



MINUTES

Tuesday, April 25, 2017

5:30 P.M.

SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Council Chambers
211 Hillcrest Avenue
Marina, California

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL & ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM: (City Council, Airport Commissioners, Marina Abrams B Non-Profit Corporation, and Redevelopment Agency)

PRESENT: Council Members: Nancy L. Amadeo, Gail Morton, Frank O'Connell, Mayor Pro Tem/Vice Chair David W. Brown, Mayor/Chair Bruce C. Delgado (late, arrived at 5:35pm)

PRESENT: Planning Commission Members: Katherine Biala, David Bielsker, Tim Ledesma (late, arrived at 6:20 pm), Adam Urrutia,

ABSENT, Planning Commission Member: Chairperson David Burnett (Excused)
3. MOMENT OF SILENCE & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (Please stand)
4. OTHER ACTIONS:
 - a. City Council and Planning Commission receive presentation and Discussion of the Marina Municipal Airport Business and Industrial Park/University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center (UC MBEST) Center Specific Plan.

Presentation by Frank Hazelton, LSA Associates.

Planning Commission/Council Questions followed the presentation. The proposed extension of the airport runway included on 1-13 was discussed. It was explained that this was not a part of this Plan, however, the runway is still on track to be extended at some future date. This would provide opportunities for larger aircraft to land at the airport.

Issues relating to clarifying Map 1-19, the General Plan Land Use Map, were also discussed for clarification.

The use of the FORA Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG) in the development of the Specific Plan was then discussed. The consultant indicated that RUDG were utilized in the development of the Specific Plan Development Standards and Design Guidelines. There was clarification that changes could be made to the document.

Discussion of a charter school then took place and there were questions as to the status of schools that were already located within the park as the Specific Plan was adopted. Steve Matarazzo explained that schools meets the needs of the public service mission of the UC- Santa Cruz. Jeff Crechriou explained that a school of up to 300 per acre may be considered. Cal-trans would be the reviewing agency of that use.

The use of floor area ratios (FAR) was raised. Figures 2.4-1 and 2.4-2 were specifically referenced. The use of a .30 FAR is typical of an industrial park. The MBEST Master Plan was the source of much of the information included in the Plan.

The inclusion of four-foot-wide sidewalks, which were discussed in connection with the development of the site, was also questioned. The consultant explained that staff had raised this issue, feeling that such a width was too narrow. This was another standard identified in the MBEST Master Plan, but it can be altered to allow for wider sidewalks.

The issue of how things have changed since the 1997 Master Plan was then discussed. Mr Mattarazo indicated that the Specific Plan expands the types of uses to include light industrial. While the Master Plan identified the uses as exclusively UC research, that has been expanded, recognizing that there wasn't sufficient market to make the Park exclusively a UC research facility. He explained that it had originally been thought that our area would become an overflow for development in Silicon Valley, but that hasn't happened. He explained that the thought now is that the growth in the area will be more locally generated. He explained that there were parties looking at the sale of the 50-acre west campus. The UC property will be for sale and for ground lease.

On page 1-14 and on the following page of the background section of the Specific Plan, it indicates that the Final Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared which included potential civilian reuse of the Army property. This included a decision regarding reuse of the former Fort Ord property by UC for a "multi-institutional center for science, technology, education and policy center to be built on approximately 970 acres. Discussion occurred around restrictions concerning the transfer of the property and how based on the uses defined, UC was not required to contribute to the mitigation of the impacts nor pay the 50% of land sales to FORA that other entities were required to do. While recognizing the need to expand uses, the issue of not paying the CFD for the mitigation nor the 50% of land sales to FORA was raised as a concern if the uses were no longer specific to the uses originally outlined for the property.

The reference to a golf course on page 1-26 was also raised as an indicator that the plan needed to be updated. It was clarified that this is background information from the general plan. There was then a question about whether or not the Specific Plan could deviate from the General Plan. Staff explained that the General Plan would need to be updated.

The discussion then turned to the variety of uses proposed in the Specific Plan and what impact the inclusion of hotel and retail space might have on drawing business from the downtown area and the new Dunes Commercial development. Additionally, the need for required standards that will protect the City was also discussed. The City Attorney indicated that there was new information presented tonight in learning that UC will be selling the land rather than leasing it and that should be addressed in the Plan. She explained that there are different zoning implications when land is sold as opposed to being leased. If UC were to retain ownership, there would be more control of what was developed than if the property is sold.

Section 5.6 Financing Capital Improvements was discussed as to its brevity. The Consultant indicated that this was a placeholder and would be expanded to provide information about alternatives for financing.

There was discussion about what areas the Specific Plan. Steve Matarazzo referred to Figure 1.4-2 and explained that the Central North Campus is the area covered under the Specific Plan. It was clarified that the reference to a golf course could be replaced with open space or landscaping. It was also pointed out that the General Plan needed to be amended to reflect the Specific Plan and that the Zoning Map should include an SP for the area.

The question was raised as to why the process for developing the Specific Plan had taken so long. It was explained that the two entities working together have priorities that don't always correspond. Both entities have had big staffing changes as well and these transitions have affected how the process.

There was discussion about the need to include information about the FORTAG trail system and the need for an interim and long-term alignment. The location for the trail would primarily be on the eastern edge of the property in the linear green space located on Figure 2.4-2. There needs to be recognition that the trail may need to extend out of that area, depending on slope. The Specific Plan would be a 100' buffer along Blanco Road.

The issue of need to amend the General Plan to accommodate the uses of the Specific Plan was adopted, along with the need to amend the zoning map to include a Specific Plan designation.

There was clarification that there could be property sales or ground lease on all of this property. The UC has Covenants, Codes and Restrictions that were recorded by UC, in addition to the Specific Plan at this point. Mr. Matarazzo indicated that all developers would be subject to the Community Facilities fees.

There was a question as to whether or not the UC Master Plan was adopted. It was indicated that it was not.

There was discussion about cannabis related sites at UC-MBEST. Mr. Haselton explained that if the land use was permitted on the use chart, it would be allowed. The City Attorney explained that cannabis research being directed by the UC may be able to occur and would not be subject to City regulations. She further explained that the land uses would be under the adopted City Ordinances related to cannabis. While the current ordinance does not allow cannabis uses, the City Council is discussing options that would allow such uses.

The question of why the streets were so wide was discussed. It was explained that the wider streets were needed to accommodate larger vehicles associated with potential industrial uses. In most cases, the streets have already been installed.

The Master Plant list was next discussed. It was requested that consideration be given to primarily native plant material. The Consultant indicated that those changes could be made.

The compatibility of land uses north of the runway with the Park was raised. The consultant indicated that there wasn't information concerning land uses north of the runway, which made such a consideration difficult. Jeff Crechriou indicated that the Airport Land Use Commission, which is a recommending body, reviews land uses for compatibility with the airport. The same question was asked about the habitat reserved to the west of the runway. Mr. Crechriou indicated that the area was not specifically addressed in the Specific Plan, other than to mention it is describing uses in the area. The question of raising strawberries was discussed and whether they could be grown in habitat reserve. Mr. Crechriou indicated that they could not. Mr. Long indicated that many of the questions raised would be addressed in the Airport Master Plan Update, which covers other areas.

Clarification of standards and guidelines was requested. Mr. Haselton explained that a standard is required while a guideline provides direction of what is envisioned. Staff was directed to review the standards and guidelines to ensure they represent the best interest of the City.

Under 1.5.1.9 and 1.5.1.10, relating to the Marina Municipal Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (2006) and the Marina Municipal Airport Master Plan Update (2018), it indicates that these documents are consistent with the proposed Specific Plan. Staff was directed to review these to ensure that such is the case.

The Substantial Conformance Section (5.3) was then discussed. The specific concern was the extent to which modifications may be approved and what really constitutes a minor modification. There was concern that the language went so far as to allowed modifying land uses. Examples of the use of Substantial Conformance being used in completed projects that resulted in less than desirable outcomes were cited. The concern was that the language be tightened to better specify what constituted a minor modification. There was further discussion about UC's ability to approve minor modifications of property under its control and whether this extended to properties they owned with intent to sell or lease; or, properties that were specifically utilized as part of UC's educational/research mission. It was felt that this language was unclear. Mr. Matarazzo stated that the UC would probably be fine with eliminating the Substantial Conformance Section, but he felt that it may be helpful for planning staff to address minor issues. The concern with not allowing for any minor changes was also mentioned.

The intent of Appendix C was brought up for discussion. It was felt that the language regarding deed restrictions may be a problem for the City. Mr. Matarazzo explained that the intent was that at the point the property was sold, it would be under the jurisdiction of the development and use standards and guidelines of the Specific Plan.

Mayor Delgado concluded the meeting.

4. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 8:07 PM

Anita Sharp, Deputy City Clerk

ATTEST:

Bruce C. Delgado, Mayor