



COUNTY OF SOLANO GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

MIDDLE GREEN VALLEY COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #6

Solano Community College
Room 1646
4000 Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield

August 14, 2007
7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

MEETING SUMMARY

At the last of six community workshops, over 30 people came to review General Plan policies and options to go forward to the Citizen's Advisory Committee. Scott Greenwood-Meinert welcomed attendees for the last time and Adena Friedman facilitated two presentations from the public. After these presentations, Ms. Friedman led a discussion on revised policies. The revised policies were to be posted to the website by August 24th and community members were encouraged to send any additional comments to the County. All comments on the revised policies will be included in the packet to be given to the CAC

Presentations

Two attendees gave presentations.

- Jerry Gerald stated that there are two sides to planning for Middle Green Valley. There are those landowners that look to benefit from development, and then there are those who live nearby and may be adversely affected by development's impact on traffic and schools. He urged attendees to consider both sides.
- Herbert Hughes suggested creating a special planning overlay district with a special commission to make land use decisions in Middle Green Valley. If such a commission was created, he asked that local representation be included in such a group.

Policies

Adena Friedman led a discussion on the revised goal and policies. The following comments were received. Some comments were directly written into the goal and policies document and were posted to the website for further comment.

- Goal
 - Define "rural character"
 - What is it now?
 - Middle Green Valley used to be rural.
 - Rural character includes the existing characteristics.
 - The goal is fluid and flexible. Definitions of rural character have changed over time and the goal allows this flexibility to continue.

- Rural character is what can be seen when one is traveling on Green Valley Road past Eastridge Rd and before homes in upper Green Valley.
 - Use policies to pin down what rural character is.
 - Perception of rural character varies from person to person.
 - The word “Some”, referring to the amount of future development, doesn’t reflect how large an increase in potential development 400 units would be (300% increase).
 - The issue is not about how many units will be developed in Middle Green Valley, but where and how these units are developed.
- Policy 1
 - Houses are visible from the road – woodland/contours would not hide development.
 - Policies do not guarantee that development will occur, but do allow flexibility for development to possibly occur.
 - Houses in the hills are not a bad thing.
 - An attendee asked that the following language be considered as a policy statement: “Allow for reasonable rural residential hillside development where such land lends itself to clustered residential use through redesignation of these Middle Green Valley areas”
- Policy 2
 - Some meeting attendees suggested adding: “[capable of] producing economically-sustainable high yields of crops”. Another meeting attendee responded by saying that “we are protecting some resources and sacrificing some resources.”
- Policy 3
 - Don’t create more access for wildlife. Be careful where a corridor is placed in order to not adversely affect gardens, vineyards, and other agriculture.
 - Delete the term “green corridor”.
 - It’s very important to have place for wildlife to move. Don’t create a barrier to their movement.
- Policy 4
 - Provide credit for good agricultural land in order to give incentives to those that want to continue farming.
- Policy 7
 - Economic aid could be provided to farmers using development credits that could be sold as part of a transfer of development rights program.
 - New development could help pay for preservation. One tool suggested by an attendee was using Mello-Roos payments
- Policy 8

- The transfer of development rights program, as it is currently being described, would be implemented within Middle Green Valley only. Some said to not limit the transfer of development rights program to Middle Green Valley, but consider a countywide program.
- Some said the 400-unit number was too low and some said it was too high.
- What type of units would the 400 be (i.e., density, multi-family vs. single-family units)?
- Change “400 units” to 1 unit /5 acres or “vs. 147 as allowed under current GP/zoning”
- Is there a way to keep the tax base of additional development in the valley, within Middle Green Valley?
- General Plan redesignation determines the value of development rights.
- How would the preservation of open space be paid for?
- A lot of the Green Valley floor is not prime agricultural land.

Process Questions

After the discussion on the policies a few additional comments and questions were brought forward.

- Someone stated that they felt the process was biased and that the time was too short. There was a request to add another meeting. County staff stated that the County had budgeted for only six meetings and that Middle Green Valley had the most meetings of any of the special study areas.
- Some would like another chance to review policies. The County offered that the policies would be posted on the website, sent in email, and mail to attendees. They stated that they would receive written comments, sent in mail or email and these comments would be forward to the CAC.

The website for Middle Green Valley Special Study Area is:

<http://www.solanocountygeneralplan.net/SPA-MiddleGreenValley.htm>

Middle Green Valley

SPECIAL STUDY AREA MEETING # 6

PRESENTATIONS

- JERRY G - TWO SIDES TO
ISSUE - PROP OWNERS, TRAFFIC SCHOOLS
- HERBERT HUGHES - ADD SPECIAL
PLANNING OVERLAY DIST, REPRESENTS
FROM LOCAL "PLANNING SPECIAL
COMMISSION" INCLUDE LOCAL PEOPLE
A GO TO

POLICIES

- DEFINE "RURAL CHARACTER"
- WHAT IT IS NOW?
- THINK RURAL A WHILE AGO

= RURAL CHARACTER IS THE
EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS

- GOAL IS FLUID DEFINITION
CHANGES -
- WHO WILL PAY FOR MAINT
OF OS
- PAST EASTRIDGE & BEFORE
HOMES
- USE POLICIES TO PIN DOWN
WHAT RURAL CHAR IS
- "SOME" DOESN'T REFLECT
300% WREASE
- NOT ABOUT HOW MANY UNITS
BUT WHEREBY HOW DONE
- PERCEPTION VARIES FROM
PER-TO-PER
- HOUSES ARE VISIBLE FROM
ROAD - WOODLAND / CONTROLS
WOULD NOT HIDE DEU

□ FEEL THAT PROCESS IS
BIASED / TIME WAS TOO
SHORT - NEED TO ADD
ANOTHER MTG

- WOULD LIKE ANOTHER
CHANCE TO REVIEW
- POST ON WEBSITE &
REQ WRITTEN COMM
TO BE SENT IN MAIL/
EMAIL
- PROCESS FOR CAC? MULT-
MTG. SEE THEM ALL

CITY GENERAL

- WE ARE PROT SOME & SACRIFICING SOME "CAPABLE"
- POLICIES DO NOT GUARANTEE DEV. ^{OR} ~~OUT~~
- A LOT OF GV FLOOR IS NOT PRIME AG
- TDR FOR MGV ONLY
- DO NOT LIMIT TDR TO MGV COUNTY WIDE
- ECONOMIC AID COULD BE W/CREDITS
- NEW DEV TO PAY BELLA ROOBS TO HELP AG
- IS THERE A WAY TO KEEP TAX BASE IN VALLEY
- 400 IS WAY TOO LOW/ TOO HIGH
- WHAT TYPE OF UNIT
- QUEST. REGARD PROCESS & WHETHER CAN TAKE OUT
- CHANGE 400 → UNIT/SACRES OR VS 147 NOW ZONED TDR
- ALLOW FLEXIBILITY FOR DEV.
- A RAGSDALE - AREAS TO ALLOW FOR REASONABLE RR HILLSIDE DEV. WHERE SUCH LAND LENDS ITSELF TO CLUSTERED RESIDENTIAL USE THRU REDES OF THIS MID GV ACRES
- HOUSES IN HILLS NOT A BAD THING
- HOW TO PAY FOR PRES OF OS
- DON'T CREATE MORE ACCESS FOR WILDLIFE, BE CAREFUL WHERE PLACED TO NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT VINEYARDS, ETC
- STRIKE "GRN CORRID"
- ITS VERY IMPORTANT DON'T CREATE BARRIER TO MOVEMENT
- GET CREDIT FOR "BEAUTY DIRT"