4. Don Sharp:
- a. Was involved in the last GP update in the 80s. Had to shift growth south and east at that time because landowners in the north weren't ready. Adjacent landowners to the south have made investments. So now to go back to the north seems out of place.
  - b. Some combo of scenarios 2 and 4 makes sense to him, since commuters/jobs are coming from Davis and Sacramento.
  - c. Also, allow for more units – in the 7-8000 range – market is inconsistent. Provide info on historic building permit issuances per year.
  - d. Move as consistently as possible from areas that were planned, SLSP, to other residential area; don't shift the focus.
  - e. Take advantage of freeway entrances/gateways.
  - f. Focus on relocation of rail and flood solution, as good jobs are dependent on this.
  - g. Partner with UCD on Ag research.
5. Kathy Trott:
- a. Likes Scenario 1, but unit count seems too restrictive. 6000 would be better. Central focus; infill.
  - b. Does not support growth east of CR 102. Follow through with Spring Lake.
6. Ken Viziri:
- a. Woodland healthcare is doing projections now too, and theirs are in the range of 0.9-1.2% annual pop growth. So, Scenario 1 growth might be too restrictive. Need to be opportunistic and promote more housing opportunities especially if Davis is limiting growth.

- b. Also, he's lived in other cities that have successfully reinvested in their downtowns – so it's possible (Denver – LODO example). Must address the flood situation, and invest in the City and Downtown.
7. Lisa Baker/Yolo County Housing:
- a. Likes Scenario 1 but too restrictive. After infill, some combination of growth. Preserving ag land should be a top priority. Remove train tracks. Prime opportunity in industrial core to focus on jobs related to agriculture innovation/industry per AB 32.
  - b. Create an ag hub. Potential is impaired by flood issue.
  - c. She believes the future is in families. Need good jobs and affordable homes. Need flexibility. Lots of underutilized land on the corridors. High jobs/housing ratio desired.
  - d. Put commercial at the gateways.
8. Maria Armstrong/WJUSD Superintendent:
- a. Flexibility in approach – with any buildout. Listened to SL area – they were promised a school. Parallel project, finish what we started with SL, but look at DT revitalization as well. Robust Downtown.
  - b. We are 8<sup>th</sup> year of a 10 year cycle.
9. John Murphy PC member (for Chris Holt on PC).
- a. Please consider Chris's comments that he submitted in writing.
  - b. Are there different flood solutions for different parts of town (nuances)? How does the solution for the north differ from that for the east?
  - c. Big fan of infill, but how do you actually make it happen?
  - d. How do you tie job growth to housing growth? Jobs are not coming in.
  - e. Big concern: cost of living for future residents. What we say are “developer costs” will get passed on to the homeowners. You can't just keep assessing people forever.
  - f. Schools are a big factor in Woodland's future. Schools need to improve to attract businesses: they are the “Elephant in the room.”
  - g. What type of development do we see at the gateways, what businesses would likely go there? Can we split out the SP acres within each scenario?
10. Al Eby: Downtown business owner:
- a. Supports flood solution and infill – but how realistic is it that we can do either? Supports market-driven growth. Likes Scenario 3. We are our own worst enemy – we put the service in the east instead of where the houses are. We don't pull people off the highway. All that is visible from highway is Denny's, Arco, and Costco.
  - b. Need to provide centralized facilities to serve the north so they don't have to drive across town. Allow walking to shopping not driving.
  - c. Not a fan of the 900 acres.

- d. If curtail growth, we may not be as attractive to business. Leans towards SP-3; wants infill.
- e. Spring Lake not necessarily the priority.
- f. Infrastructure improvements are also important for the established downtown area. Infill needs services and technology; needs walkability and sustainability.

**Areas of GPSC Consensus:**

- Infill is a high priority. GP should include policies that actually make this possible, and also acknowledge the constraints.
- Support downtown. Technology and infrastructure issues in DT. Walkability and bikeability, pedestrian friendly.
- Flood solution should be pursued no matter what growth scenario we end up with
- Moderate growth: more than 4,000 but less than 9,000 households
- More information is desired on exactly where and how much prime ag land there is in each specific plan area
- Focus on improving gateways – at the north and the south – regardless of where residential growth occurs
- Everyone more or less agrees that Spring Lake should proceed as a priority; less consensus (actually, generally less concern) over where it goes after that; though the vast majority of GPSC members did not speak in favor of growth in SP-2; most talked about north and south instead.