

REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL

City of Nevada City
317 Broad Street
Nevada City, CA 95959
www.nevadacityca.gov

June 28, 2017

TITLE: Old Airport Property Workshop Summary/Next Steps

RECOMMENDATION: Pass a Motion confirming prioritization of the top five conceptual property uses and direct staff to prepare a report outlining various considerations (e.g. environmental, cost, feasibility, zoning, etc.) related to each conceptual use.

CONTACT: Amy Wolfson, City Planner and Dawn Zydonis, Park and Recreation Supervisor

BACKGROUND

At the February 13, 2017 “Six-Month Strategic Objectives” workshop City staff and elected/appointed officials laid out a preliminary 6-month schedule intended to set in motion the accomplishment of several goals within a total timeframe of three-years. One such three-year goal was to “Enhance and Maintain the Infrastructure and Facilities.” Among the objectives intended to reach this goal was for staff to “hold a public workshop as part of developing an Airport Property Master Plan, and report the results to the City Council.” At the regular City Council Meeting on May 24th, staff held a public workshop with an objective of receiving broad-level community feedback on the preferred use of the Old Airport property.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK

Public Workshop: The May 24th workshop was attended by approximately 30 people, including councilmembers who were encouraged to participate. Several attendees appeared to be property owners that neighbor the Old Airport property.

Attendees of the workshop were divided into three groups and were dispersed to various sections of the room to consider the following broad land use categories: 1) Miscellaneous (for uses that don't fit neatly within the other two categories, 2) Park and Recreational uses, and 3) Economic Development uses (income-generating/income-saving uses). Each station was set up with large poster pads labeled with the category being considered. The stations were managed with a designated staff scribe who recorded the participants' desired land uses for the site. Once each group had a chance to visit each of the three stations, staff passed out four sticker dots to each workshop participant. They were directed to place their dots on those land uses that were most in line with their preferred vision for the property. Staff has organized all of the comments at the workshop in Exhibit A using two organizational methods: 1) as written on the posters, and 2) as organized by theme. The purpose of providing the data organized by theme is to consider those uses that were duplicated or could be considered a similar land use as others.

The top five specific land uses are as follows:

1. Solar Farm (30 ½ dots)
2. Golden Gate Park-like development (11 dots)
3. Walking Trails (9 dots)

4. Nisenan Education Center (7 dots)
5. Open/Natural/Birds/Plants (6 dots)

It is important to note that staff has grouped the second, third, and fifth land use preferences into the “garden park” theme, which provides a combined dot total of 26 dots or 31 when considering other land use preferences that didn’t make it in the top five land uses (See Exhibit A, Data Organized by Theme). Land use themes that were weighted significantly include:

1. Public utility service such as solar farm and biomass power plant (31 ½ theme dots)
2. Garden Park such as nature reserve and arboretum (31 theme dots)
3. Active recreation use such as athletic fields/courts (11 theme dots)
4. Educational facility such a cultural center and nature and cultural museums (11 theme dots)

Public Comment: In addition to the workshop feedback, staff has received additional written comments, which have been included as Exhibit B of your staff reports. Public comments will continue to be received for subsequent phases for the development of a Master Plan document.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending the City Council confirm prioritization of the top five conceptual property uses and direct staff to prepare a report outlining various considerations related to each conceptual use. This analysis will help to determine the impacts that the top preferred uses will have on issues such as staff availability to manage facilities, fiscal solvency of developing and managing uses, environmental resources, scenic resources, General Plan consistency, entitlement and permitting requirements.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS: Not applicable.

EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A- Workshop Comments (as-written, themed, and poster images)
Exhibit B- Written Public Comments