



City of Sebastopol
Incorporated 1902
Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472
707-823-6167
707-823-1135 (Fax)
www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us

Email: kwebster@cityofsebastopol.org

JOINT MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
AND PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF: March 08, 2016
SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX
425 MORRIS STREET

UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF March 08, 2016

SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX
425 MORRIS STREET

CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION:

The City Clerk posted the notice of the meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Please turn off all cell phones and pagers during the meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

- a. Mayor Gurney called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.
- b. Chair Doyle called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

a. City Council

Present: Mayor Gurney, Vice Mayor Glass, and Councilmembers Eder and Slayter
Absent: Councilmember Jacob (excused)
Staff: Larry McLaughlin, City Manager-City Attorney

b. Planning Commission

Present: Chair Doyle, Vice Chair Kelley, and Commissioners Pinto, Douch, Fritz and Jacob (arrived at 4:37 p.m.)
Absent: Commissioner Fernandez (excused)
Staff: Kenyon Webster, Planning Director
 Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of: February 09, 2016

Commissioner Kelley amended the minutes.

Vice Chair Kelley made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Commissioner Douch seconded the motion.

Vote:	Ayes:	Mayor Gurney, Vice Mayor Glass, Councilmember Slayter, Chair Doyle, Vice Chair Kelley and Commissioners Pinto, Fernandez, Douch and Fritz
	Noes:	None
	Abstain:	Councilmember Eder

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA - This is for items *not* on the agenda, but that are related to the responsibilities of the Planning Commission or City Council. The Commission and Council receive any such comments, but under law, may not act on them. If there are a large number of persons wishing to speak under this item, speaking time may be reduced to less than 3 minutes, or if there is more than 15 minutes of testimony, the item may be moved to the end of the meeting to allow agonized business to be conducted.

Nancy Prebilich, 7600 Leland Street, commented:

- Missed the draft review of the Land Use Element and Map.
- The property owner, Juanita Robertson, at 7605 Bodega Avenue, which is adjacent to her property, has given her consent and support to request that it remain zoned medium density as it has been in the past.
- The topography of that property dumps directly into Calder Creek.
- Thanked the Commission and Council for their time.

Two women with Analy High School's Arts Program commented:

- Analy Arts' Spring Musical is putting on a production of Fiddler on the Roof in April.
- This is an amazing program.
- Performances will run April 8, 9, 15 and 16 at 7:00 p.m., April 10 at 1:30 p.m., and April 14 at 6:30 p.m.
- Proceeds will benefit Sebastopol World Friends/Ukraine.
- Encouraged people to spread the word and attend.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney closed the Public Hearing.

5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: There were none.

6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT (Update on Future Agendas, Action of Other Boards and City Council)

Director Webster provided the following update:

- The draft Climate Action Plan 2020 has been released.
 - The regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on April 12th will be a joint meeting with the City Council to receive an informational presentation on the draft Plan.
- The City Council recently awarded a construction contract for the Skatergarten Expansion project.

- The Design Review Board recently conducted preliminary review of the Piazza Hotel project at the former lumberyard site. Preliminary review by the Planning Commission is slated for the second meeting in April.
- At the next City Council meeting, the Council will review this years Village Building Convergence projects.
- The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on March 22nd. The agenda will include:
 - Scoping session for the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This will allow the Commission to identify issues they may want the EIR to study.
 - A couple of items that were continued from the last Planning Commission meeting because the Commission was unable to get to them. The first being preliminary review of the Village Park/Tomodachi Park annexation concept, the second being mandatory amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that were identified in the Housing Element.
- The agenda for the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on April 26th will include review of several development projects.
- The City's River Parkways grant application, worth close to \$500k for Laguna Preserve restoration and trail improvements, was not accepted.
- The Laguna Foundation received a grant worth \$20-\$25k. Their grant proposal includes 5 different Laguna keeper work days or events in our Laguna Preserve.

There were no questions of staff at this time.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR (PUBLIC HEARING IF REQUESTED): None

8. DISCUSSION:

A. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: REVIEW OF DRAFT ECONOMIC VITALITY, NOISE, AND SAFETY OF THE GPAC DRAFT GENERAL PLAN: The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), conducting numerous public meetings for more than a year, has created a GPAC Draft General Plan. The City Council and Planning Commission will conduct an initial review of the draft in joint meetings, to consider whether any revisions to the GPAC draft are appropriate, before a formal draft General Plan is created. The first joint meetings were conducted on January 12, and February 9, 2016. The March 8 meeting concludes this initial set of meetings. Comments from members of the public are welcome regarding the Elements listed for discussion. There will be additional public hearings after the formal draft General Plan and a draft Environmental Impact Report are published.

Mayor Gurney outlined the process for tonight's proceedings and asked to hear from Ben Ritchie of De Novo Planning Group.

Mr. Ritchie introduced the Commission and Council to the Economic Vitality Element of the General Plan.

Mayor Gurney asked the Commission and Council if they had comments on any of the broad questions that were laid out in the memo from De Novo Planning Group dated February 22, 2016.

There were none at this time.

Comments, questions and responses are summarized below.

Mr. Ritchie asked to hear from the Commission and Council on Goal EV 1 and its supporting Policies.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Referred to the 'Industry Attraction' box.
- Professional services such as, Attorneys, Certified Public Accountants (CPA), Engineers, software developers and home-based businesses should be included.
- We should capitalize on what we already have by including art, antiques and vintage clothing.
- Would like to attract an electric vehicle dealership as well.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- The additions suggested by Vice Mayor Glass are great.
- Under professional services, she suggested adding therapists and consultant-type people.
- The addition of those fits in with our identification as a place for wellness.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Expressed concern over our downtown being taken over by wine tasting, as has happened in Healdsburg.
- Asked if there was a way, without specifically targeting wine tasting activities or businesses, to address overconcentration.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Could craft a Policy along the lines of 'discourage overconcentration of single business types within the downtown core, for example, wine tasting.'
- Such a policy would provide the Commission and Council with some policy leverage should they find that things are heading in an undesirable direction.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Commissioner Fritz asked if applications for wine tasting rooms were currently subject to public review by way of requiring a Use Permit.

Director Webster responded that a Use Permit is required for wine tasting rooms.

Councilmember Slayter referred to Policy EV 1-16 on page 9-3 and commented that it would be important to include high-speed internet throughout the city.

Councilmember Slayter commented that Policy EV 1-8 and Policy EV 1-17 are largely redundant.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Mayor Gurney referred to Policy EV 1-9 on page 9-3 and commented that the Sebastopol Center for the Arts should be included.

Commissioner Pinto referred to Policy EV 1-15 and Policy EV 1-16 and commented that Sonic has already equipped Sebastopol with high-speed fiber optic systems, which is a huge asset.

Vice Chair Kelley referred to Councilmember Eder's comment on overconcentration and suggested that it be expanded to include all of Sebastopol, not just the Downtown Core.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Eder asked if allocations were set for different types of uses given our fixed sewer capacity.

Director Webster responded that allocations were not set for different types of uses. He noted that the annual LOS report looks at where we are at in terms of actual use and remaining capacity every year.

Councilmember Eder asked how the City could ensure that our remaining capacity wasn't serving industrial uses at the expense of residential uses.

Director Webster responded that the general assumption is that we will look at how we're doing on an annual basis and when we start to get close or see a big change we can look into it and consider whether there is any action that needs to be taken. Based on what we've seen over the past few years, we don't have a looming or immediate issue and appear to be doing fine.

Councilmember Eder asked about buildout in the General Plan and stated that it'd be prudent to protect that value initially.

Director Webster agreed.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- The pending EIR is going to consider buildout.
- The EIR will:
 - Look at the General Plan as constrained by the Growth Management Ordinance (GMO).
 - Look at a longer term, cumulative buildout number that will go beyond the twenty year timeframe of the GMO using a much more theoretical number based on what could be done under the Land Use Map.
 - Look at water and sewer demand projections for each of those scenarios.
 - Account for non-residential demand.
 - Ensure that there is adequate capacity for sewer and water supply for buildout of the uses shown on the Land Use Map, which will include a mix of residential and non-residential uses.
- There are a number of policies in the Community Services and Facilities Element that are meant to ensure that adequate supply and available capacity are maintained.
- The City is much more on top of this issue than a number of other communities in that they prepare a LOS report every year.
- Preparation of an annual LOS report positions the City well to foresee capacity problems long before they become an issue.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that our capacity has held somewhat static because our population continues to lower the amount of water that they are using.

Mr. Ritchie agreed and commented that our per capita generation has gone down so, while we are seeing some modest population growth, our absolute volume has actually decreased.

Mayor Gurney referred to Action EV 1g on page 9-4 and suggested that creation of an economic development committee be changed to an Economic Development Specialist position as recent interest had been expressed in that over creation of a community oriented committee.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Vice Chair Kelley referred to Action EV 1e and commented:

- The City currently has a living wage ordinance in place for City employees and City contract workers, which was not referenced.
- Questioned whether the intent was to consider requiring a living wage for all of Sebastopol, which she saw a number of obstacles with.
- While a huge issue, it would be a worthy discussion to have.
- Asked if Mr. Ritchie had experience working with cities with a living wage requirement in place.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- Some communities have self-reported success with enacting a living wage.
- De Novo has not personally worked with a community that enacted a living wage and was then provided follow up data on the reporting of the effectiveness of it.
- Not in the position to make a recommendation.
- Tried to write it in a way that would pay homage to the thought without committing to any specific course of action.
- The intent, from the GPAC's perspective, was to consider a living wage ordinance that applied beyond City employees and contractors.

Vice Chair Kelley asked how the EIR would look at the use of the 'implement' instead of 'consider' with regards to requiring a living wage.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The EIR would not look at that issue because it would not have a direct physical effect on the environment, which is their purview under CEQA for the EIR.
- Economic impacts and things like market indicators are not looked at.
- The only time economics comes into CEQA is when you start to talk about blight and physical urban decay.
- If the City wanted to enact a citywide living wage ordinance it would likely involve a very lengthy, detailed discussion and economic and financial experts advising on what that wage should be.

Mr. McLaughlin commented:

- Agreed with Mr. Ritchie in that this is a tremendously complicated matter that would take careful study from a local perspective.
- Recommending either leaving it as is with the word 'consider', or removing it entirely.
- Would not recommend changing it from 'consider' to implement because we have no good, firm idea at this point about what that would entail.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that there might be a legal purview issue in that a city like Sebastopol may not legally be able to require a citywide living wage.

Mr. McLaughlin responded that he recalled that as well, however, after looking into it further he recalled having learned that it might be possible. He commented that he'd have to look into it further.

Commissioner Jacob apologized for being late and commented:

- Referred to Action EV 1f and asked if it would make sense to tie it to our Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Sphere of Influence (SOI).

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Can certainly add language to that effect.
- The intent of Action EV 1f was to reference land within the UGB and SOI as it's currently drawn so these types of annexations, in the Southern Gateway area, wouldn't require a UGB amendment or an SOI expansion.

Ms. Thompson noted that the South Gateway area is outlined in Figure 2.4 of the Land Use Element on page 2-16.

Councilmember Slayter suggested that Action EV 1e be revised as follows, 'Consider expanding the existing living wage ordinance.'

The Commission and Council agreed.

Mayor Gurney asked if a really good map that defines the downtown area was included in the Plan.

Ms. Thompson responded that a figure that demarcates the larger area of the downtown was not included, but could be added.

Mayor Gurney commented that the downtown area should be more widely defined than it has been historically and felt that inclusion of a figure was important.

Mr. Ritchie asked if The Barlow should be included in the larger downtown area.

The Commission and Council agreed that The Barlow should be included.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that the use of consistent wording and naming is important.

Ms. Thompson commented:

- In the General Plan, when you see the words 'Downtown Core' referenced it is referring to that specific Land Use designation on the Land Use Map.
- In the General Plan, when we're referencing the greater downtown area, which we'll include a figure to show that area, it is referred to as 'Downtown'.

Mayor Gurney commented that her goal was to define the area more widely because we are working to this unification, and also to this identification of that area extending north and south so we can have a business district.

Commissioner Jacob asked if the subcommittee that drafted the Downtown Design Standards was working with a geographic outline.

Councilmember Eder responded that they were.

Councilmember Slayter commented that the Downtown Design Standards were based upon the 'CD' Downtown Core Zoning District.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- There will be a differentiation between the 'Downtown Area' and the Land Use designation 'Downtown Core'.
- A figure will be provided in the General Plan showing the 'Downtown Area'.

Councilmember Slayter commented that it would be interesting to see a graphic overlay of the 'Downtown Area' on the Land Use Map so that the land use designations could be seen.

Ms. Thompson responded that they could include an outline of the 'Downtown Area' on the Land Use Map.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Mayor Gurney asked Councilmember Slayter if he was requested that that be included in the General Plan or if he wanted it for purposes of their discussion.

Councilmember Slayter stated that it would be nice to include it in the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie stated that it would be very easy to include it in the General Plan.

Ms. Thompson commented that they could also add a small callout box to explain the difference between the 'Downtown Core' and the 'Downtown Area'.

Councilmember Slayter commented that the fact that we have different land uses within our 'Downtown Area' is one of our strengths.

Chair Doyle pointed out that 'The Barlow' was referenced specifically in Action EV 3a and commented that it may, or may not be known by that in twenty years.

Ms. Thompson responded that the GPAC's discussion was meant to ensure that the broader downtown area is looked at if and when the Sebastopol Downtown Plan is updated. She noted that Action EV 3a could be revised to reference the figure, once one is inserted.

Vice Mayor Glass suggested calling the area that includes The Barlow and other associated properties the 'Downtown Extension'.

Ms. Thompson responded that the greater downtown area would be shown on a map within the Plan.

Mayor Gurney commented that she didn't like the term 'Downtown Extension' because there's separation in the language itself.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- They'll delineate the 'Downtown Area', which will include the 'Downtown Core', The Barlow and some other properties in the periphery.
- The two terms that will be used are the 'Downtown Core' and the "Downtown Area'.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from the Commission and Council on Goal EV 2.

Councilmember Slayter commented that it was very strong.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Mayor Gurney referred to Policy EV 2-3 and asked if the GPAC's discussion was that the tagline 'Local Flavor, Global Vision' was too old or inadequate, or if they were talking about something else entirely.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- An audit on that term was not brought up by the GPAC.
- 'Local Flavor, Global Vision' is perfectly appropriate.
- May want to revisit from time to time.
- More of a broad policy statement in keeping with the spirit of Sebastopol.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- 'Local Flavor, Global Vision' is the Chamber's tagline.
- Wanted to clarify that Policy EV 2-3 was talking about something new, fresh and different.

Mayor Gurney suggested adding art to Action EV 2c as a target industry. She noted that art and music are a big part of this culture and economy.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that the suggested additions to the 'Industry Attraction' box on page 9-2 should be encompassed as well.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Hearing nothing further on Goal EV 2, Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal EV 3 and its supporting Policies and Actions.

Mayor Gurney and asked to hear from the Commission and Council on Goal EV 3 and its supporting Policies and Actions.

Councilmember Eder commented that the City's existing Formula Business Ordinance (FBO) tends to push formula businesses to existing shopping centers on the outskirts of town and asked if that should be acknowledged.

Mr. Ritchie asked Director Webster a clarifying question on formula businesses only being allowed outside the downtown.

Director Webster responded:

- The Formula Business Ordinance prohibits two kinds of businesses in the downtown and requires a Use Permit otherwise.
- You can have a formula business, below a certain size, without a Formula Business Use Permit in select shopping centers.

Mr. Ritchie asked Councilmember Eder if that was something he wished to codify in policy, or if that was something he was seeking to rectify.

Councilmember Eder responded that his recollection was that it was the consensus of the Council that we want to try to keep formula businesses in established shopping centers on the outskirts of town with the provision that we don't want the entry points of our town to be one chain store or restaurant after another for a mile before you get into the downtown.

Mayor Gurney commented that her recollection was the same and that the Council agrees with Councilmember Eder's comments.

Councilmember Eder responded:

- So much effort has gone into making our downtown unique, charming, different and funky.
- We don't want to ruin that with national chain stores and restaurants.

Councilmember Eder referred to Action EV 3c and asked if the concept of establishing a single district encompassing the entire Highway 116 corridor in the City and the Downtown was reasonably practical.

Mayor Gurney commented that there was a subcommittee of the City Council that was supposed to be working on that.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that that was our old CDA district.

Councilmember Eder commented that he was just wondering if that would be setting too high a goal.

Mr. Ritchie responded that they tried to structure it to provide enough flexibility to get business improvement districts in the Plan as options on the table without hamstringing the boundaries of areas that it would encompass.

Councilmember Eder referred to Action EV 3e and commented:

- Expressed being mixed on the issue of allowing conversion of existing homes along South Main Street and Petaluma Avenue.
- Questioned if we are allowing depletion of our housing stock.
- Expressed being concerned and unsure about his support for it.

Mayor Gurney asked for comments from the Commission and Council on Action EV 3e.

Vice Chair Kelley commented that she tends to agree with Councilmember Eder, especially because we want to create a livable and walkable downtown.

Mayor Gurney asked Director Webster to explain the current process for converting a residence into an office along South Main Street and Petaluma Avenue.

Director Webster responded:

- Presently those areas are zoned commercial, not residential.
- They do allow residences to continue existing without issue.
- The Zoning Ordinance allows easy conversion of a house to offices in those zoning districts.

Mayor Gurney asked if that process is ministerial or if Planning Commission review would be required.

Director Webster responded that it is a ministerial process and in terms of zoning, is permitted.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- It's an interesting point.
- A lot of large homes, particularly on the south end of town, have probably been saved by virtue of being converted to thriving businesses.
- It's important to consider it from both directions.

Councilmember Slayter commented:

- Not seeing a huge rush to convert our existing housing stock in those areas.
- Realizes that there could be pressure in the future.
- Realistically there haven't been many conversions in recent years.

Director Webster agreed that it was a slow trend of maybe two to three per year.

Councilmember Slayter commented that we might want to continue to allow conversion through a Use Permit process.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- We are already living with a combination.
- Expressed not feeling a great threat by conversion.

Chair Doyle commented:

- This is a major land use issue.
- Due to the zoning, the existing residences are non-conforming uses.
- It doesn't make sense to require a Use Permit for bringing a non-conforming use into conformance.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The action calls for continuation of something that is already in place in terms of your Zoning Code provisions.
- May make sense to leave Action EV 3e as is.

Councilmember Eder asked Director Webster if the term 'conversion' also includes the significant remodeling and/or demolition of an existing structure and replacement with an office.

Director Webster responded that demolition would not be considered a 'conversion', however, significant rehabilitation of an existing building and/or adding on to an existing building would.

Councilmember Eder concluded that the character of a building on one of our main streets could be significantly changed in its conversion to a commercial use.

Director Webster agreed.

Mayor Gurney referred to a project on South Main Street by Architect, Kathy Austin. The project was a beautification of the site and included a housing component.

Commissioner Fritz agreed and commented that the trend in that area seems to be doing mixed-use projects like the one done by Ms. Austin, which is a good thing. Councilmember Eder reiterated that he hates to see the depletion of houses because it changes the character of the downtown.

Commissioner Fritz referred to Action EV 3e and commented that 'Commercial Office' and 'Office' districts should be combined.

Mr. Ritchie responded that he'd make a note of it, however, the semantics of combining commercial and office land use designations are different than combining zoning districts.

Councilmember Slayter referred to Action EV 3c and commented:

- Understood the flexibility of it as it is worded, however, he suggested removing the idea of there being separate business improvement districts in the north and south parts of town.
- Suggested revising 'the entire Highway 116 corridor in the City, and the Downtown' to, 'the city's main economic sectors in all areas'.

Vice Mayor Glass asked if it would be appropriate to include an Action and/or Goal to encourage our Downtown Association to expand to be inclusive of the greater 'Downtown Area' rather than just the 'Downtown Core'.

Councilmember Slayter commented that our Downtown Association was based upon the district itself.

Mayor Gurney commented that it might be better not to include that at this time.

Mayor Gurney and asked to hear from the Commission and Council on Goal EV 4 and its supporting Policies and Actions.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- West County is a very significant identifier, however, there are a lot of people to our east that identify with our community as well.
- Our regional library had 23,000 items checked out in the month of February.
- Santa Rosa, a facility six times bigger with a service area twice as big as ours only had 30,000 items checked out in the same month.
- Not sure how to deal with.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- A change in terminology won't change the fundamentals of the policies and how their implemented.
- 'West County' is terminology that is understood locally and is not meant to semantically snub anyone who happens to live geographically east of here.

Mayor Gurney responded that everyone was okay with leaving it as written.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- When she first moved to Sebastopol this area was called the gateway to the Russian River.
- The gateway idea isn't really applicable anymore.
- Sebastopol is more identifiable as the city on the way to the coast.

Mayor Gurney comments continued:

- It is important to put into words our identification with Sonoma County beaches and coastline.

Councilmember Slayter agreed and commented that Policy EV 4-5 may be an appropriate place for that.

Mayor Gurney agreed and noted that Action EV 4a and a number of other places might also be appropriate.

Mr. Ritchie responded that they would include that where appropriate.

Councilmember Slayter referred to Policy 4-3 and requested that the word 'boutique' when referring to hotels be stricken.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Commissioner Pinto commented:

- There seems to be an undercurrent of not wanting businesses that don't serve our community.
- O'Reilly Media may be one of those businesses.
- Asked what the controversy with O'Reilly Media was back when their application first came through.

Mayor Gurney responded that the controversy had to do more with the location, mass and size of the development and noted that that was about 15 years ago.

Commissioner Douch referred to Action EV 4-5 and commented:

- It should read, 'Promote both the City and the City's open space and natural resources as a tourist destination'.

- Inclusion of, 'with emphasis on the Laguna Wetlands Preserve' could stay or go because it's one part of the bigger picture.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Eder referred to Policy EV 4-3 and asked if the term 'home-stay' was referring to Airbnb or VRBO.

Director Webster responded:

- The way we've talked about home-stays in recent years is where one or two bedrooms are rented out in an already occupied home.
- Home-stay is not an official term in the Zoning Ordinance.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Questioned the appropriateness of including the term 'home-stay' given the lack of discussion surrounding the topic.
- Personally supports vacation rentals and the like.
- Asked if we were condoning vacation rentals by including the words, 'encourage' and 'home-stay' in Policy EV 4-3.

Mayor Gurney asked Director Webster if removing the term, 'home-stay' would create issues for people who are doing, or will do home-stays.

Director Webster responded:

- Removing the term, 'home-stay' from this document would not create issues.
- There is a policy in the Housing Element that calls for the City to 'consider' examination of the Airbnb phenomenon and possible development of a policy.
- It is an issue that the General Plan has identified as something we need to look at.

Mayor Gurney agreed that 'home-stay' was a confusing term that was not widely used.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the term 'home-stay' could be removed.

Vice Chair Kelley recalled that the Council had come up with a policy having to do with transient occupancy taxes (TOT) for vacation rentals.

Director Webster responded:

- Our existing regulations allow for what we call home-stays, B & B's, and hotels.
- All are required to pay TOT.
- Our existing regulations accommodate and regulate these uses.
- There are some situations that are happening that don't fit our regulations.

Vice Chair Kelley asked if the whole issue would be discussed at a later date.

Director Webster stated that it would. He added that that would be one of many issues requiring policy discussion by both the Commission and Council as part of the Zoning Ordinance update after the General Plan is adopted.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on Goal EV 5.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal EV 5 and its supporting Policies and Actions.

Mayor Gurney and asked to hear from the Council and Commission on Goal EV 5 and its supporting Policies and Actions.

Councilmember Eder referred to Policy EV 5-2 and Action EV 5a and commented:

- Our existing Façade Improvement Program should be acknowledged.
- Suggested adding, 'promote use of Façade Improvement Program' under both.
- Agreed with including something along the lines of, 'consider a grant and loan program' as well.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on Goal EV 6.

The Commission and Council were in support of Goal EV 6 as written.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on Goal EV 7.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal EV 7 and its supporting Policies and Actions. In response to a comment from Mayor Gurney, he commented that a lot of the Policies in the General Plan could be prefaced with 'continue to'. He added that they were not meant to imply that something wasn't already being done.

Chair Doyle referred to Action EV 7d and asked if it was suggesting that the City should be encouraged to buy and develop properties and act as a landlord.

Mr. Ritchie responded that it was a tool that was being provided based on the Commission and Council's previous discussion about the City taking a more proactive stance towards land acquisition to further the goal of the types of development and land use that it wants to see. He noted that the Action uses the word 'consider' in the event that it doesn't come to fruition or prove to be feasible.

Chair Doyle commented that he could see how Action EV 7d fit in the context of their previous discussion.

Mayor Gurney commented that had Action EV 7d been in play, the Pellini site, which sat vacant for years, might have been purchased so that a more internally acceptable use could have been placed there.

Chair Doyle commented that his initial reaction was that it was encouraging the City to become a landlord by getting into the business of buying a building, remodeling it, and then renting out space to desirable businesses, which he did not think the City should do.

Mr. Ritchie responded that it was meant to spearhead efforts.

Councilmember Eder commented that Action EV 7c and EV 1e were redundant and should be internally consistent.

Mr. Ritchie agreed and commented that Action EV 7c would be stricken.

Councilmember Slayter suggested removing the specific website reference at the end of Action EV 7f because web addresses can and do change over time.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Gurney asked for any additional comments on the Economic Vitality Element of the General Plan.

Chair Doyle referred to Action EV 1b on page 9-3 and commented that the word, 'report' or 'analysis' should be inserted in the first sentence between the words, 'economic impact' and 'that analyzes'.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Vice Chair Kelley commented that the Council discussed the idea of a community impact report a number of years back.

Mr. Ritchie responded that, based on previous discussions, a new Action item has been added calling for the development of standards for preparation of community impact reports.

Vice Chair Kelley commented that a community impact report would incorporate fiscal and economic impacts.

Mr. Ritchie responded that he would make a note to reconcile economic and community impact reports.

Mayor Gurney commented that she and Councilmember Jacob were on the Council subcommittee on Community Impact Reports and had recently met to discuss. She noted that they would be bringing a recommendation to the Council at a future date.

Mr. Ritchie noted that the language in the revised draft would return to the Commission and Council at a future date.

Vice Chair Kelley commented:

- It is important to reconcile this action so that we don't end up being redundant and/or confusing.
- The parameters of a community impact report would come from an ordinance, which is needed.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Action EV 1b was written before they'd gotten the Commission and Council's direction to come up with a community impact report requirement.
- The action, laid out in draft form, encompasses Action EV 1b and much more.
- Action EV 1b may be rendered obsolete with inclusion of the new community impact report Action item.

Mayor Gurney commented that this is a complex issue that a Council subcommittee is currently exploring and that due to timing, she was not sure that the conclusion of their work would be including in the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The Action doesn't set specify the standards and it doesn't specify the trigger mechanism.
- The Action calls out, with enough detail to be meaningful, the types of items that should be analyzed in the community impact report.
- The Action doesn't get out in front of the subcommittee in crafting the standards; it's meant to provide enough teeth to set the stage for what is coming.

Mayor Gurney commented that that sounds appropriate.

Mayor Gurney asked if members of the public wished to speak on the Economic Vitality Element.

Hearing none, Mayor Gurney closed the Public Hearing and asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on the Noise Element.

Mr. Ritchie introduced the Commission and Council to the Noise Element of the General Plan.

Due to a concern on timing for members of the public who may wish to speak on this item prior to adjourning for break, Mayor Gurney asked if the Commission and Council would be amenable to conducting the Public Hearing before their discussion of this Element. The Commission and Council agreed.

Mayor Gurney opened the Public Hearing.

Patty Holden, 443 Eleanor Avenue, commented:

- Her neighbor, Larry Robinson, provided a letter and asked her share since he was out of town. Mr. Robinson's comments included:
 - Expressed his appreciation to the Commission, Council and staff for the hard work they put into keeping Sebastopol a livable and enjoyable small town.
 - Expressed having some concern with the proposed new Noise Ordinance.
 - Increasing the allowable noise level for downtown businesses will have the greatest impact on those who live near the downtown.
 - On warm evenings, when people like to keep their windows open for fresh air, the music venues open their doors for the same reason, the noise level in our neighborhood of Eleanor, Fannen, and Walker Avenues often becomes very disturbing.
 - Too often, even with all windows and doors closed, the bass notes of music comes through our walks. This very directly affects our peace of mind.
 - The standards in the existing Noise Ordinance do not need to be relaxed.
 - Hopes that they will seriously reconsider the proposed changes to the ordinance and vote to protect the tranquility of Sebastopol's residential neighborhoods.
 - Thanked the Commission and Council for their time.
- Ms. Holden's comments included:

- Strongly opposes the idea of increasing acceptable noise levels in the downtown area.
- Her neighborhood has been struggling with downtown noise for years and this would eliminate the progress they have made after many complaints and help from City staff.
- Excessively loud music does not make a vibrant downtown.
- Relentless noise can quickly outweigh all the benefits of living close to town.
- Please do not increase the allowable noise levels in the downtown area.
- Instead, continue to enforce the existing regulations in ways that work for everyone.
- Thanked the Commission and Council for their time.

Jack Fisher, Cleveland Avenue, commented:

- When you're talking about relaxing standards, you're also talking about relaxing the exceptions to those standards.
- The exceptions are controversial, ambiguous, subjective, costly to establish or monitor and nearly impossible to enforce. They allow and even promote the continuing degradation of the soundscape.
- Only those who don't live in the neighborhoods impacted can have the luxury of taking this issue lightly. Unfortunately, this is often the case for those making the decisions, granting the exceptions, or giving the approvals at their discretion.
- People who live in town want the City to be vigilant about those quality of life issues.
- Any changes should make things better, not worse.
- Suggested that existing standards be kept and that ambient noise levels be relied on, rather than averages, when discussing and enforcing noise.
- Decibels and averages are not what humans perceive, those are just scientific data gathered and calculated by a monitoring device. To ignore the difference takes this serious issue into a nonhuman realm.
- Speaking on behalf of his wife, Donna, their neighbors and the Sebastopol Alliance for Neighborhood Empowerment.
- Thanked the Commission and Council for their time and consideration.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney thanked members of the public for their comments and closed the Public Hearing.

Mayor Gurney referred to an email that was submitted by Bill Roby.

Mr. Roby's comments included:

- The updated Noise ordinance repeatedly refers to mitigating noise and minimizing noise exposure from all sources, including traffic, construction, trash collection, and even County airport flight activities.
- In a complete reversal from the rest of the document, Policy N 2-1 recommends that noise from downtown businesses be allowed to increase, up to 42% higher than current levels, on weekend nights via a permit process.
- Expressed concern with Policy N 2-4, which would allow downtown business noise levels to exceed normal standards on an ongoing basis and without any process at all.
- With the inclusion of Policy N 2-1 and N 2-4, surrounding residential neighborhoods will, thus, not have the same protections from noise impacts deemed necessary in every other part of the city.
- Policy N 2-1 and N 2-4 run contrary to the spirit and intent of the Noise Ordinance and need simply to be eliminated.

Chair Doyle commented:

- In response to Mr. Roby's comment on Policy N 2-4; as he understood it, Policy N 2-4 wasn't suggesting that noise levels be elevated.
 - Under Policy N 2-4, residential uses may be allowed in areas that have higher acceptable noise levels.
 - In other words, there could be a proposal for a mixed-use development in an area that is more urbanized and has higher noise levels, which could be considered appropriate due to its proximity to a transit stop or a bunch of restaurants, etc.
 - It's not that the noise levels would be higher; it's just that the noise levels that were permitted were allowed to be higher because it would be in a commercially zoned area.
 - The question is with whether or not the City wants to allow residential uses within those areas.
 - This would allow the City to make an exception to permit housing in these areas even though the average sound levels are higher than typically allowed in areas zoned for residential use.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Chair Doyle's assessment was very accurate and concise.
- Policy N 2-4 is about allowing residential development to occur in an area that may already have an ambient noise level in excess of our residential standards.
- Strongly recommends retaining Policy N 2-4.
- A lot of discussion on the subject of wanting to encourage more housing in the downtown has occurred.
- It's important to distinguish between allowing residential uses where it is already a little bit noisy versus Policy N 2-1, which is saying to allow some standards to let it be noisier on certain nights.

Mayor Gurney agreed and commented that for some housing choices, higher ambient noise is part of the circumstance.

Councilmember Eder asked how we could prevent high noise uses from being established next to residential areas.

Mr. Ritchie responded that that was addressed under the standards under Goal N 1.

Councilmember Eder commented that the draft Sebastopol Downtown Design Standards, which had not yet been adopted, include provisions on acoustic shielding.

Mayor Gurney adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m. for a dinner break.

Mayor Gurney resumed the meeting at 6:47 p.m.

Mayor Gurney asked Mr. Ritchie to orient them on where they left off.

Mr. Ritchie referred to Policy N 2-1, which is supported by Actions N-2a and N-2b and asked if the Commission and Council thought it acceptable to put a mechanism in place to provide flexibility for Downtown businesses to occasionally exceed our noise standards on weekend nights.

Chair Doyle asked for clarification on the baseline numbers.

Mr. Ritchie explained.

Commissioner Fritz asked for an explanation of 'Hourly Noise Level Descriptor' 'Leq' and 'L_{max}'.

Mr. Ritchie responded that 'L_{max}' refers to a sustained noise, while 'Leq' refers to an average noise level.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Our two priorities are to have a vibrant, active downtown, and to protect our residential neighbors from intrusion on the peace and enjoyment of their property.
- There is a reasonable expectation, if you are housed downtown, that it will be a little noisier than being housed in other places outside the downtown.
- Referred to the standards in Table N-1 and expressed a concern that the proposed allowances would result in too much noise.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- From a practical standpoint, in terms of interpreting what this might feel like, he suggested assuming that the noise would be coming from a band.
- Therefore, the sound would not be sustained.

Chair Doyle asked if the numbers were measured from the property of the residents.

Mr. Ritchie responded that it is measured from the exterior property line of the receiving residence.

Commissioner Fritz commented that the Commission had heard complaints from residents on Eleanor Avenue and asked if staff knew what the decibel numbers were for those complaints.

Director Webster and Mr. McLaughlin responded that the reports were received after the fact so no measurements were taken.

Commissioner Fritz commented that this is a vague and esoteric matter that is hard to quantify in terms of saying how much is too much.

Mr. Ritchie commented that rather than getting hung up on the numbers, the fundamental question is, should your General Plan allow for exceptions for weekend noise in the downtown to be higher than what would normally be accepted.

Commissioner Jacob commented that we might want to extend this to include Thursday's due to The Barlow Street Fair.

Councilmember Slayter stated that that extends the question that they were already being asked and that they should deal with the initial question first.

Councilmember Slayter commented:

- Not sure that we need to extend the hours.

- We've heard loud and clear from our community that noise is one of the biggest issues.
- The noise issues are not Hopmonk Tavern/Eleanor Avenue exclusive in any way.
- We should stick with what we have now.

Mayor Gurney commented, for purposes of discussion, that she'd be willing to allow more noise on Friday and Saturday nights.

Vice Chair Kelley commented:

- A person she knows purchased her house at Laguna Parkway and Johnson Street before The Barlow got developed. Somehow, the event center at The Barlow was approved to face those residences. That never should have happened.
- We need to make sure when we're approving projects that we really have looked at the impacts on the neighbors.
- Expressed a concern over our downtown residents not having been noticed about this discussion.
- As a property owner on Eleanor Avenue she expressed understanding the issues being raised by her neighbors.
- Our standards are high enough.
- We should seek more input from the people who will be affected.
- An increase in noise will not create a more vibrant downtown.

Mayor Gurney asked if the GPAC was most concerned with sound levels relating to music.

Mr. Ritchie responded that that was the simplest example of what he would anticipate someone would come forward and ask for a Use Permit for. He noted that it could also relate to other noises generated by a business being operated in the downtown. Councilmember Slayter surmised that it was not entertainment exclusive.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Mayor Gurney agreed with Commissioner Fritz in that it is hard to quantify what these levels will translate to in reality.

Mr. Ritchie responded that people would find the noise to be a nuisance and annoying, but that it would not hurt people's ears.

Vice Mayor Glass asked where our noise complaints were coming from now.

Commission and Council members commented that The Barlow, Aubergine, Hopmonk Tavern and Jasper's have received complaints over the years.

Director Webster agreed that those entertainment venues have received complaints. In addition, rooftop equipment, truck deliveries and idling trucks from some of our markets in town have also been the source of complaints.

Vice Mayor Glass asked for the frequency of those complaints.

Director Webster responded that the City does not receive a huge volume or frequency of complaints due to undue disturbance.

Mr. McLaughlin commented that one thing he had heard when talking to Hopmonk about some complaints that the City had received was that Hopmonk was running into contractual issues because some bands that perform there require a certain level in their contracts. However, after Hopmonk made some changes and there were no further complaints, they did acknowledge that they were operating the business as successfully as they had before.

Vice Mayor Glass responded that that was gratifying to hear.

Vice Mayor Glass asked if the City had received complaints about the Peacetown Summer Concert Series.

Director Webster responded that the City might have received a complaint, or two, but no more than that.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Agreed with other members in that it was hard to judge what an appropriate level might be.
- Expressed feeling unqualified to make a judgment.
- The City already receives complaints under our current Noise Ordinance.

Mr. McLaughlin responded:

- The Noise Ordinance that we presently have in place calibrates noise levels at the property line where the noise is emitting from.
- The way this is worded is a deviation from the way we enforce our noise ordinance currently.
- In the past, we found it to be impractical to try and calibrate noise levels where they are received.

Commissioner Jacob commented:

- When the downtown becomes denser, mixed-use occurs, and there are more people walking around at night, the background noise will increase.
- While the City may continue to receive complaints initially, a rise in constant background noise will eventually become unnoticeable, like the ocean.
- The noise that spikes above the constant background noise is what is noticeable.
- Trying to identify an appropriate decibel level is challenging.
- We have to recognize that as our downtown becomes more vibrant, it will also become noisier.
- Allowing, whether by Use Permit or by a change to our Noise Ordinance, noisier weekend nights is appropriate.

Chair Doyle commented, as he understood it, that there was a Noise Ordinance in place without any mechanism for requesting to exceeding the current limit.

Mr. McLaughlin responded that that was not correct, a variance from our Noise Ordinance could be granted on a one-time basis.

Chair Doyle commented:

- For purposes of supporting the concept, a Use Permit would require noticing of property owners within 600 feet, which would provide an opportunity for public noticing and a full discussion at the Planning Commission.

- We could consider referencing this concept in the General Plan and something to the effect of, 'consider reviewing the Noise Ordinance regarding permissible noise levels in the downtown area.'
- Doing so would allow us to look into this further after the General Plan has been adopted.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- Due to our lack of an understanding of what the impacts of this are, it is appropriate to defer specific action on this until after the General Plan has been adopted.
- Most of the suggested changes throughout the General Plan use the word 'consider' but this one doesn't.
- Echoed Chair Doyle's comments.

Commissioner Fritz commented:

- Expressed being generally supportive of some increase to the allowable noise level in the downtown on weekend nights.
- Reiterated Commissioner Jacob's comment that the background noise will increase when the downtown becomes denser, mixed-use occurs, and there are more people walking around at night.
- Expressed being okay with the level increasing over time.
- It's difficult to have a good grasp on what the levels would translate to.
- Suggested including a policy to recognize an increase in noise levels on the weekend in the downtown area without being more specific.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Agreed that as the downtown becomes more vibrant the general sound level will increase which will result in a higher ambient noise level.
- Doesn't see a nexus between increasing the sound level and economic vibrancy in our downtown.
- A website that he visited about sound attenuation said that three decibels yields about a 23% increase in perceptible loudness.
- Vibrancy doesn't require more noise.
- There's no other applicability aside from music.
- Allowing a formal increase would place the burden onto staff as far as monitoring goes.
- Allowing a formal increase is not necessary.

Mayor Gurney responded that it would put the burden onto the permit holder.

Mr. Ritchie noted that staff would be dealing with those complaints as well.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the Commission and Council appeared to be split on the matter and suggested the following, 'consider establishing standards that would provide for flexibility to periodically exceed the noise standard for downtown businesses who go through a Use Permit process'.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Eder referred to the first bullet under Policy N 1-7 on page 6-2 under 'Transportation Noise Sources' and commented that '+5 dB' should be reduced to '+3 dB'.

Mr. Ritchie commented that that threshold was considered an industry standard.

Councilmember Slayter referred to Policy N 1-6 and asked about existing facilities that were planning to install new equipment.

Mr. Ritchie responded that that was partially accomplished under Policy N 1-18 and agreed that language could be added to Policy N 1-6 to expand to include 'changes to existing operations'.

Chair Doyle commented:

- The Noise Element struck him as being more specific in detail than any other Element.
- Referred to Policy N 1-3 and suggested removing, 'such as rubberized asphalt' as it was too specific.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Chair Doyle commented:

- Referred to Action N-1f on page 6-4 and commented that a more appropriate place for that much specificity would be directly in the Noise Ordinance.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Because this is a self-mitigating General Plan, we're going to have to write answers to CEQA questions after the General Plan is implemented and one of those questions is about construction noise.
- This is pointing back to a mitigation measure and procedure that the City will require for subsequent development projects during their construction periods.
- Our current Noise Ordinance is lacking in terms of construction best practices.
- Action N-1f could be prefaced with, 'update the Noise Ordinance to include the following requirements' or it could stay as an Action Item.
- The bottom line is that these should be requirements of all construction projects.

Chair Doyle commented:

- Understood that it would help with the process of the EIR.
- Action N-1f seems inconsistently specific.
- In 15 years there will be new best practices.

Mr. Ritchie responded that he understood Chair Doyle's comments, however, it was general enough in that it talked about methods rather than specifics.

Chair Doyle referred to Policy N 1-16 on page 6-3 and asked for an explanation of the 'vibration impacts' it was referring to.

Mr. Ritchie responded that is was referring to pile driving, blasting to remove bedrock, or other serious construction.

Chair Doyle asked for an explanation of 'PPV' (peak particle velocity).

Mr. Ritchie responded that PPV refers to how hard the ground is shaking.

Chair Doyle noted that the City has a Planning Director, not a Community Development Director which should be reflected in the Plan.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Gurney asked for any final comments on the Noise Element.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on the Safety Element.

Mr. Ritchie introduced the Commission and Council to the Safety Element of the General Plan.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from the Commission and Council on Goal SA 1.

Commissioner Slayter referred to Figure 8.1: Geologic and Soils Hazards and asked where the consultants had gotten that information from.

Mr. Ritchie responded that most of the information had come from the United States Geological Survey.

Councilmember Eder referred to Policy SA 1-3 and asked if all of downtown Sebastopol was considered an area with high seismic hazard.

Mr. Ritchie responded that in terms of earthquake susceptibility there really is no differentiation between one part of town or another, all of Sebastopol is in an earthquake risk zone.

Councilmember Eder asked if the words 'high seismic' should be stricken from Policy SA 1-3.

Mr. Ritchie commented that he understood Councilmember Eder's comment.

Ms. Thompson commented that this was referring to high seismic hazards, not events.

Councilmember Eder asked staff if all City facilities had been seismically inspected.

Mr. McLaughlin commented that he would look into that.

Councilmember Slayter commented that the Police and Fire Departments were most likely built to the highest State standard, safety wise.

Councilmember Eder commented that funding should be identified for City facilities that may be considered at risk.

Councilmember Eder asked if there were any unreinforced masonry buildings in town.

Director Webster responded:

- There was a program about 20 years ago that identified unreinforced masonry buildings in the downtown.
- The City's redevelopment agency gave loans for safety improvements to those identified buildings.
- Believed that all of the identified buildings were addressed at that time.

Councilmember Eder concluded that warning plaques were no longer needed for those buildings.

Director Webster responded:

- Those buildings still don't have the same level of safety as a modern building would have.
- Warning plaques are often used even when the buildings have been retrofitted.

Councilmember Eder asked if the Fire Chief and the Police Chief had reviewed the Safety Element of the draft General Plan.

Director Webster responded that they had.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from the Commission and Council on Goal SA 2.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal SA 2.

Mayor Gurney commented that we should ensure that the stormwater that we release into the Laguna goes through some sort of filtering system.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative and commented:

- The Conservation Element includes a detailed set of policies on water quality.
- The Safety element includes policies on protecting life and property from a flood risk.

Commissioner Jacob commented:

- During discussion of the Ives Park Master Plan, we spoke about covering and uncovering sections of the creek to make it appear more natural.
- Asked if the creek at Ives Park was fenced off due to a safety concern.
- Ragle Park has a fenced in pond as well.
- Would rather not see a bunch of fences in a natural setting.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- There is quite a bit in the Conservation Element about naturalizing and daylighting creeks.
- The General Plan does not talk about fencing around creeks in terms of safety.

Mayor Gurney commented that it was likely an insurance issue.

Commissioner Jacob asked if public safety around water should be mentioned in the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie responded that the likely consensus would be to not put a fence around some nice, natural water if you didn't have to. Recommended that the General Plan remain silent on the matter.

Mr. McLaughlin commented that his understanding was that the fences mentioned derived from concerns about liability by the City's insurance carrier, REMIF (Redwood Empire Municipal Insurance Fund).

Commissioner Pinto asked how old the FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) flood maps are.

Director Webster responded that FEMA did an update to flood mapping within the past 10 years.

Mayor Gurney asked if our 'no net fill' policy was mentioned in relation to development in the flood zone anywhere in the General Plan. She commented that it is a significant guiding policy for development in much of our downtown area and could effect flooding.

Vice Chair Kelley referred to Policy SA 2-9.

Mayor Gurney asked Mr. Ritchie to make a note of it and ensure that it is mentioned somewhere within the document.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Gurney asked if consideration of dredging the Laguna channel to create more water storage would belong in the Conservation Element.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Most of the policy approaches taken, with regards to the Laguna, have been in deference to the Laguna Wetlands Preserve Restoration and Management Plan.
- The General Plan lays out the framework of protect and enhance the Laguna while leaving the nuances of treatment of the Laguna to lie within the Management Plan document.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal SA 3.

The Commission and Council had no comment.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal SA 4.

Councilmember Eder referred to Action SA-4h on page 8-8 and asked about the nine-minute response time, as it seemed like all of Sebastopol would be well within a nine-minute response time.

Director Webster responded:

- Nine-minutes is the national standard for a volunteer Fire Department.
- The Fire Department requested that the national standard be reflected in the General Plan

Chair Doyle commented that Action SA-4h forces the City to maintain its Fire Department to ensure that that standard can continue to be met.

Councilmember Eder referred to Policy SA 4-7 and Action SA-4n and asked about the City's stance of the use of chemicals for weed abatement.

Mayor Gurney responded that the City has a policy that discourages the use of chemicals for weed abatement on City property and includes a statement that encourages voluntary toxic-free weed abatement.

Director Webster added that the City policy was not an absolute prohibition of its own use of herbicides; it strongly discourages their use while recognizing that there may be some situations where they are the only viable solution.

Councilmember Eder concluded that the use of chemicals was not forbidden.

Director Webster responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Eder referred to Action SA-6h on page 8-11 and commented that the word 'prohibit' is used.

Director Webster agreed that a word other than 'prohibit' should be used.

Ms. Thompson commented that they would review the resolution and modify the language accordingly.

Councilmember Eder commented that he was looking for consistency.

Mr. Ritchie clarified that Action SA-6h was not intended to reopen, revisit, or contradict the City's existing policy.

Commissioner Jacob asked for an explanation of the 'Fire Protection Impact Fee and Fund' listed in Action SA-4i.

Mr. Ritchie responded that it was suggesting consideration of a new impact fee that would provide an additional revenue source for fire protection services.

Commissioner Jacob asked if there was an active need to increase funding for the Fire Department.

Mr. McLaughlin responded that the Fire Chief has requested that one or more paid personnel be added to his staff to meet the need for daytime response.

Commissioner Jacob asked if those monies would go into the General Fund.

Mr. McLaughlin noted that enacting an impact fee would require voter approval.

Mayor Gurney commented that the idea was for the impact fee monies to be used by the Fire Department for either personnel or capital improvements, meaning that it wouldn't go into the General Fund.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative and commented that the monies would be specifically earmarked for use by the Fire Department.

Director Webster commented that there were many forms of impact fees and different ways that one could be structured.

Mr. Ritchie clarified that assessments on existing property owners that aren't applying for development permits are different than impact fees on new development, which would only apply as part of the permit application process.

Mayor Gurney that assessments and impact fees may want to be considered.

Ms. Thompson agreed that either/or could be considered.

Mayor Gurney agreed that we should say 'and/or' with regards to assessments and impact fees.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- A successfully functioning Fire Department in this day and age is an anachronism.
- It is likely that Sebastopol will have to look at a partially or fully paid Fire Department within the lifespan of the General Plan.
- Nearly four years ago, the Fire Chief estimated that Sebastopol going to a fully paid Fire Department would cost about 3.5 million dollars per year.
- It is important that we look to the future on how we can fund that because it will be a huge hit on the City financially.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on Goal SA 5.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal SA 5.

Councilmember Eder suggested that, 'including minorities' be stricken from Policy SA 5-6 because it was a given that they would be included.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Jacob suggested that language be added to encourage outreach to all different segments of the population and to maintain the highest level of training for doing so.

Director Webster commented that there was a policy about that in the Community Services and Facilities Element.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Gurney commented that the Police Department should remain aware and on the edge of best practices in terms of peace keeping.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Mr. Ritchie on Goal SA 6.

Mr. Ritchie introduced Goal SA 6.

Councilmember Slayter referred to Action SA-6b and commented that the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency (SCWMA) may only exist for one more year and expressed being uncomfortable with calling them out specifically.

Mr. Ritchie suggested adding, 'or relevant equal successor' after.

Councilmember Eder suggested, 'current hazardous waste disposal program.'

Mr. Ritchie commented that they'd look at it.

Councilmember Eder referred to Policy SA 6-4 and asked if the City was currently being notified or could be, when somebody was coming through town with hazardous materials.

Mr. Ritchie commented that they could look into it and get back to the Commission and Council.

Commissioner Pinto asked if there was anything in the General Plan about the City's role in monitoring existing portions of the aquifer and contamination.

Mr. McLaughlin commented that that was extensively monitored.

Ms. Thompson commented that there is discussion of monitoring water supply for contamination in the General Plan.

Mayor Gurney referred to Action SA-6h and commented that we should also discourage the application of pesticides and other toxic chemicals on County parkland adjacent to City property.

Vice Chair Kelley commented that the last sentence of Action SA-6h seemed to cover that.

Mayor Gurney commented that she would like reference to public park property specifically.

Mr. Ritchie commented that he would fold in language to that effect.

Vice Mayor Glass asked about intersecting with the Marin/Sonoma Mosquito & Vector Control District (MSMVCD).

Mayor Gurney and Mr. Ritchie agreed that the MSMVCD would be another agency to coordinate with.

Commissioner Pinto commented that the pond at Ragle has an abundance of fish this year.

Hearing nothing further, Mayor Gurney asked Mr. Ritchie to explain the next steps in this process.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The Implementation Chapter is a compilation of all of the Action items so there really isn't any new information in it. The Implementation Chapter identifies the responsible department and priority and includes a status box to track what has and has not been completed.
- The Planning Commission will hold an EIR scoping meeting on March 22nd. The meeting will include a brief presentation by De Novo and an opportunity for the Commission and members of the public to comment on the environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR.

- Targeting early May for release of the public draft EIR as well as the revised draft General Plan. There will be a minimum 6-week public review period for those.
- After that, final Planning Commission and City Council hearings will be held.
- Targeting October for adoption.

Vice Chair Kelley asked if a new draft General Plan would be prepared.

Mr. Ritchie responded that a new draft General Plan would be prepared and circulated.

Mayor Gurney opened the Public Hearing and asked for comments from members of the public on the Safety Element.

Hearing none, Mayor Gurney closed the Public Hearing.

Mayor Gurney thanked Mr. Ritchie, Ms. Thompson, staff, the Commission and Council.

9. PUBLIC HEARING: None

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None

11. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Gurney adjourned the meeting at 8:31 p.m. The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 15, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. at the Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472. Chair Doyle adjourned the meeting at 8:31 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 22, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. at the Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kenyon Webster
Planning Director