

11/1/91

91-11



# LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA PARK MASTER PLAN PROJECT SCHEDULE

October 30, 1991

Submit Draft Master Plan to TAC	December 20, 1991
TAC Review	January 16, 1992
Revise Draft Plan, Prepare Draft Initial Study	January 29, 1992
City Prepare Negative Declaration	February 12, 1992
30 day notice period complete	March 16, 1991
Submit to Parks & Recreation Commission Agenda	April 1, 1991
Parks & Recreation Commission Review	① April 8, 1991
Submit to Planning Commission Agenda	April 21, 1991
Planning Commission Review	② April 28, 1991
Submit to City Council Agenda	May 12, 1991
City Council Review	③ May 20, 1991
City File Notice of Determination	May 21, 1991
30 day statue of limitations to court challanges on Negative Declaration complete	June 12, 1992
Publish Final Master Plan Report	June 26, 1991

C. Gary Hyden ASLA  
California Registration 1741

Next Laguna Foundation - March 23  
set it up



# LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA PARK MASTER PLAN REPORT OUTLINE

October 30,1991

The following is the outline for the Laguna De Santa Rosa Park Master Plan. Please note that item 12 Exhibits, will be interspersed throughout the report as appropriate.

1. **Table of Contents**
2. **List of Figures**
3. **Summary**
4. **Introduction**
  - a. Introduction
  - b. The Planning Process
  - c. The Regional Context
  - d. The Site
  - e. Goals of the Plan
5. **Existing Conditions**
  - a. Soils
  - b. Plant Communities
  - c. Wildlife
  - d. Hydrology
    1. Surface Water
    2. Ground Water
    3. Water Quality
  - e. Recreation Facilities
  - f. Circulation and Parking
  - g. Views and Vistas
  - h. Land Use
  - i. Management Conflicts
6. **Opportunities and Constraints**
  - a. Natural Resources
    1. Plant Communities
    2. Water features
    3. Wildlife
    4. Views and Vistas
  - b. Recreation and Public Access

C. Gary Hyden ASLA  
California Registration 1741

1. Public Access and Education
2. Active Recreation
3. Circulation and Parking
  
- 7. Land Use**
  - a. Public Lands
  - b. Easements and Set Backs
  - c. Opportunity Purchases
  - d. Management goals and objectives
  
- 8. Master Plan**
  - a. Design Concept and development Goals
  - b. Natural Resources Preservation and Enhancement
  - c. Recreation and Public Access Facilities and Programs
  - d. Operations and Management
  - e. Construction Phasing
  - f. Funding
  
- 9. Conclusion**
  
- 10. References**
  
- 11. Appendices**
  
- 12. Exhibits**
  - a. Site Analysis Diagrams
  - b. Regional Biotic Resources
  - c. Water Shed
  - d. Master Plan
  - e. Detail Area Plan
  - f. Cross Sections

11/11/91



# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** 10/30/91  
**TO:** All TAC Members  
**FROM:** C. Gary Hyden  
**SUBJECT:** TAC meeting on September 26, 1991

On September 26, 1991 a TAC meeting was held at the Veterans Hall in the city of Sebastopol. The following members attended:

Patty Holden	Parks and Recreation Commission
Fran Murphy	Planning Commission
Cam Parry	Chamber of Commerce
Tom Spittler	Sebastopol Little League (representing Mindi Marshall)
John Cummings	Laguna Foundation
Miles Ferris	City of Santa Rosa
Bill Cox	California Department of Fish and Game
Sue Kelly	Public Works Department
Cynthia L. Ketelsen	Design Review Board
Kim Cordell	
Richard Spittler	Planning Director
Harold Appleton	

C. Gary Hyden ASLA  
 California Registration 1741

In addition the following members of the public attended:

Eliot Raleigh	Sebastopol Little League
---------------	--------------------------

Prior to the start of the meeting Cam Parry noted that there is potential source of funding through the Federal Government called the Resources for the Future. This is a federal agency that provides funding for resource enhancement. Hyden Associates will investigate this potential source during the funding phase of the master plan development.

The TAC read the minutes from the last meeting and made the following clarifications:

1. With regard to the 200 ft. comment for the buffer areas south of the recreation trail, the master plan should identify the 76 foot contour as the setback line. The plan should discuss the need for a setback from the wetland edge and explain the desirability of 200 feet. Furthermore, the plan should point out that the 76 foot contour setback provides the desirable 200 feet in this area.
2. With regard to the trail easement above the 76 ft. contour south of the existing recreation trail, the design team should develop a description of the trail easement that is simple and flexible. The TAC directed the design team to work with Richard Spittler, the City Planning Director, on exact language.
3. The design team should obtain a copy of the letter from the TAC to Caltrans for the bridge design for the project record.

71-11, 1910

4. The TAC directed the design team to describe Caltrans as a possible source of funding for a pedestrian bridge at Highway 12 . The argument should be made that since Caltrans is eliminating pedestrian crossing in their new bridge design, they should provide funding for a new separate pedestrian bridge north of the Highway 12 crossing as proposed in the park Master Plan
5. The TAC instructed the design team to include the concept of view shed protection and enhancement . In this section on view shed protection and enhancement describe the city review process for proposed projects. The TAC recommended a process similar to that described in the Hillside Protection Ordinance. Furthermore, the view shed enhancement and protection section should include concepts describing the use of native species for additional vegetation.
6. The existing city corporation yard at the Laguna Park site is approximately 3/4 of an acre in size. Sue Kelly thinks the city can work with an area 1/2 acre in size if it is properly sited in relation to driveways and or a proposed parking lot.
7. Accessibility for heavy trucks is an important element in the resiting of a corporation yard.
8. Many TAC members think that a skateboard park at the Laguna Park is an incompatible use. According to some TAC members the City has an agreement with the developers of the skateboard park to provide \$30,000 per year for operation after it is built.
9. With regard to the renovated sewer treatment ponds, the TAC agreed that meandering pond edges are highly desirable.
10. After much discussion of additional studies prepared by the design team showing a relation of an additional ballfield and interpretive center on the project site, the TAC directed the design team to prepare two detailed plans for their consideration. These two detailed plans will be reviewed by the TAC prior to finalizing the draft Master Plan. The design team will make a recommendation on which plan should be included in the Master Plan. The TAC will review the recommendations and reasoning developed by the design team and make a determination of which plan should be included in the draft Master Plan. The two detailed plans will consist of elements as follows:

One detail plan will be similar to the latest plan developed by the design team. This plan shows existing ballfield facilities to remain, it also show an amphitheater, a meadow area adjacent to renovated ponds along with the additional parking, a skateboard park, and teen center. This plan will also note that the City Corporation yard can function as a skateboard park site if the City desires. The second scheme will show the existing ballfields to remain, it will show the renovated ponds as required by the Army Corps of Engineers, in addition it will show an additional senior league ballfield, required parking as determined by the design team, and a teen center.

11 11/19/0

Furthermore, the design team will show passive elements such as the amphitheater ,etc., as can be properly fitted to the site.

12. The TAC directed the design team to reconfigure the existing single use or individual picnic area into a multi-use picnic area. The new multi-use picnic area should be pulled back far enough to allow the existing soggy lawn area to revert to a natural wetland. The TAC directed the design team to include bus parking for two spaces as well as the required handicap spaces in the parking lot design.
13. The TAC noted it is a priority to minimize additional parking on the site. In this regard the design team should consider whether eliminating parking on one side of Morris Street to add a class II bike lane will adversely affect parking.