




Planning Commission Staff Report

Date: March 9, 2021

TO: Chair Quinn and Planning Commissioners

FROM: Raffi Boloyan, Community Development Director 

SUBJECT: **Addition Correspondence for March 9, 2021 Planning Commission Adoption Hearing of Dixon General Plan 2040 and Associated Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)**

Attached are three additional letters received after the last distribution of public comments in the Monday 3/8 Memo

ATTACHMENTS

- Letter from Old own Neighbors, dated 3/9/21
- Letter, Submittal of Comments, and Additional Comments received from Ms. Ginger Emerson on 3/9/21
- Letter received from Ms. Shirley Humphrey on 3/9/21

March 9, 2021

City of Dixon Planning Commissioners
600 East A Street
Dixon, California 95620

Dear Commissioners:

As members of an informal neighborhood group known as the Old Town Neighbors, we have a number of comments regarding the proposed 2040 General Plan. Before proceeding, we would like to introduce our group to those who may not be familiar with our activities.

Background

Formed well over a decade ago, one of our missions has been to keep our neighbors informed of land use issues that pertain to the older residential areas that surround downtown. A number of years ago at the direction of a former Planning Commission, the City's Community Development Director kept us updated on a variety of land use matters. For example, during the lengthy Omnibus V Zoning Amendment process, representatives of our group met regularly with the Director. At the request of our representatives, the Community Development Director also held a series of at-large neighborhood meetings pertaining to the proposed zoning amendments as related to our neighborhood.

Over the years in an ongoing effort to keep the neighborhood informed and involved, members of our group have also collected signatures on numerous petitions pertaining to land use matters. Petitions have been presented to the Planning Commission, the Transportation Advisory Commission, the General Plan Committee and the City Council.

Comments about the General Plan process

We were surprised to learn that the City is moving forward with the General Plan Update process while restrictions on social gathering are still in place. Many of the Covid 19 orders have not been lifted; and as a result, we have been unable to go door to door to gather signatures related to the 2040 General Plan Update. In an August, 2020 letter to one of our members, the City Attorney acknowledged the right of the people to petition their government and offered assurance that those rights would not be forfeited.

We would also point out that sustaining public interest in a General Plan Update process that has been underway since 2007 has been problematic. We have documentation from the initial

years of the process which highlights far greater community involvement than in later years (2015 onward). In that regard, a former Community Development Director publicly acknowledged that the workshop at Anderson School was poorly promoted and attended. At the time, more workshops were promised but never came to pass. We would also add that several members of the GPAC were highly critical of the Community Survey citing very limited participation by “disadvantaged” groups within Dixon.

In the event that the Commission decides to proceed with recommendations to forward the Plan to the City Council without benefit of input collected by petition, we have summarized a few of the issues that we know to be of the greatest concern to many of the residents of Old Town.

Comments Related to Density

From its beginnings, our Old Town Neighbors’ group has raised objections to any plan that would increase density in our neighborhoods. For instance, we collected signatures on numerous occasions opposing the designation of the downtown residential neighborhoods as part of a Priority Development Area. We raised concerns about increased density in the planned mixed-use zones in downtown. We were also involved when residents objected to an increase in the number of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s) per lot in our area. Other examples of our participation are likewise documented in the public record.

Increased density impacts the neighborhood in many undesirable ways, including more traffic, parking problems, increased noise, sanitation issues, public safety issues and historic preservation. We would add that certain of the census tracts discussed in the General Plan under Environmental Justice are in our downtown neighborhoods.

Specifically, designating planned mixed-use corridors in the downtown area should be re-examined. Since the proposed Plan extends mixed use along the North First Street corridor, we see no reason to impact areas of Old Town with a designation that does not reflect the preferred single family use of land along sections of North and South Second Street, East and West Mayes Street and South First Street. For instance, three new single-family homes have recently been constructed along East Mayes and South Second Streets. Another historic home on South First Street has been converted back to a single-family residence, as has a home on East A Street adjacent to the back of the Catholic Church. Clearly, the market and the community support the area as residential rather than mixed use. We would add that public documents reveal that there was opposition to the planned mixed-use designation in 1993, particularly in regard to extending mixed use zoning on South A Street between Mayes and Broadway. The older homes on that block are significant in their contribution to the historic character of the downtown area and their continued use as single family residences should be encouraged.

We want to reiterate our longstanding concern that increasing density with plans such as the Priority Development Area (PDA) could lead to displacement of “disadvantaged” residents, particularly in certain census tracts in the downtown area. The smaller, fixer upper homes have long provided an opportunity for members of those “disadvantaged” groups to obtain home ownership. Similarly, the smaller, older homes have served as affordable rental housing for other “disadvantaged” families. Encouraging the investment in greater density may well lead to the demolition of too many of those older, fixer uppers, thereby denying other “disadvantaged” families similar opportunities.

We would point out to new members of the Planning Commission, that allowing unsprinklered ADU’s was opposed at the State level by firefighter associations. Legislation at the time allowed the City to limit areas where ADU’s would be allowed. In addition to the fire hazard issues, shared sewer laterals are common in the older areas of town and should be a consideration as to where ADU’s are located.

While we strongly support the preservation of agricultural land, it shouldn’t come at the expense of disrupting and destroying long established neighborhoods that are home to many disadvantaged families. Rather than using infill to accommodate density, we would ask that you take another look at new developments such as the Southwest in terms of its inadequate contribution to meeting multiple family and affordable housing demands.

Comments on Noise

While the older residential neighborhoods near downtown are zoned as planned mixed use and multiple family (RM1 and RM2), in reality the area was historically single family homes. Thankfully, in recent years, new affordable single-family homes have been constructed on numerous vacant lots throughout the downtown residential area. Taking that into account, we would lobby that noise levels should be in keeping with allowances for single family neighborhoods.

In regard to noise, we also have concerns about some of the uses proposed for downtown Dixon. Economic development of the downtown area should take into account the close proximity of residential uses. Increased traffic, overflow parking into neighborhoods, frequent large events, live entertainment, etc. all contribute to increased noise for residents in the vicinity. The quality of life of those residents shouldn’t be sacrificed for the sake of economic interests. Many residents of the area do not have the economic means to escape new sources of noise by moving to more privileged neighborhoods such as the Southwest Development area.

Make no mistake, we would like to see downtown thrive. We only ask for consideration of those who live nearby.

Comments on Public Safety

We have already discussed our concerns about unsprinklered Accessory Dwelling Units in our neighborhood. We would also point out that our older residential neighborhoods, as well as the downtown commercial area, are more vulnerable to fire and earthquake hazards. For that reason, we continue to question the location of both fire stations on the north and west sides of the railroad tracks. Even with the eventual completion of the Parkway Boulevard overcrossing, emergency access to our older downtown neighborhoods and the commercial downtown area, is restricted by the bottleneck created where South First Street drops from four lanes near the Brookfield and Valley Glen subdivisions to two lanes near the fairgrounds. Similarly, there is a bottleneck on North First Street entering the downtown area. Depending on vehicular traffic and the rail activity at the crossing on First Street, emergency access to our neighborhoods could be delayed or cut off. Years ago, the City had fire stations located on both sides of the railroad tracks providing all residents of town better access to emergency services.

We are also alarmed to learn that certain census tracts in the downtown area are among the most impacted by environmental hazards including air, noise and water pollution. No doubt, density exacerbates some of those hazards and would be more appropriate in newer areas of town.

Comments on Traffic

We would suggest that there has been one unspoken “silver lining” to the pandemic lockdown. With schools not in session, our neighborhoods have experienced a significant reduction in traffic. With the high school and elementary schools in or near our older neighborhoods reopening, traffic will once again become a major issue. The relocation of the junior high school to the campus of the old high school will compound the problem, as will the construction of more and more new homes to the South and West of our Old Town neighborhoods.

Not long ago, the City reduced the Level of Service (LOS) in order to avoid widening of streets. The reality for our older neighborhoods meant accepting a further decline in our quality of life and public safety associated with ever increasing traffic (LOS issues) OR sacrificing the historic character of our neighborhoods and losing much needed on street parking by widening streets to accommodate more traffic. The idea that the opening of the Parkway Boulevard overcrossing will alleviate the traffic issues is nothing more than a pipe dream. It won't address traffic created by more and more families from throughout town needing to access the junior high school.

Traffic in the downtown area diverting onto local residential streets has been another longstanding concern as it relates to public safety and quality of life for residents of the downtown neighborhoods. The 1993 General Plan addressed that issue and we would suggest that goals to limit such traffic diversion be included with the current Plan.

Comments on Historic Preservation:

We would request that you to review the 1993 General Plan in terms of its emphasis on historic preservation. The draft 2040 General Plan is very lacking in provisions to encourage the preservation of our historic structures and homes. We were unable to find an appendix to the 2040 Plan with an inventory of historic homes and structures in Dixon. Over the course of time since the 1993 General Plan, many more homes should have been added to that inventory. Any claims to maintain the small-town character of Dixon are disingenuous without an emphasis on the historic preservation of the older neighborhoods surrounding downtown Dixon and their contribution to the City's charm and uniqueness.

The history of the Carnegie Library (as presented in the General Plan) should recognize the group that saved the historic resource from demolition. While the Women's Improvement Club was instrumental in securing a Carnegie Library for Dixon, the Dixon Carnegie Library Preservation Society formed many years later in order to ensure that the Carnegie was spared from demolition and took its rightful place on the National Register of Historic Places. For the City to recognize one group for its contribution and slight another is inappropriate.

Conclusion

While we have highlighted a number of longstanding concerns shared by many of our neighbors, we would respectfully suggest that you hold off on recommending the General Plan Update to the City Council until such time as groups such as ours can exercise our right to petition our government.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Old Town Neighbors

March 9, 2021

Members of the Planning Commission
City of Dixon
600 East A Street
Dixon, California 95620

Re: Agenda Item 9.1 Public Hearing on the General Plan Update

Dear Commissioners:

Please find attached my response to the General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report that I submitted in August of 2020.

I am also providing comments that I presented as a GPAC member in August of 2018 following the last meeting of the Committee. The comments are in a rough, note format and the policy and action references correspond with the version of the General Plan that was discussed at that meeting. The yellow highlighting was added to mark issues that community members (who reviewed the notes) considered of utmost significance. It is my hope that you will explore whether issues raised at that time have been reconciled in the version of the Plan that is before you this evening.

As a member of GPAC, I am concerned that the Committee has not met for over two and a half years. For whatever reason we have not been dismissed and are still required to complete a Form 700. The requirement to submit Form 700 would imply that we are still actively involved as a Committee in the General Plan process. That has not been the case since the Fall of 2018. Even at that time, certain members had resigned and other had not attended a number of the meetings, up to and including, the August, 2018 meeting.

As mentioned in the introduction to my comments on the Draft Environmental Report of August 2020, I am also very concerned that the City is proceeding with a Plan that will impact residents for the next 19 years without affording them the opportunity to address and engage with the Planning Commission at a physical meeting. As established members of the Planning Commission should be well aware, many members of the public want the opportunity to address matters of significance before their elected and appointed bodies at physically open meetings, rather than virtually by ZOOM.

I would also note that the new City website has been very difficult for some community members to navigate. It is unfortunate that the debut of the new website coincides with community members attempts to access information relevant to your agenda this evening.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments and the attachments I am providing.

Ginger Emerson

August 24, 2020

Mr. George Osner, Contract Planner
City of Dixon
600 East A Street
Dixon, California 95620

Re: General Plan Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Osner:

We are living in unprecedented times.

- Quoting from a news article of August 20, 2020, “Besides having the most COVID 19 cases nationwide, California’s crises this week include dozens of major wildfires and surprise power outages as residents endure a blistering heat wave.”
- Another news article dated August 19, 2020 points out that “America’s parents are going through a year of tough choices and it isn’t getting any easier. With the school year starting, many have to choose between their jobs and staying home to take care of their kids. ... One in five working age adults is unemployed because COVID 19 upended their child care arrangements.”
- A research article published on July 10, 2020 found that “The results shed light on both the financial fragility of many small businesses, and the significant impact COVID 19 had on these businesses in the weeks after the COVID 19 disruptions began. The results also provide evidence on businesses’ expectations about the longer-term impact of COVID 19...”
- In yet another news article, a Southern California resident is quoted in an e-mail to the council and city officials in regard to restrictions on physically participating in local government meetings that “it’s mind bogglingly disrespectful of public opinion and demonstrates disregard for the public.”

Yet, after years and of years of delay on a General Plan update, City of Dixon officials seem to believe that now is the right time to expect public comment on the nearly 600-page draft Environmental Impact Report. Contrary to information claiming that the kick-off for the preparation of the plan was in 2014, a summary report presented to the

City Council a number of years ago states: “On December 11, 2007, the City Council awarded a consultant services contract to Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC) to prepare an update to the City’s General Plan. Completion of the General Plan Update was anticipated to take two years.” The names of a number of those who were appointed to the General Plan Committee at that time, appear on the proposed plan as presented today.

SO WHY NOW...

- Long before we were facing the catastrophic times that we are living through now, a former Community Development Director publicly acknowledged that little real effort had been made to engage the public.
- And, for months, the City claimed to have lost written public comment presented at General Plan meetings. Likewise, during GPAC meetings, staff did not acknowledge receipt of a letter from an attorney representing a special district. When questioned, staff once again claimed there was no record of the attorney’s letter. And, the report makes clear that comments in the letter were ignored.
- On the City’s website, the public can only review GPAC meetings held in 2017 and 2018. If documentation even exists of previous GPAC meetings, there are no records available on the City’s site.
- The General Plan Committee has not even met for the last two years and did not review the Plan as it is proposed today or the draft EIR.

AND NOW THE CITY IS PROCEEDING WITH THE GENERAL PLAN PROCESS WHEN MOST MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ARE UNDERSTANDABLY DISTRACTED; AND OTHERS INCLUDING MANY OLDER, MANY HISPANIC, AND MANY LOW INCOME RESIDENTS ARE EITHER UNABLE OR UNCOMFORTABLE WITH PARTICIPATING IN MEETINGS HELD ON ZOOM (See recent petition submitted to the Transportation Advisory Commission). I would also point out that both the Planning Commission and the City Council have postponed consideration of both the Noise Ordinance and provisions of the Zoning Ordinance until physical meetings can be held. At a recent meeting of the Planning Commission, there was even outcry from those who were able and willing to participate on ZOOM that consideration of matters of importance to the people of Dixon should be held off until the public could physically attend and comment. Yet, with the submission of the draft EIR, the clock has started ticking for the Proposed Plan to move forward to the Planning Commission and the City Council

In these times and in these circumstances, how can City Officials expect the public to review and provide written comment on a massive draft EIR with information that will

affect the lives of Dixon residents for the next 20 years? While the local government is not known for transparency, in this case the answer to “why now” is very obvious. CLEARLY, there is no real interest in ensuring that the Proposed General Plan is the peoples’ plan.

Rather than expose the fallacies in the report with painstaking page by page commentary, I am focusing on a number of issues that I know are of major concern to many people.

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY: One only has to look to the La Esperanza housing development with homes on small lots and the RM zoned neighborhoods near downtown with multiple family housing, to see the fallacy that increased density gets people out of their cars and using alternative modes of transportation. Take a count of the cars overflowing the limited parking provided for such development. The result is a very negative impact on neighborhoods with on-street parking to the point that visibility is dangerously restricted with cars parked too near the corners. Consider the safety impact of overcrowded on-street parking for not only drivers, but pedestrians and cyclists. Review meetings of the Planning Commission, the Transportation Advisory Commission, and the City Council for evidence of the publics’ concern about the parking and traffic congestion in neighborhoods with homes on small lots, such as La Esperanza. Review years of documentation of the concerns of residents in the RM zoned districts near downtown related to issues and concerns about density for a better understanding from those who actually live in denser neighborhoods.

See further density related comments under Transportation.

DOWNTOWN: Plans for Downtown Dixon have long been, and still are, full of contradictions. “The Proposed Plan envisions further revitalization downtown with the addition of a mix of new residential, retail, office, entertainment, cultural, civic and personal service uses that contribute to the area’s vitality and its charming Main Street feel.” According to the Proposed Plan permitted uses would include: restaurants, apparel stores, specialty shops, theaters, bookstores, travel agencies, hotels/motels (totally absurd) and other similar uses serving a community wide market and larger visitor population. Such uses do not serve the needs of many of the residents in the area, particularly those living in low-income developments such as the Valley Glen Apartments, the Second Street Apartments, the Moonlight Apartments, the Veterans’ housing and the Section 8 housing in rental units scattered throughout the RM neighborhoods downtown. Furthermore, higher density and mixed-use zoning downtown will in all likelihood add additional lower income housing downtown to meet

rising Regional Housing Needs Assessment numbers. The aforementioned uses do not meet the needs of the people who are living in the type of housing that has been, and in all likelihood will continue to be, concentrated in or near the downtown neighborhoods. If the City is truly interested in reducing VMT, why would the low and moderate income residents near downtown need to look elsewhere for the food and services they require?

In order that the types of businesses planned for downtown thrive, many homeowners in certain areas downtown have legitimate concerns about gentrification and displacement. The downtown residential neighborhoods have long served as an opportunity for many residents of modest income, and often Hispanic, to rehabilitate existing housing thereby becoming first time homebuyers. In the case of the Hispanic population, certain neighborhoods near downtown do not just provide housing opportunities but also serve to maintain cultural ties. The social fabric with its profound sense of community identity should not be overlooked.

Again, plans for downtown with the intention of attracting visitors for the sake of revitalization overlook the needs and interests of many living in the neighborhoods nearby.

On a different note, I would call your attention to Figure 3.10-1: Proposed Land Use Change Areas. Obviously, the Proposed Plan is already outdated before its adoption. Changing the land use on South Second Street and East Mayes to commercial is inconsistent with the brand new, single family homes that have recently been constructed there and the historic home on South First Street that has been recently rehabilitated and converted back to a single family residence. This is but one example of outdated proposals in the plan which are certainly the result of GPAC not meeting for the last two years and not reviewing the Proposed Plan as now presented in the draft EIR.

DOWNTOWN DIXON PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA: As stated in the draft EIR, “A downtown PDA Plan was prepared in 2017 but was never formally adopted by the City of Dixon.” I would add that despite repeated requests by certain members of GPAC, the PDA plan was never presented to them or to the public. Yet it appears as part of the Proposed Plan. It is unclear whether it will require its own EIR as did the Southwest Specific Plan and the Northeast Quadrant Plan. Under the circumstances, while it is referenced in the draft EIR, there is no basis to comment on it since the City did not see fit to include the plan for consideration by GPAC or the public. In 2011 when downtown was nominated as a location for the PDA, there was considerable community

opposition. And at least two petitions were presented to GPAC objecting to the designation. As mentioned, in other comments, transit-oriented development is the focus of a PDA. The efficacy of such development in downtown Dixon is not only questionable, but highly controversial (with many members of the community opposed while City Officials promote it).

MIXED USE: Mixed use areas with efforts to reduce parking near commercial enterprises can result in spillover to nearby residential streets. Downtown mixed use is of particular concern considering the close proximity of the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

OPEN SPACE: Quoting from the draft EIR: "Public facilities and parks can be found in many of the residential neighborhoods across the city with some of the largest parks including Northwest Park, Hall Memorial Park, Westside Park and Silveyville Cemetery." Referring to the Silveyville Cemetery as a park drew the ire of not only the public but the cemetery district. While the land is owned by the cemetery district, plots there are deeded for a specific purpose: to be used by the owner of the plot to legally bury human remains and to memorialize the departed with a headstone. The Silveyville Cemetery is not a PARK, it is a final resting place which must be respected. It should not be considered a park for the Proposed General Plan purpose of meeting requirements for open space.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION: Implementation of the Plan may indeed cause a substantial adverse impact in the preservation of historical resources. Preservation of the historic homes in the neighborhoods surrounding downtown depends on taking into account the negative impacts that certain plans for the adjacent downtown area will have, as well as impacts from further development to the Southeast. Traffic congestion, overflow parking, noise from entertainment venues, frequency of events, issues with security and waste management all have a negative impact on nearby residents, including but not limited to those residing in historic homes. Restoration and maintenance of historic homes is a painstaking process and those who commit themselves to that preservation should be respected and considered. As it is now, many residents in the downtown area leave when events are held downtown. And the City has already received complaints about noise generated by certain downtown businesses.

I would point out that without the hard work and dedication of the Dixon Carnegie Library Preservation Society, the historic Carnegie Library (highlighted in the Proposed Plan) would have been demolished during the last General Plan cycle with the blessing

of city officials and with no meaningful intercession by the Historical Society or the Woman's' Improvement Club.

It is also of concern that the local register of Historic Resources was not included for review in the draft EIR. Inclusion of that list is vital to any efforts to prevent the demolition or relocation of historic buildings and homes. Not being able to review the list, it is unknown whether George's Giant Orange was included. And far more than the buildings downtown; the historic homes in the surrounding neighborhoods, be they mansions or cottages, are critical to the historic character of the town. A listing of those homes should have been included. At the present time, a historic home along Dixon's South First Street is being replaced by a new home. I know of no action by the City to discourage that demolition. Contrary to recommendations in the Proposed Plan, the home is out of scale with those surrounding it; and, there is concern as to whether it will be required to provide much needed alley access parking.

TRANSPORTATION: There are many red flags related to the efficacy of reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled in and around Dixon. First and foremost, it has been recognized for many years that employment density (the number of jobs per square mile) is more important than residential density for encouraging transit use (bus and/or rail) as an alternative to driving. Transit ridership by commuters is higher in metropolitan areas that have higher employment density. Years of poor planning in Dixon have also led to issues in reducing VMT. Access to jobs, food and services unavailable in the downtown area and in new residential development in the Southeast necessitate residents traveling across town.

I should also be noted that the Northeast Quadrant and to some degree parcels in the Southwest Development Area are intended as Employment Centers for Dixon. It is my understanding that the proposed Campus Corridor is also intended to provide employment opportunities. Since the Campus Corridor is proposed mixed use, one would hope that it would include workforce housing and thereby reduce transit needs.

Technological advances also need to be considered. The ongoing lockdown and shelter in place circumstances have seemingly incentivized and accelerated a trend to work from home which is predicted to continue after the threat of COVID 19 has passed. Without taking that into consideration, the draft EIR is already outdated in terms of the importance of transit-oriented development to limit Vehicle Miles Traveled.

In terms of a passenger rail service near downtown Dixon, it should also be noted that rail represents a relatively small share of transit commutes. And non-commute trips are

even less likely to involve transit. What's more, transit fares cover only a very small amount of operating costs and operating costs have been increasing at times more rapidly than inflation. Rail systems are expensive to build (for example: expanding the length of platform in Dixon) and operate leaving them open to criticism of cost ineffectiveness and waste. And until such time as the costly Parkway Blvd and an undercrossing on West A Street are up and operating, a rail stop in Dixon is not at all feasible even if there was a demand.

I also would point out that the operating costs for the local REDI Ride transit service are continuing to increase and fares do not even begin to cover those costs. Concerns have also been raised as to whether seeking federal funding for REDI Ride has been appropriate considering that the service is at times dedicated to school ridership.

Intercity bus service is accommodated at a location off of Pitt School Road with easy on and off access to the freeway. A park and ride lot services that location. It is unlikely that intercity buses will be routed to the station location in the downtown PDA despite the area's designation as transit-oriented.

And last but not least, plans for the downtown area to serve a community wide market and a larger visitor population will not reduce VMT. As mentioned earlier, non-commute trips typically do not involve transit. Without a doubt, the uses intended for downtown will result in more, not less, car trips originating from throughout the community and from visitors from elsewhere.

I am also attaching a letter I submitted to the Transportation Advisory Commission relative to the South First Street Corridor which addresses a number of transportation related issues. Also of interest, a pedestrian and bicycle plan for Dixon submitted to TAC not long ago did not even connect proposed routes to the West B Street pedestrian undercrossing which is designated as a Safe Route to Schools.

PUBLIC SAFETY: There has been a great deal of community concern about the planned location of a second fire station in Dixon. Locating the second station on the same side of the railroad tracks as the existing station is unwise. As the Proposed Plan points out historic buildings (residences should be included) are far more vulnerable to fire and other natural disasters. The downtown commercial core of Dixon, many of the historic homes, and the residences of many older, Hispanic and low income residents are south and east of the RR tracks. The high school, the continuation high school, the soon to be relocated junior high school (all serving the entire community) as well as Anderson

Elementary, a private Christian school and a proposed Catholic school are all located south and east of the tracks as well.

I would also point out that allowing Accessory Dwelling Units crowded into the older residential districts is a fire hazard and that policy should be reevaluated.

NOISE: In regard to noise, I would stress that single family residences are located throughout the multi-family zoned districts near downtown. The occupants of those residences should not be subjected to any greater level of noise than those living in single family zoned districts. The General Plan definition of noise sensitive land uses includes residences and I find no justification to expect residents of some districts to endure greater levels of noise than others.

I would add that the types of uses to be permitted in the downtown area may have a significant impact related to noise (traffic, entertainment, etc.) on the many residents living in very close proximity to the downtown core. In that regard I would question whether some of the proposed land uses are compatible with the residential districts that are adjacent. Impacts on those residents should be a primary concern.

In regard to construction noise, strict enforcement of a noise ordinance is critical. There have been many complaints over the years that enforcement does not occur. It is my understanding that in regard to the Southwest Development under construction currently, the EIR requirements relative to noise are not being carried out.

Issues related to both noise and vibration occurred during the construction of the West B Street undercrossing. Expecting residents to “mitigate” the impacts of that construction by closing their doors and windows and turning up their TV’s and radios was ridiculous and showed the lack of concern that the City is now well known for.

MEASURE B: Misinformation in the draft EIR regarding Measure B should be corrected. I would refer you to the ballot question passed by the voters for a better understanding of the will of the people to require, not just authorize, growth limitations in Dixon.

In closing, I can assure you that my response to the draft EIR would have been far more comprehensive if I had over two years to prepare my remarks (equivalent to the length of time taken to prepare the report). Instead I am held to the statutory 45-day timeframe.

Ginger Emerson, General Plan Advisory Committee Member

Additional Comments Regarding July 28, 2018 meeting of GPAC

E 1

Policies:

- 1 Residential uses should not be sacrificed for business uses. Residents rely on zoning to distinguish housing from business districts. Consideration should be given in regard to how much and what type of business use to allow in residential zones. Maintain and enforce strict restrictions on HOP to alleviate impact on other residents (parking, noise, privacy, security, etc.)
- 2 Residential accesses from freeway interchanges should be given more consideration. Residents, such as those from the Valley Glen and Brookfield developments and Heritage Commons ,use Midway Road; and, other residents use Pedrick Road to avoid congestion at other interchanges like Pitt School and North First Streets. At times, freeway traffic also diverts onto roads at perimeter of city to avoid congestion on I-80. For example, Pedrick Road.
- 3 Consider that rail service for freight takes priority over passenger service.
- 4 What about Development pays for itself? The longstanding policy that development pay for itself should not be abandoned.
- 5 What about workforce housing near business development (not across town)?
- 6 The development process should start with proper vetting of applicants.
- 7 Longstanding businesses such as Superior meat packing plant should be considered in planning before the permitting of sensitive uses in the vicinity.
- 8 Downtown is a bottleneck and also severely impacted by school traffic.
- 9 I have been asked if cannabis is considered an agricultural use? I have heard objections to land suited for traditional agricultural uses being used for cannabis cultivation.

Actions:

- A How will delays to existing passenger rail service be mitigated?
- B What about development pays for itself?
- C Emphasis on parking, trees screening, lot coverage and building heights to maintain small town atmosphere for city.

E 2

Policies:

- 1 Notification of other businesses or residents in area should not be eliminated. Impacts on others must be considered.
- 2 Concerns of nearby residents regarding impacts should NOT be considered an unnecessary business constraint.
- 3
- 4 Maintain opportunity for public input.

Actions:

A Impact fees should be collected even in cases of redevelopment of lots with preexisting homes. For example, more bathrooms mean more impact on older City sewer and water lines.

B

C Feedback from residents should be encouraged as well.

E 3

Policies:

- 1 Focus on location of such business within City to mitigate impacts.
- 2 Encourage Chamber and other groups to vet member businesses to ensure that they are operating legitimately and in compliance with City codes and regulations.
- 3
- 4 How much staff time will be given to such assistance?
- 5
- 6 What is current ratio of residential to business development? Isn't Dixon a bedroom community?
- 7 While I support the policy, I do question its viability. How do neighborhood markets compete with Walmarts and other large chains for business. Higher prices at neighborhood markets discourage shopping, particularly by low or fixed income residents. How do such markets serve low income populations or people such as seniors on a fixed income?
- 8
- 9 How???

Actions:

A

B Developmental Impact Fee Deferral Program??? Impacts affect local residents (for example failure to have Parkway Blvd in place before opening of new high school and expanded development in South east area).

C & D Is this the City's role?

E Local procurement program? Needed to be defined for committee.

F Bad idea! Neighborhood residents should be allowed to address their concerns about a business operation in homes near them (parking, traffic, privacy, security, etc)

. No description of these types of businesses provided to GPAC members. I have heard from neighbors of one local HO business that should move out of neighborhood and use retail space due to expansion of its business.

G

H Local business cannot compete price wise. Hardship on low income and senior fixed income residents.

I

J

E 4

Policies:

1 Pay higher than average wages. What employer will do that considering cost of health care, liability insurance etc etc. How realistic is this?

2

3 Examples of such "placemaking and community development projects" were not provided to GPAC members.

4

5 Where do resources come from to have sites shovel ready?

6

Actions:

A How long has the university been a neighbor? Why do you think this can be accomplished now? Especially after such fiascos as racetrack and movie studio

B Development Impact Fee deferral again???

C Customize incentives???

D Need to recognize impacts and protect community from unwanted consequences

E

F Grants are taxpayer monies . Development is not paying for itself.

G

H

I

J

K Embarrassment of Dixie the Dinosaur which 3 members of Council jumped on Failure to vet movie studio project.

E 5

Policies:

1 Traffic bottlenecks for local residents at those interchanges. People running stop signs near Pitt School Road. Local people try to avoid traffic at those interchanges

2 Street dividers on 113 that make ingress and egress issues for access to certain businesses .

3

4 Access issues along certain commercial corridors such as to North Lincoln Street where existing auto dealership is located. Also to strip mall area along freeway out by Carl Junior's where another car dealership was located.

5 Downtown commercial area does not serve needs of nearby residents . Most nearby residents are not served by the overconcentration of bars in the downtown area. Downtown has a low income and senior population that is not served by the current commercial sector. Downtown also does not serve younger families with no businesses such as bakeries, ice cream parlors, etc. Efforts to do so have failed.

Actions:

A Visibility needs to be coupled with easy access. See number 4 above.

B

C Retain Milk Farm sign. It is a landmark and efforts should be undertaken to have it placed on the registries for its historic significance. The same goes for the Orange on West A Street.

D As stated above, the Milk Farm sign has been a locator sign for many years and continues to be so. It is unique and long associated with Dixon. I have been in conversation with people in areas outside of Dixon who share the concern about the removal of that sign.

E Clarify business improvement districts and where does funding come from.

F Daily needs of downtown residents not currently met by commercial downtown area. Specialty shops, restaurants and bars do not meet daily needs of nearby residents especially low and fixed income residents or those without vehicles.

E 6 *****

Policies:

1 This is a community that would have stood by and allowed the demolition of the historic Carnegie Library were it not for the efforts of a group of nearby neighborhood residents and Library staff. The current work on the old high school, replacing the roof with a modern, industrial looking metal one shows ignorance on the part of City regarding historic character. Over the years too many older homes have been demolished to make way for multiple family housing. Lots have been joined to make way for more units. Education on historic significance should be undertaken.

There is an unacknowledged Impact of evening uses in downtown: overflow parking into nearby neighborhoods, noise, etc. must be considered. Residents near downtown are just as entitled to a quality of life as residents in newer areas of the City.

2 Where would parking for mixed used sites be located? . . Example: mixed use on corner of East A and Second Streets (evening and weekend parking of residents along those streets competing for spots with business, church and other nearby residential) Some mixed used sites are not directly adjacent to downtown commercial but separated by current residential (in historic homes) which should be maintained. Mixed use is inappropriate along South First Street between Mayes and Broadway. There are several historic homes in that block and parking

issues along a major, highly travelled arterial making it inappropriate for mixed use.

3 Residents in downtown neighborhoods have the same type of needs as those in newer residential development. One senior apartment complex is located near downtown as is the farmworker housing. There is nothing downtown to serve the everyday needs of those residents as well as the needs of other downtown residents. Concentrating restaurants, bars and entertainment downtown ignores those needs.

4 The streets downtown are not safe. It is nearly impossible to cross First Street anywhere other than at the light at First and A. Relocating Hwy 113 will not address the traffic impact of the schools and newer neighborhoods developed to the South on the downtown area.

5 Comments from residents presented previously (at GPAC meetings) regarding "cultural" as a description of anything other than the Library in the downtown area

6 Regular events impact nearby residents with street closures, parking restrictions, noise, trash, strangers etc, etc etc. What about QUALITY OF LIFE of residents living in nearby neighborhoods?

Actions

A Where would needed parking for offices and particularly residences in upstairs spaces downtown be located? Currently, on weekends and in the evenings, parking is impacted all along both sides of Second Street to accommodate residents of the established mixed use on the corner of East A and Second Streets. It conflicts with parking for the Catholic Church services and functions.

B WHERE, WHERE WHERE? Parking??? This idea has been considered before. Cinemas are complexes now, not single theaters. When the new high school was built the auditorium was to be shared with the community for performing arts. The High School has parking for such events. As WITH MANY IDEAS FOR DIXON THAT USE WAS NOT SUSTAINED.

C Rejection of associated PDA by local residents both in the area and throughout town. Too many strings attached in terms of density, etc. Residents in the area should be considered stakeholders as well.

D At one time the wine stroll included an art show. Consider the comment about the wine stroll by Council member Minnema. He referred to the event as the

“wine stagger.” Events more focused on art and culture may be better venues for local artists to display their works.

MT 1

Policies:

1 Current non operational train station location does not accommodate intracity travel. Realistically, buses do not want to navigate local residential streets and traffic.. They want easy on/off access to the freeway. They use the Pitt School Road location instead. The current, non operational train station is surrounded by residential uses. It is at a BAD LOCATION with its only access through long established residential neighborhoods

2 The current GP calls for traffic not diverting onto local residential streets. This is a safety and a quality of life concern. It is particularly concerning for local residential streets that parallel arterials with people looking to avoid traffic on arterials. Also East Chestnut Street is an example of where property values and neighborhood appearance have declined with the use of that local residential street for high school and a community park access..

3 Due to traffic, arterial and collector streets are not safe for pedestrians to cross. Not just 113 which we talk of moving but also on A Street. School traffic is a big issue as well as traffic from newer residential development.

4 Level of service affects pedestrian safety. Example: trying to cross South First Street when traffic is at a standstill in one direction but travelling in the other. It is not safe to cross to the middle of street and be left standing there because of oncoming traffic.

5 What type of roadway modifications and improvements would be made in established older neighborhoods. As discussed at the July meeting, parking is at a premium for residents in certain older residential neighborhoods. Many homes either do not have off street parking or parking may be alley loaded which residents do not feel comfortable using due to visibility (line of sight) issues. Also many of the duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, etc. do not have enough off street parking for the number of residents.

6 Connecting neighborhoods is a problem for the older neighborhoods downtown. For example, connecting Valley Glen through the older neighborhood west of 113 contributes to increased traffic on residential streets as people use streets such as South Jackson to avoid Hwy. 113.

7 Bottleneck of downtown is a hindrance in regard to emergency services

8 Clarify

9

10 Too late for many streets in older neighborhoods. The City used to abate the weeds growing in the streets, but no longer sees fit to do so.

11

Actions

A As one committee member pointed out, a study determined that a considerable amount of traffic was local, particularly considering locations of new high school and new residential development. Rerouting 113 will not address those issues.

B I absolutely understand concern about truck traffic, but at least to some extent the issue seems to be addressing itself since truckers don't want to be held up in local traffic either. Many trucks were found to be serving the local community not just passing through. As stated at the meeting, we don't know the degree of business generated from Hwy 113 traffic. I have been downtown on numerous occasions and been asked for restaurant recommendations by people travelling through. I have also been asked where the historical sites are that the signs direct people downtown to see.

C Disruption to downtown business with a lengthy project a West A would be difficult to recover from. The West B street undercrossing is less than ½ block away.

D Where and at what expense? What is the usage at the West B Street undercrossing?

E Are we recommending something that we have never been provided for review?

MT 2

Policies

1 How exactly do you intend to make First Street and A Streets safe in the downtown area and to the residential areas to the South, West and East? The only somewhat safe place to cross is at the light downtown. Anywhere else is not at all safe for pedestrians, especially children and seniors.

2 How do you promote safety over traffic flow? Bear in mind the recent road rage incident on North First Street in Dixon? Haven't you experienced road rage from impatient drivers?..

3 Arterial or collector traffic should not be diverted onto local residential streets.

This comes from the current GP and should definitely be incorporated into the new Plan.

4 We are already at a level of service D and we haven't seen the impacts of moving the junior high on the same side of the tracks as the new high school. We have a lot of residential development underway in the Southeast and we haven't even begun developing the Southwest area. Traffic bottlenecks in the older areas nearer down town are already an issue. I understand that at a TAC meeting residents were scared about the possibility of front yards being taken by eminent domain to accommodate traffic should the level of service continue to deteriorate.

5 Many people consider the promise of such an improvement a pipedream!

6 What strategies? The School District is talking about a 15 minute difference in start times. That just traps areas residents even longer in certain neighborhoods that are bordered by both South First Street and East A Street. While the startup times may help parents and students commuting to schools, it will do nothing to address quality of life issues experienced by residents in certain neighborhoods..

7 Our junior and senior high schools are not located to accommodate walking or biking from all neighborhoods in Dixon. Apparently, attempts to encourage carpooling of students to school were not successful.

8 How will a development agreement accomplish this? What about the impacts of smaller infill development not subject to formal development agreements?

9 Traffic from the freeway often uses Kidwell and Pedrick roads to escape all too frequent jams. What about farm equipment? Do we want to preserve agriculture or not? What about big rigs from the tomato plant and the new truck facility north of town.

10 By locating a second fire station where? On what side of the tracks?

Actions

A Do roadway improvements mean widening streets? Where? See number 4 above.

B Examples of "best practices" were not presented to committee for discussion.

C How much funding are we talking about? Again, many residents consider this a “pipedream”. Actions should be realistic.

D

E This should have been considered before the bond went on the ballot. The School Board doesn’t show any interest in working with the City or with the residents . They claim that they don’t control the streets.

F Has this been discussed and mitigated in the District’s so called traffic study?

MT 3

1 How will you do this? What about people from out of town? They won’t be walking or biking to events, etc. Once again, the older neighborhoods that border downtown need on street parking to accommodate residents. Some older homes do not have adequate off street parking. Eliminating parking in those areas to accommodate bicycle and transit connections would pose a hardship for some residents, many of whom are low income or seniors.

2. Some of those physical connections just increase traffic in once peaceful, established neighborhoods.

3 Where would trails be put in established areas? What works in areas of new development will not work in established areas.

4

5 People working in certain jobs like carpenters and landscapers can’t use regional transit. This is a problem in Marin County that impacts Hwy 37 with workers living in Solano County (Vallejo) in order to find more affordable housing. Expanding shuttle service to Amtrak would be helpful for people travelling out of Dixon for whatever reason.

6 What ever happened to carpooling? My Dad was carpooling in the 50’s and 60”s before the term was probably even used. What about carpooling of students to the schools. At one time the District was promoting it, but apparently it was a dismal failure.

7 READI RIDE wasn’t intended as a school bus but the City allows the School District to get away with not providing school buses. Doesn’t funding for READI RIDE come from sources intended to serve our senior, disabled, minority, low income and transit dependent persons?

8 Continue door to door pickup of disabled and seniors who would have difficulty accessing sites for a fixed route service..

9

Actions:

A A central location, such as downtown would result in delays and impacts on residential neighborhoods. (The location of the current train station is in downtown surrounded by residential uses and impacted by traffic congestion)

B

C Can this be done without eminent domain?

D

E See 7 and 8 above.

F Walking and bike trails in certain areas starting by the Dixon Lumber have been used by the homeless and drug addicts. Access to residential backyards has been a problem with those trails.

MT 4

1 Speaking from the personal experiences I have had with my Dad, walking in Dixon is not safe for the elderly. Cyclists and skateboarders do not yield to pedestrians on the sidewalks. The schools and PD should educate and then enforce regulations for yielding to pedestrians.

2 Four fatalities in less than a month. Two involving accidents caused by younger drivers, probably distracted. Education and enforcement needs to concentrate on teaching drivers to yield to pedestrians at intersections.

3 Focusing on safety issues such as yielding to pedestrians and obeying vehicular rules and regulations such as stopping at stop signs not racing through.

4

5 What about trees in the downtown area, both in commercial zones and residential neighborhoods bordering downtown? We have potted plants for trees in the downtown that provide no shade whatsoever. All kinds of trees have been lost in downtown neighborhoods due to sidewalk repairs and threats to property owners of their liability in regard to sidewalks.

6 See above comments regarding safety conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.

7 What traffic calming? Striping lines in streets has done little to calm traffic.

8 What about trees instead of structures for shade?

Actions:

A Consider the impact on residential areas in terms of the loss of on-street parking if bike lanes are installed.

Consider bicycle/ pedestrian conflicts on sidewalks and trails. Special concerns for seniors on sidewalks with cyclists or skateboarding uses sharing the space. Education should be the focus in regard to yielding to pedestrian and efforts to educate need to be followed by strict enforcement of the rules.

B Seniors live throughout Dixon not just at senior living centers or near the Senior Center. What about their needs? Example of my Dad: My husband and I had to be bodyguards for him even though he was quite capable mentally and physically to walk downtown for a haircut, to the bank or library; but we needed to go with him to protect him from traffic issues: car drivers, cyclists and skateboarders who do not yield to pedestrians. . His quality of life suffered in that he did not feel the independence that he was otherwise capable of due to our legitimate concerns for his safety as a pedestrian. Many seniors take blood thinners. A fall from being hit by a cyclist or skateboarder resulting in a bump on the head or some internal injury could be fatal for someone on blood thinners. Seniors should be safe all over town (particularly in their own neighborhoods), not just in specific areas. It is ridiculous to only focus on certain routes particularly when we claim to encourage aging in place.

MT 5

Policies:

1 Current Multi modal center is not on an arterial street but impacts residents of a residential neighborhood (children playing, older adults driving, limited off street parking for historic residences and existing multiple family housing) Needs of area residents should be balanced as well. Furthermore, intra city buses use area off Pitt School Road for easy on/off freeway access

2 Difficulty crossing arterials of First Street (hwy 113) and A streets needs to be addressed by education of drivers and enforcement of pedestrian right of way. In case of First Street, increase in local traffic due to residential development south of town.

- 3 Downtown streets do not lend themselves to safe bicycle use/no space for bike lanes without restricting parking for downtown area or impacting nearby residential streets with loss of on street parking in front of homes.
- 4 Passenger rail to downtown Dixon comes with strings attached in terms of PDA which residents of area do not support.
- 5 Concerns expressed in past by downtown merchants and employees when it was suggested they park across tracks by train station. They did not want to cross tracks via tunnel after dark.
- 6 Where? Parking at Pardi Market site will be limited. Residents in areas bordering downtown should not have to contend with overflow parking to accommodate economic development in the area.
- 7 How do you encourage people to walk between locations? Walking downtown in the summertime is miserable with very limited shade and in the wintertime there is little shelter from the weather.
- 8 Shared mixed use parking may work in the daytime but not in the evenings or weekends when residents are home

Actions:

- A How realistic is a grade separated crossing at A Street? How long have we been waiting for funding for Parkway Blvd? Lengthy disruptive construction downtown discourages business in the area.
- B Event management parking? What about spill over onto local residential streets?. Downtown residential areas south of A Street are sandwiched between downtown, Hall Park and the Fairgrounds and are heavily impacted by events in those areas. Many residents rely on on-street parking. They can't leave home during events and come back to find parking anywhere near their homes. What about the quality of life of those residents? Shared parking (see above). Look at current mixed use development at the corner of East A and Second streets (in the evenings vehicles belonging to residents of the upstairs mixed use housing line the streets). Parking in that area is also impacted by Church events.
- C As agreed at GPAC July 2018 meeting, buffered bike lanes will not work in established areas due to need to eliminate parking to accommodate such dedicated lanes. Speed on South First Street is a problem and not safe for cyclists, particularly children.

MT 6

Policies

1 Freight service slows passenger rail service.

2

3 same as above.

4 How will noise be mitigated? When West B Street undercrossing was being built, neighborhood residents were told to shut their doors and windows and turn up their TV's to mitigate noise. The sound barrier was a chain link fence with astro turf on it. Vibration from the construction was also felt blocks away.

5 The older historic and low income neighborhoods are predominately affected.

6

Actions

A Pie in the sky promise.. And what about local traffic on First Street (Hwy 113)? Continuing to focus on moving 113 is diverting attention away from resolving local traffic issues along that route.

B What school is separated by the tracks at First Street from a residential neighborhood?

C

PSF 1

Policies

1 The efforts made at enforcement are appreciated, but need to be extended to focus on pedestrian safety as well. Drivers need to be trained by enforcement to stop for pedestrians at intersections. Also, cyclists need to be cited if seen not obeying vehicular code at stop signs, etc. The ordinance in downtown forbidding riding bicycles on the sidewalks also needs to be enforced.

2 Fire prevention and emergency services require another fire station east of the RR tracks and the bottlenecks of traffic downtown need to be addressed. The HS being at one end of town poses a problem in an emergency.

3 same as above

4 Mutual aid has benefited the community for years and should be continued.

5 New development must absolutely be committed to such fair share funding.

- 6 Complying with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles should be part of the review process.
- 7 Good idea but specifics should have been discussed with Committee. Neither the Committee members nor even the member of the PC had any idea what Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design entails. Both elected and appointed officials need to be educated about CPTED.
- 8 The difficulty of neighborhood watch in areas of multiple family housing with frequent turnover of residents should be acknowledged. Both RM 1 and RM 2 zoning districts are a mix of single family homes and multiple family units.
- 9 How long have residents been waiting for Parkway Blvd.?

Actions

- A A necessity especially considered so many recent catastrophes in other communities. We are all more susceptible than we realize.
- B Who would pay for an incentive program? "Encouragement" is key rather than a requirement.
- C Encourage police officers to wave at residents like in the old days. Friendliness goes a long way with residents of all ages.
- D

PSF 2

Policies

- 1 Isn't Cal water more costly?
- 2 Who pays for this ? Will development continue to pay for itself?
- 3 Who pays for this considering that it is for future demand?
- 4
- 5 The Plan adopted in April of 2018 wasn't detailed for the Committee for comment.
- 6 Who pays for this, particularly as it related to future need?
- 7 Same comment as 6 above.
- 8
- 9 Isn't this done now?

10 Development should pay for itself. Recently the costs have been met by establishing Community Facilities Districts. If that is what is actually meant by the policy, it should say so.

11

12 This should be done. People are complaining about the cost of present service.

Actions

A Development should cover the cost.

B

C Should have been elaborated on for Committee.

D Wasn't this resolved?

E Again, who pays for this considering it is for future growth?

F Who pays?. People are already upset with increases for service. It is very hard on low and fixed income property owners

PSF 3

Policies

1 Everything should not all be concentrated in the older, east side of town. Better placement would provide access for the entire community and less impact on older areas.

2 Examples of co locating should have been clarified.

3 Main school sports and recreational facilities areas are all located on one side of town. Using the new HS auditorium has not been successful for performing arts as was planned.

4 Too too late. The location of schools that serve the entire community has ruined the quality of life for residential neighborhoods near downtown with increased traffic.

Actions

A The current Multi use center is small and without good parking during the daytime and during events at the north side of Hall Park by the swimming pool.

B

C. Where are the public services districts and why allow senior housing there?. This should have been elaborated on.

PSF 4

Policies:

1 Community parks should be located in areas that are more easily accessible off arterial and collector streets without impacting local residential streets.

2

3 In lieu fees do not ensure development of parks.

4

5 Vehicular access should not be via local residential streets for community parks which provide for a variety of activities for all city residents and people from out of town.

6 I have heard numerous complaints about the restroom facilities at Veterans' Park in Valley Glen area.

7

Actions

A

B Funding ??? If such funding is so available why hasn't it been used to refurbish parks? People are complaining about trees dying, other maintenance shortcomings ,etc. etc.

C Where?

D

E

F

Accessibility is a key issue.

PSF 5

Policies

1 Examples of possible locations would have been helpful in terms of eliciting Committee comments.

2 Why would the School District be involved in providing activities for seniors?

3

4

Actions

A

B What is a Police Activities League? This is another example of actions which were not defined for the Committee for comment. And time was very short on July 28 to cover all the proposed policies and actions.

C This would be a good use for HS auditorium.

D

E This seems like a function of the school district more than the City.

F

G How will City support the Library with such programs.

H

I The Library already provides free WiFi.

PSF 6

Policies

1 How is this the City's business?

2

3

4 We used to have an urgent care facility here. One needs to be re-established, but I don't know the City's role in doing so.

Actions:

A What is an Electronic Benefit Transfer?. Again this was not defined for the Committee.

B What are urban agricultural regulations and incentives? Not explained to the Committee.

C Would this be on DUSD land?

D Isn't the sale of tobacco near schools prohibited and shouldn't it remain so? Afterall, we are talking about healthy eating but considering allowing the sale of tobacco near schools, etc. Talk about contradictory!!!

E

PSF 7

Policies

1 Im sorry but this is a misleading policy considering how the City actually conducts its business, for example losing public comment addressed to the GPAC committee.

2 Same as above.

3 The City used to alert Old town area residents through contact with the Old Town Neighbors group to upcoming changes, projects or issues, but has failed to do so for a number of years. Such contact should be re established.

4

Actions

A At what cost?. Consider the poor response to GP survey.

B But, do not discourage input from people without access to internet. According to information from another library, 40 % of the population does not have internet access at home. As a member of TAC, a resident complained to me that the recent Read Ride survey was only available on-line. She does not have internet access at home and as a result did not fill out the survey even though she is a frequent user of Read Ride with valuable input.

C Holding meetings in various locations must take into account video recording of meetings.

What happened to PSF 8 and 9? *****

PSF 10

Policies:

1

2

3

4 What business is it of the City who a local business hires and how will it be enforced?.

5 Council has not seemed receptive to that idea, particularly on commissions with decision making matters such as the PC.

Actions:

A

B Identify public and private spaces throughout the community, not just in downtown.

NESH 1

Policies:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 For new construction and extensive rehabilitation.

8 More significant for areas subject to catastrophic fires like we have seen far too much of lately.

9 Prepare for emergencies, especially for notification of those likely to be affected. Notification was a major downfall during Sonoma fire disasters.

10

11 Difficult with already in place facilities.

12 Consider that certain disasters occur at night such as the fires in Santa Rosa. Smoke also disoriented evacuees.

Actions:

A

B

C This seems to be a very worthy action.

NESH 2

Policies:

1 Too often wording such as “to the greatest extent feasible” becomes a cop out.

2 Should be for infill as well.

3

4 Very important.

5

6

7 I would have appreciated more information on this policy before commenting.

8

9 How?

10

11 Far too many trees have been lost in the older residential neighborhoods near downtown. Property owners are fearful of liability related to damage to sidewalks and some have removed trees out of that concern. City should take care in vetting tree service companies to ensure that they do not damage trees in landscape strips in older part of town. Those trees provide much needed shade for pedestrians and for parked cars.

12 See above.

13. I am unaware of the requirement of the replacement of trees. When trees in Old Town were lost due to sidewalk repairs, the City made no accommodations for their replacement.

14 Where are street trees in new development?

Actions:

A

B I believe this has been done. My issue is that some of the species are more ornamental rather than adequate for providing much needed shade (especially with a goal of making the neighborhoods and community more walkable).

C Maintenance is critical. What is the point of planting trees without a program for their maintenance?

D

NESH 3

Policies

1

2 When possible (such as with new or infill development) buffers should be in place from the RR as well.

3 This has been lacking in development projects such as those in the Valley Glen area. Dust was a major issue with the construction of the Valley Glen Apartments a number of years ago. The dust affected the residents in the nearby older neighborhood which included those in the rest home off of Cherry Street.

4 This should be from the RR as well.

5 Noise was a major issue during the construction of the West B Street undercrossing with serious impacts on nearby residents and an insensitive response by the City, STA and the RR.

6 RM 1 and RM 2 neighborhoods should not have different noise standards than those in single family neighborhoods.

7 Studies should have been conducted for both noise and vibration during the West B Street undercrossing project.

8 Restricting hours of operation may not be enough to address issues for noise sensitive receptors. People living near downtown and the Fairground events have babies and take care of terminally ill family members just like people in other parts of town do.

9

10 Setbacks need to be sufficient before development is approved in such areas.

11

12

Actions:

A

B At what cost and to whom?

C

D

E

F

NESH 4

Policies:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Actions:

- A
- B
- C
- D More information would have been helpful for Committee member comments.

NESH 5

Policies:

- 1
- 2
- 3

Actions

- A This should have been done a long time ago, when residents were required to have blue toters.
- B Education for residents so as not to impact neighbors
- C

LGC 1

Policies:

- 1 Maintain agriculture without increasing density in older neighborhoods, allow for higher density only in new development
- 2 How was this addressed in sphere of influence discussions and decisions?
- 3 Compact development should be considered for new development, not in established areas within ½ mile of train station (whether it is ever operational or not). Our older neighborhoods contribute most to our small town atmosphere. If we truly care about a small town feel (or whatever), as survey respondents indicated and public input has made clear over the years, it is only found in the older areas of town and efforts should be made to preserve those neighborhoods rather than increasing density within and around them.
- 4 Preserve what is left of quality of life for residents in older neighborhoods. Public comment has been consistent for many years that residents do not want to see the older neighborhoods near downtown densified and residences and additional units squeezed in with reduced setbacks.
- 5 What about discussion related to Measure B?
- 6
- 7 The mistake of Parkway Blvd. cannot be allowed to repeat in the future. Development agreements should have better provisions.
- 8 There should not be an exception for infill in downtown neighborhoods where traffic is already a problem and parking is an issue (as well as security).
- 9 Requiring a conditional service agreement seems to run counter to limiting “leapfrogging” as mentioned in #3.

Actions:

A

B

C Development is outpacing public facilities in Planning Areas already in regard to roadway infrastructure.

D This is already taking place but we are not meeting our goals.

E This is Important not only for commercial development but for residential development as well

F This is not really development paying for itself in terms of the developer footing the costs, but instead passing costs along to new residents.

G Any revisions to the ZO should be undertaken only with ample opportunity for public input (such as the meetings former Community Development Director Dowsell had with Old Town property owners and residents).

H Would this be going back in time or from now on only? I question whether the public records will reflect past exceptions made. What about variances made without proper findings over the years? Such variances should not be considered.

LGC 2

Policies

1 How? "Small town character" was never defined. As it stands, it is too subjective.

2 Examples should have been provided for the Committee to discuss.

3 Again, examples would be helpful in order to provide appropriate input.

4 How is this compatible with reducing front yard setbacks in Downtown residential areas as proposed in LGC 3. Once again, residents have consistently rejected the idea of reduced setbacks in the older neighborhoods. Reduced setbacks will contribute to a mass affect. Look at the mass of the new hotel in Winters or some of the new residential development in downtown Davis. Dixon is not Davis and does not have to ruin our older neighborhoods near downtown by reducing setbacks and squeezing more housing in. As one former resident repeatedly stated at public meetings, the City needs to stop trying to squeeze "square pegs into round holes" when it comes to making housing denser in older neighborhoods.

5 Scale is important and setbacks contribute to maintaining a scale.

6 Obviously, this fits with provisions for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design which the Committee was entirely unfamiliar with. Selectively installing fencing and landscaping would help in crime prevention and enforcement and would also maintain the character of our neighborhoods, particularly the older, established neighborhoods.

7 How would this be enforced? Selectively?

8 How can scenic vistas be preserved with development at interchanges that are relatively close together?

Actions

A Citywide design guidelines should not be applied to older established neighborhoods. Areas such as those older neighborhoods may benefit from particular guidelines.

B All design review should be a public process. Currently, I have heard complaints from neighbors of infill and remodeling projects that they find out of scale with the surroundings.

LGC 3*****

Policies

1 What about parking and overflow into residential neighborhoods? What about noise? Dixon's small downtown is in very close proximity to residential uses and that needs to be taken into consideration

2 How do policies for making Downtown Dixon the city's primary district for specialty retail, dining, entertainment, civic, social and cultural uses support the nearby residential areas?. How do those uses support the transitional and supportive housing that is being concentrated downtown, or the low income, senior and farmworker housing that is within blocks of the downtown commercial areas?

3 Adaptive reuse has not worked. The two homes that were turned into offices some years ago have both been converted back to residential use. One is the house behind the Catholic Church which required extensive remodeling to restore a kitchen.

Until recently all infill was duplex, triplex or larger projects. The type of infill that people appreciate are the single family homes that Ascher has built on South Jackson and South Jefferson Streets. Both homes were market rate housing much more affordable than what is being built in planned developments. Members of the committee and the public have stressed that the city needs smaller, more affordable, market rate housing. Ascher's infill homes meet that criteria while respecting setbacks in our older neighborhoods.

4 There is one block of commercial along east A street Where would you put outdoor dining on Jackson Street. As a pedestrian, try to get by when people are congregating between the fenced in dining areas and the potted trees and cyclists are on the sidewalks.

5 Such as????? The emphasis is on restaurants and bars. The residential areas are still family oriented and with many low income or fixed income residents without disposable income for restaurants and bars.

6 Transit oriented, high density development 1/2 mile of the train station would entirely change the character of Dixon's oldest neighborhoods. Such development would be out of place with small town character that is most apparent in the older neighborhoods.

7 The PDA plan was objected to time and again. Lost or more likely destroyed letters attest to that. There are too many strings attached that increased density in our older, more historic neighborhoods and in those areas that are predominately low income. The train station is on the residential side of the tracks with access through a tunnel that many people will not use. Disabled or senior access is too long and fraught with conflicts with bicycles and skateboarders and drunks.

8 Why does the DDBA have influence over mixed use and residential when those uses border on other residential zoning and should be compatible with those residential uses?

Actions:

A Regular events create noise, traffic, parking, trash, security issues for nearby residents but those residents are not consulted or asked for feedback.

B What is a pedestrian overlay? This was not discussed with the Committee.

C Mixed use designation south of A Street is an area of many historic and older homes used as single family residences. Mixed use zoning is not compatible with those homes.

What sites adjacent to the downtown area? Areas adjacent to downtown are residential, except for north on 113. What happened to Backwards L PMU designation north of East A Street? It is also an area of older or historic homes used as single family residences.

D Second story offices and housing need parking. Nearby residents do not want overflow parking in their neighborhoods. Where do residents of housing work? There is no real downtown business to support their employment. The buildings would require extensive retrofitting to be used for housing and disabled access would have to be provided for either housing or office space..

E Proposing curb extensions on Hwy 113 or even on A Street fails to take into account the volume of traffic. There has already been a loss of parking spaces on the street with turn lanes at First and A streets.

F We have a park a block away that is for the most part underutilized except for some drug activity along with other illegal activities.

G **What are considered the downtown zones? Are PMU 1 and 2 considered downtown zones? Why reduce the front yard setbacks? Residents have been adamant that they don't want setbacks reduced. Doing so would contribute to a mass look so close to the street. We are not Davis where new development overwhelms the older nearby homes there. What is an auto oriented use? Isn't a restaurant or a specialty store that serves the community auto oriented?**

H How is affordable housing compatible with specialty shops, restaurants and bars? How does greater density of affordable housing support downtown? Explain value capture strategies. Terms are used that most people won't understand when reviewing the plan.

LGC 4

Policies

1 How does the new truck sales and service facility at Pedrick Road fit in as a gateway?

2 Aren't we talking about moving 113 including between RR tracks and Walmart?

3 **Why establish zoning that will require exceptions?**

4

5

6 Would mixed use include workforce housing?

7

8

Actions:

A Neither North 113 or Pitt School Road interchange areas are attractive gateways. Areas near interchanges support freeway users and usually focus on needs for fast food and gasoline.

B How will maintenance of murals be enforced?

C Preserve Milk Farm sign.

D

E Home Occupation Permits should continue to emphasize business that is basically unnoticed by other residents and that do not contribute to traffic, parking, security and other issues. Care should be taken to preserve quality of life in residential areas over addressing barriers for small businesses in those areas.

F

LGC 5

Policies

1 What about already established neighborhoods where this has not been done? Also, people travel by car to find the best price.

2 What about transitional and supportive housing or will it continue to be concentrated in the older downtown neighborhoods?

3 Nice ideas for quality of life for certain residents, unfortunately not those near downtown. How do you discourage pass through traffic?. You are actually promoting it by the connection between Valley Glen and the older parts of town

4 What? For years old town investors have bought property to tear down homes in order to make way for more multiple family units . Also when you detract from people's quality of life they lose interest in maintaining their property. Consider never knowing if or when the property around you will be torn down to make way for investment properties. How much are you as a homeowner willing to invest maintaining your property with that uncertainty.

5 Again, this is part of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Unfortunately, the Committee members had no understanding of the concept and commented as if it had to do with backyard fencing..

6 Explain to the Engineering Department that trees are important in Old Town as well. How do you foster a walkable neighborhood without street trees for shade?

7 Again CPTED is critical.

8 Neighborhood watch is difficult in neighborhoods impacted by investment units and too many duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and larger complexes amongst single family homes..

9 What about impacts on other residents?. As community members in one town where Vacation Home Rentals are on the ballot point out, there is a reason for the distinction between residential and commercial zoning districts

Actions

A And, maintain front yard setbacks, as well as other setbacks.

B How often and with what input from neighbors? What about neighbors with other needs, such as those caring for a terminally ill family member who requires the services of health care providers on a daily basis who need access.

C

D Does this mean not notifying the neighbors and not soliciting input? I hope not.

LGC 6

Policies:

1 The maps provided are difficult to see (too small). It is difficult to distinguish the different areas. Again and again, this plan does not address that downtown Dixon does not serve the needs of the nearby residents, particularly those of low or fixed income or seniors.

2 The people in the nearby residential neighborhoods need a downtown area that is compatible with their needs. The idea of making downtown "party central" for the rest of the community with nightlife, an overconcentration of bars and restaurants does nothing to provide for the needs of nearby neighborhood residents.

3 Good. While I recognize the need for public restrooms, I am very aware of the issues related to the maintenance of those facilities and their use by the homeless which discourages family use

4 For example? Difficult to do in already established neighborhoods.

Actions

A Neighborhood centers should be used for office and start up businesses rather than those uses in residential zoned neighborhoods.

B For quite some time centers like Safeway Center have not been well maintained. The same is true for the strip like mall on Pitt School Road across from the Safeway Center. The businesses or owners of the Centers should be keeping the sidewalks clean to make the areas more welcoming.

LGC 7

Policies

1 Compatible reuse hasn't happened for residences (see earlier comment regarding residences in the PMU 1 zoning area). The two that were at one time used for offices have been converted back to residences, much to the satisfaction of their neighbors.

2

3

4 This is important for sites not governed by CEQA (such as under 5 acres, infill, etc.

Actions

A It is my understanding that many buildings and residences in Dixon do not qualify for the National Registry due to insensitive remodeling over the years. However, the Old GP had local registry which should be maintained. And all homes over a certain age should be considered, not just those of a grander scale.

B See above. What is meant by a qualified historic building? Just because a building home doesn't qualify for the National Registry doesn't mean it doesn't have local historic significance.

C Again is this for buildings and home that meet the National Registry designation or also for those of more local interest?. Many homes and buildings have been too altered to qualify, but they still have have local historic significance.

D

E This has been done to some degree but is not inclusive enough. Carriage blocks, hitching posts, etc. should be noted as well as Silveyville properties moved to Dixon and other historic homes, even if altered. What are the other community groups? To my knowledge, the only group that has succeeded to any degree in historic preservation was a group formed to save the Carnegie Library. The Dixon Carnegie Library Preservation Society worked to secure a place for the Carnegie on the National Registry. No other groups stepped up to the plate.

Brandi Alexander

From: Shirley Humphrey <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, March 9, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Comments on General Plan
Attachments: General Plan Comments.docx

Enclosed are my comments on the General Plan.

Shirley Fanning Humphrey

Parkway

The Parkway Boulevard should be completed now. This project was supposed to be finished in August 2007. It has been impossible for the public to find out how much money has been collected and spent, yet one councilman asked for this information. Come to find out Dixon City did not do project accounting (which every other town in the county has done for at least 15 years) so it has been impossible to get accurate information.

During this time the town has loaned funds for Parkway to the B Street undercrossing and Core Drainage project.

Following is a story which shows why Parkway should have been finished before now. The story was related to me and a colleague by a former fire chief who has years of experience with public safety:

An Interview with former Fire Chief Bill Fairfield Are Many Dixon Residents Being Put at Risk by Delaying the Parkway Overpass by Loran Hoffmann and Shirley Humphrey, November 16, 2020

Recently we were interviewing a long time Dixonite for an article to be published by the Dixon Historical Society. During that interview, we were asked by our interviewee who was a former Dixon fire chief about what we thought about the danger to the residents of Dixon who live east of the railroad tracks. He went on to explain that in the 1980's there was a fire in Dixon which involved a propane tank, and the tracks had to be completely shut down. People coming into town from the west could not cross the rail tracks. Thus, the fire trucks could not drive to the following areas in town—Collier Manor, Valley Glen, May Fair, Country Fair, Brookfield, etc.

We had not given the question much thought, but after contemplation, we realized he was right. Dixon fire trucks could not reach those houses without going out to I-80 and then going to the Midway area (or Pedrick Road) to reach the east side of town. A little further thought reveals that if a rail car goes off the tracks in Dixon, access to these houses is very limited. If a propane tank goes off on a rail tracks, there is a huge danger because a propane fire on a rail car can create a large bomb. Plus, rail cars transport ammunition through Dixon. These accidents are rare but Dixon should make sure that all areas in Dixon can be reached by fire trucks.

How did we get into this situation? If we look back to the 1990's, Dixon had a fire substation on both sides of the railroad track. There was a substation on North Adams; the main station was located at 140 North Jackson Street. When the new station was built off of North First Street, the substation and main fire station were sold. It is not clear where the funds gained by selling the fire stations are now?

Residents were told that a fire station would be built with the funds received from the Bertolero property and fees for the Brookfield homes. The Bertolero Property Proposal was

published on April 21, 2004. Just below a picture, the following is listed: Dixon Unified School District; **City of Dixon**; Brookfield Homes. On Page 17, Table 2 Brookfield's Bertolero Property Milestone Timeline. Item #16. **City to complete Parkway Boulevard, Railroad Grade Separation by 8/2007.** On page 13, under Enhanced Benefits Provided by Brookfield, item 3 lists "Parkway Blvd. Grade Separation Contribution, \$900,000.

At a city council meeting a few years ago, the current city manager referred to a report, "The Bertolero Report" mentioned above. In this report which was passed during meeting before the new high school was built, people who attended the meeting on the new high school were told that the Parkway Overpass Boulevard would be completed in 2007.

At a meeting a later meeting, the city manager said the report was just a marketing piece, and people who were buying houses should have known that. It was also pointed out to the city council audience that even though the city is listed on the front cover of the report, the report has no legal standing. Wonder if the people who attended the meeting before the high school was built were told that the city's name on the report was meaningless. Did the folks who bought those homes receive a warning message that an accident on the railroad tracks could make it impossible to reach the east area of town?

In discussions with Police Chief Thompson, when I asked him if the town is prepared to deal with a hazardous materials accident, he said, "We recognize the vexing situation, we can dealing with. We are prepared to deal with such a situation." But like most of us, he wonders how we got here.

Is it possible that state and county folks who reviewed the plans for houses on the west side of town could be accessed by the planned Parkway Overpass which was planned but never built?

What training have the fire and police received on hazardous materials fires? How often do they receive training? What is their plan to reach all areas of town? The police chief believes the department is prepared.

How seriously has the city council evaluated the risk of having part of town closed off because of a railroad hazardous materials accident?

It has been 17 years since the Parkway Overpass should have been finished. It has been longer since the city sold off a fire station that could have avoided this problem. Ask our council what priority is being given to solve the problem? Ask for a time table on when Parkway will be completed.

Before the first of the year, Dixon's General Plan should be finished. You may want to evaluate this situation and write or attend meetings to make your views known.

Small Town Character

Change “Preserve Small Town Character” to “Preserve Dixon’s Unique Character.” During the past few months the City Council has approved over 1000 new houses. With Dixon’s population over 21,000, Dixon will soon no longer be a small town. In fact, USDA states that town that over 25,000 are not small town.

Level of Traffic Service Should Not be Moved to Level D

Last time, I looked the Level of Service would be allowed to move down to Level D. This should be avoided and should stay at Level of Service C. I would comment further, but your web site is not working today and I cannot access the web.

Jobs/Housing Balance

(Dixon is a bedroom community. Currently, 7,000 residents leave the community to work in other towns. 3500 people work in Dixon. It is not known if these are Dixon residents or if they commute to Dixon.)

The General Plan must emphasize the need for a **jobs/housing balance**. Recent housing growth has not been offset by jobs growth. Recently, the community development director stated that the city has approved the building of over 1,000 new houses – where are the plans for the new jobs?

Conversely the recent residential growth has not brought the economic growth in commercial and industrial uses that will be necessary for the long-term growth of Dixon

Improve economic development through establishing a goal of 0.9 jobs for every member of the labor force by 2025.

1. Economic Development: City Must Take Proactive Steps and Be Evaluated on Economic Development

Strategic Planning: The current strategic planning process is flawed. Each year the city council/departments hold a strategic planning process. The public is invited, but in some cases, the city department heads/council must give permission for the citizens to participate in the process. The current progress allows the department heads to set their own goals. The process also makes elected representatives superior to those that elected them.

This may be appropriate but the citizens must have an opportunity for their input into priority items. After the initial process is finished, workshops with residents in all 4 districts should be held with citizens indicating what they agree with and what should be change.

The town must develop short term, mid-term and long term strategic planning. (The town of Dixon has suffered from a series of unfortunate economic development proposals which have had an adverse effect on Dixon—Dixon Downs, Clarissa Carpenter proposal for a movie studio (note: Carpenter is jail for numerous fraud counts), magic bean proposal (Innovation project UCD, businesses, student housing, etc. –note the UC Innovation Center—Aggie Square Village was established between the city of Sacramento and UC Davis around June. The state legislature approved \$2.5 million as start-up funds for the project).

The Cities of Woodland and West Sacramento are going forward with Innovation Centers, as well as the Aggie Square Village in Sacramento. Dixon highlighted a proposal going forward in an address by the mayor and city manager in January. A couple of months later, a Stronach representative presented some preliminary information. Since then, there is little evidence any progress has been made.

These poorly though plans/efforts have resulted in embarrassment for the community and have been costly to the taxpayers. A process must be developed to vet projects in the early stage, and city leadership must be held accountable for these project success/failures.

Transportation

Travel and economic management is most effective when it is part of an integrated program rather than on an ad hoc basis. Demographic and economic trends are changing. Dixon should develop a 10-year transportation plan by hiring an outside company to evaluate if Dixon's ride-Ride is meeting the demands of citizens, if bus transportation is needed between Amtrak stations in Dixon and Fairfield.

Innovation

Plan for change. Driverless cars may be available by 2025. The General Plan should note this development and provide a plan. Establish a Transportation Technology Committee to make recommendations as driverless cars are on the road.