COUNTY OF SOLANO
MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY
LAND USE PLAN

County Administrative Center
First Floor Multi-Purpose Room
675 Texas Street, Fairfield

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF The Middle Green Valley Citizen's Advisory Committee April 13, 2009

The regular meeting of the Middle Green Valley Citizen's Advisory Committee was held Monday, April 13, 2009, in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas St., Fairfield, CA 94533.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Craig Gillespie, Bob Hager, Herb Hughes, Sarah Lindemann, Nancy Nelson, Anthony Russo and James Wiley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Mayben

OTHERS PRESENT: Birgitta Corsello, Director, Resource Management; Mike Yankovich, Planning Manager, Resource Management; Matt Walsh, Principal Planner; Resource Management; and Kristine Letterman, Administrative Secretary, Resource Management; Brendan Kelly, Project Manager, Hart Howerton; Amie MacPhee, Principal, Hart Howerton; Teifion Rice-Evans and Ashleigh Kanat, Economic Planning Systems John Wastaff, Wagstaff Associates

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda**
4. **Review and Approve March 23, 2009 minutes**

Matt Walsh briefly called the meeting to order and took roll call. He asked for public comments that were not on the Agenda and asked for an approval of the March 23, minutes. They were approved without comment. He then turned the meeting over to Brendan Kelly (Hart Howerton).

- Mr. Kelly encouraged the participation of CAC members at Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings.
- Mr. Kelly began the meeting by stating that TDR's start with open space and conservation. The proposed plan includes three times the existing amount of agricultural lands, with approx. $10million budgeted for revitalization of agricultural lands.

- The Conservancy may be managed by landowners, neighbors, and advocacy groups; Blue Ridge Oaks is an example of a successful conservancy, with open space held by homeowners.
- Herb Hughes commented that the proposed neighborhood produce stand should be consistent with its context, keeping with agricultural vernacular. He also stated that this has the potential to be something extraordinary and can serve as an instant transformative element.

5. **Review of General Plan MGV goal, policies, and implementation regulations**

- Mr. Kelly began the presentation by reviewing the general plan goal and policies, and reviewed how each policy was addressed by Alternative Plan #2 (See page 25 of Community Design Workbook).
- A question was asked about what will be done to stop existing parcels from further subdividing. Mike Yankovich replied that the existing 5 acre rural residential zoning still applies for existing parcels.
- Mr. Kelly discussed the notion of "use it or lose it" approach, where unused units be redistributed amongst landowners participating in the TDR program. The CAC agreed that this approach seemed reasonable.

6. **Transfer of Development Rights and Alternative Mechanisms in MGV**

- Mr. Kelly presented a land value/unit comparison chart, reviewing land values associated with 4 scenarios (approved 1980 General Plan zoning, 100 units, 200 units, 300 units, and 400 units).
- Herb Hughes commented that momentum is needed, as well as design guidelines and standards. We need to take advantage of economies of scale, provide consistency, and ensure that the Plan reflects a single vision and should be executed by someone who shares the level of concern. He believes the Conservancy concept outweighs the number of units and that we should consider the future of agriculture and viability for community.
- Nancy Nelson asked for clarification on the definition of compound lots (i.e. allowed buildings, number of detached buildings). She commented that we need to avoid negative impacts from higher number of units, and address sufficient infrastructure.
- Sarah Lindemann commented that we must identify incentives for landowners for to achieve such a large percentage of open lands.
- Bob Hager commented that the unit total doesn't necessarily need to go up, but lot sizes can increase to increase value.
- Herb Hughes and Nancy Nelson both liked the mix of lot types presented.
- Craig Gillespie finds that the quality of the project surpasses expectations. He understands the landowners' concerns that the open lands are too large. He thinks the plan achieves a good balance, addressing views and agriculture, and providing high quality products. He encouraged everyone to think about the potential of what we are getting.

- James Wiley commented that there is a need for compound lots, as people need help running agricultural lands.
- Anthony Russo commented that he stands behind the plan 110%, but has some concerns regarding the financial analysis. He believes that he can get infrastructure and a tentative map for less than $400k (as shown in the land value/ unit comparison chart) and can sell in 3-4 years in a recovered market. He believes there is a need to increase incentives for landowners in order to justify the participation of landowners. He sees a lot of risk and effort involved in the plan, only to end up in the same place. The plan needs flexibility in order to work, and it's important to weigh risks and rewards. He commented that efficiencies lie in the use of one developer, and the plan's vision cannot be accomplished with 5-6 developers.
- Mr. Kelly responded to Anthony's comments, identifying the potential risks associated with the existing approved General Plan zoning, including the lack water and wastewater treatment, the constraints of the floodplain, and potential opposition from neighbors.

7. **Open Land: Conservation and Preservation**

- A question was asked about what mechanism will start the open space conservancy. Mr. Kelly responded that developers will be more easily attracted if landowners are able to obtain a tentative map and establish some infrastructure. The Specific Plan will provide direction and incentives for landowners as well.

8. **Developed Land: Quantities and Qualities (see Community Design Workbook and Handout).**

9. **Schedule Update for EIR, Specific Plan and Other Milestones**

- Mr. Wagstaff reviewed the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scoping requirements, including the Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting. He stated that the EIR requirements are driven by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), dictating the process, content, public input, certification, and implementation. The Notice of Preparation will be sent out to local and regional agencies, as well as nearby cities, inviting comments regarding the scope and content of the EIR. The Notice of Preparation is anticipated to be released at the end of April/early May.
- The Scoping Meeting will be led by the Planning Commission and is anticipated to be held in early May.

10. **Homework**

11. **Adjourn to next CAC meeting**
    - May 4, 2009