



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: January 12, 2016
SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX
425 MORRIS STREET

APPROVED MINUTES

CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF January 12, 2016

SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX
425 MORRIS STREET

CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION:

The notice of the meeting was posted by the City Clerk on January 07, 2016.

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 7:05 p.m.
- b. Chair Doyle called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

a. City Council

Present: Mayor Gurney, Vice Mayor Glass, and
Councilmembers Eder, Jacob and Slayter

Absent: None

Staff: Larry McLaughlin, City Manager-City Attorney
Mary Gourley, City Clerk

b. Planning Commission

Present: Chair Doyle, Vice Chair Kelley, and Commissioners Pinto,
Fernandez and Jacob

Absent: Commissioner Douch (excused)

Staff: Kenyon Webster, Planning Director
Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of: December 8, 2015

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

Commissioner Jacob seconded the motion.

Vote:	Ayes:	Chair Doyle, Vice Chair Kelley and Commissioners Pinto, Fernandez and Jacob
	Noes:	None
	Abstain:	None

Mayor Gurney congratulated Commissioners Doyle, Kelley and Fernandez on their recent reappointment to the Planning Commission. On behalf of the Council, she expressed appreciation for their willingness to continue to serve on the Planning Commission, especially given the work that is before them with regards to the General Plan.

Mayor Gurney outlined the process for tonight's proceedings.

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.

There were none.

5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Commissioner Doyle stated that he owns property on Ragle Road, in the County, west of the city limits. The area around his property may be discussed by the Council and Commission tonight during review of the city's Urban Growth Boundary and Sphere of Influence. If the area around his property is to be discussed, he will recuse himself from that part of the discussion. As advised by the City Attorney, he may join the public to listen to the discussion. He will rejoin the Planning Commission after discussion of the area around his property is complete.

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

Director Webster provided the following update:

- The City Council approved the Laguna Preserve Management Plan at their last regular meeting.
- As mentioned by the Mayor, last night three members of the Planning Commission were reappointed by the City Council. Congratulations to Commissioner Doyle, Kelley and Fernandez. One vacancy remains. The Council will be discussing their process for filling the vacant seat at an upcoming meeting.
- The City Council also reappointed the three incumbents to the Design Review Board.
- At the City Council meeting on January 19th, the Council will consider a recommendation from the Public Arts Committee for a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for a public artwork funded by the City's art in-lieu fee.

Director Webster update continued:

- Also on that agenda will be an informational presentation on a County of Sonoma initiative targeted at ending homelessness in the County over the next ten years.
- Also on that agenda, the LANTERN group, a group of citizens working on expansion or replacement of the library, will be talking to the Council about support for something happening at the current library site, as opposed to other sites.
- At the Council meeting of February 16, the Council will be looking at a draft ordinance regarding the Urban Growth Boundary. The Council had some discussion of this at their last meeting as the UGB is set to expire at the end of this year.
- Also on that agenda are a number of bicycle related items.
- At the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting of January 26, the Commission will consider three Use Permit applications.

There were no questions of staff.

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

8. DISCUSSION:

A. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: REVIEW OF LAND USE, CIRCULATION AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER ELEMENTS OF THE GPAC DRAFT GENERAL PLAN: The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), conducting numerous public meetings for more than a year, has created a Draft General Plan. The City Council and Planning Commission will conduct an initial review of the draft General Plan in three joint meetings, to consider whether any revisions to the GPAC draft are appropriate, before a formal draft General Plan is created. Comments from members of the public are welcome regarding the first three draft Elements to be discussed (Land Use; Circulation; Community Character). The other Elements will be reviewed at joint meetings on February 9 and March 8, 2016. There will be additional public hearings after the formal draft General Plan and a draft Environmental Impact Report are published.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Ben Ritchie of De Novo Planning Group.

Ben Ritchie of De Novo Planning Group introduced his partner, Beth Thompson, made a presentation and was available for questions.

Mayor Gurney asked a clarifying question of Mr. Ritchie on the process for tonight's meeting.

Mayor Gurney asked if anyone in attendance wished to speak on any of the items on the agenda at this time. She noted that there would be additional opportunities as the meeting progressed.

Mayor Gurney commented that all parties may want to consider an earlier start time of 6:00 p.m. for the joint meetings scheduled for February and March. She noted that other accommodations may want to be considered as well.

Hearing none, Mayor Gurney asked for guidance from Mr. Ritchie on how to proceed.

A summary of comments, questions and responses are summarized below.

Commissioner Jacob referred to page 1, the Table of Contents, and asked why there was no Chapter for the Housing Element.

Mr. Ritchie responded that the Housing Element would be added at the adoption point.

Commissioner Jacob commented:

- Requested that the Housing Element be included in the Table of Contents of the General Plan and that the Housing Element be included in the General Plan when it goes out for public review even if it were highly annotated to say that it was informational and not up for discussion.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- It would be helpful, for both members of the Commission and Council as well as the public, to see what the changes were from the prior General Plan.
- Requested that those be provided at the next meeting.

Ben Ritchie indicated that tracking changes from the current General Plan had been discussed but was not included in the scope of work but that major changes were described in the draft document. He introduced the Land Use Element and asked for any comments on the Land Use Designations.

Commissioner Doyle questioned the intent behind the recommendation to increase the maximum density in Low Density Single Family Residential, Medium Density Single Family Residential and High Density Single Family Residential. He also asked what they foresaw as modifications to the Zoning Ordinance as a result of these changes.

Mr. Ritchie responded as for overall intent, with the following:

- We heard numerous times throughout this process that we need to seek opportunities for additional affordable housing, a range of housing types, and housing for all income groups.
- Coupled with a very consistent theme of not wanting to grow outside city limit boundaries, and the consumption of new, undeveloped land for pretty much any type of project, including housing, being undesirable.
- When surveying a number of other General Plans statewide, Medium Density Single Family Residential with a maximum of six units per acre is very much on the low side and is more consistent with a lot of low density designations.
- The recommendation to increase the maximum density brings the designations more into conformity and provides opportunity for additional housing development within the city limits without tapping into undeveloped land resources.

Commissioner Doyle reiterated his question about what the consultants foresaw as modifications to the Zoning Ordinance as a result of these changes.

Mr. Ritchie and Ms. Thompson responded:

- Possible adjustments to minimum lot size.
- Possible adjustments to setback requirements.
- Possible creation of a new zoning district.
- He noted we don't try to write the General Plan to conform to how the Zoning Code is currently written. At the end of any good General Plan, there will be a number of required changes, updates and revisions to your Zoning Code in order to bring it into compliance with the newly adopted General Plan.

Commissioner Doyle asked if the rest of the Commission and Council was comfortable with the recommended density changes and explained by Mr. Ritchie.

Mayor Gurney stated that she was and asked if Mr. Ritchie would conduct straw polls as needed.

Mr. Ritchie replied that he would, if needed. He added that he was not picking up a significant concern with the densities as laid out.

Hearing nothing further on that topic, Mayor Gurney invited additional questions of the consultants.

Councilmember Slayter commented that he was that the colors on the Land Use Map were a bit more saturated than the previous and felt it to be easier to understand, which he appreciated.

Councilmember Slayter stated that there appeared to be less land use designations than before.

Mr. Ritchie commented that the Commercial and Office land use designations were combined. He noted that there hadn't been many changes to the Land Use Map, but that a map would be put up on the projector during their discussion.

Councilmember Slayter asked which land use designations disallowed housing.

Mr. Ritchie commented that housing is not allowed in the following designations; OLI (Office/Light Industrial), CF (Community Facility), OS (Open Space) and PA (Park).

Councilmember Slayter commented that zones, specifically in the downtown where the community's interest is in having a higher density, a minimum FAR (Floor Area Ratio) should be established. Doing so would allow us to promote and require the densities that we are interested in having in our downtown.

Mr. Ritchie referred to a diagram on FAR on page 2-4 of the Land Use Element and expounded as follows:

- Covering exactly 100% of a lot with a 1-story building would equal a FAR of 1.0.
- Conversely, covering exactly 50% of a lot with a 2-story building would also equal a FAR of 1.0.
- It goes upwards from there.

Mr. Ritchie asked the Commission and Council if there was general support for a minimum FAR in the Downtown Core, which would preclude projects that don't make efficient use of land and end up with too much parking and a single-story building. He proposed using 1.0 as a minimum FAR.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from members on the issue of establishing a minimum FAR in the Downtown Core.

Commissioner Pinto commented:

- That a statement promoting establishment of a minimum FAR can be seen in Action LU 1c on page 2-7 of the Land Use Element.
- Echoed Councilmember Slayter's comment on the colors on the Land Use Map being easier to understand.
- Suggested that an explanation of 'Referral Area' be added under Planning Boundaries on page 2-2 of the Land Use Element.
- Asked if 'Referral Area' was a legally recognized land use concept in the State of California.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- 'Referral Area' is not a legally recognized land use concept in the State of California.
- The 'Referral Area' serves to ask that the County of Sonoma and City of Santa Rosa notify us of pending projects within a certain area outside of our city limits. This would allow us an opportunity to comment before a decision is made.
- The 'Referral Area' is not a formal boundary on a map that you would adopt.
- There is not necessarily legal remedy for not being notified of projects outside of our SOI.
- Around here, as practiced, there are good neighbor policies and referrals/consultations do occur.

Commissioner Pinto asked if this came from the recent large-scale winery and distillery that was proposed on former dairy land off of Highway 12, about 2 miles east of town.

Mayor Gurney stated that this issue had first been discussed many years ago.

Mr. Ritchie added:

- It's a very common planning practice.
- Many cities request referral from projects in their vicinity.
- A general rule of thumb would be to keep lines of communication open for projects within 2 miles.

Mr. Ritchie summarized what he'd heard thus far, as follows:

- Establish a minimum FAR of 1.0 for the Downtown Core.

Chair Doyle commented:

- As it relates to other things in the General Plan, a minimum FAR of 1.0 for the Downtown Core sounds good, generally.
- Expressed having a problem with being too specific in the General Plan.
- Suggested being less specific in the General Plan, and more specific in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Doing so would allow applicants to apply for a variance versus a text amendment to the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- Cautioned members on the use of a variance within the Zoning Code.
- There is rather specific Planning law on how variances can be applied.
- The variance has to do with a physical hardship on a parcel, such as a massive rock outcropping where you can't possibly make the setback work.
- An example where an exception to this FAR requirement would make it for a better or viable project doesn't actually meet the criteria for the application of a variance.
- There's a push and pull between how much specificity to put into a General Plan.
- If you stay more vague, you have more flexibility in the future, but you haven't accomplished as much towards meeting the goals that you set out to meet.
- There are a number of courses of action for moving forward on this FAR question.
 - On page 2-3 and 2-4 under the description of the 'Downtown Core'. We could add another sentence saying that the minimum FAR shall be at least 1.0. Doing so would provide a very high level of specificity.
 - We could leave Action LU 1c, on page 2-7, as is and remember down the road that the intent in thinking was to make it 1.0.
 - Revise said Action to read, "Revise the Zoning Code to establish a minimum FAR of 1.0 for new major development projects within the Downtown Core." Doing so would direct the City to put that minimum FAR into its Zoning Code, rather than having it become a policy within the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie comments continued:

- Revise said Action to read, "Consider revising the Zoning Code to establish a minimum FAR of 1.0 for new major development projects within the Downtown Core."

Mayor Gurney expressed a preference for the first option; meaning to provide a very high level of specificity. She commented that not being definite may result in our not being motivated to become more dense in the downtown.

Commissioner Jacob asked the following:

- Why wouldn't we subject all projects within the Downtown Core to the FAR requirement. As drafted, only major development projects would be subject to it.
- How was the suggested minimum FAR of 1.0 arrived at.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Based on professional experience with communities of this size, makeup and character, a FAR of 1.0 would be considered an appropriate minimum.
- Higher minimums, like 2.0 or 3.0, create more intense, urban areas which wouldn't be in the character of downtown Sebastopol.
- 1.0 provides enough flexibility where you aren't mandating major multistory projects, but it's robust enough where you'll start to see an increase in density.
- From a professional Planning standpoint 1.0 is a very reasonable number to consider as a minimum.

Chair Doyle commented that that would pretty much require 2-story projects.

Mr. Ritchie agreed and responded:

- For the most part, yes, the language is saying that you want to see multiple story development in the Downtown Core.

Mayor Gurney stated that we want at least, partly multiple story development in the Downtown Core.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- The function of a General Plan seems to be to tell developers what we want. If we make it too flexible, we're not sending a clear message.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he agreed with Vice Mayor Glass' statement.

Councilmember Jacob asked if the General Plan specified how many stories we want the buildings to be in the Downtown Core.

Mr. Ritchie referred to Action LU 7c on page 2-16 which reads, "Revise the Zoning Code to allow building heights up to four stories/50 feet in the Downtown Core if residential uses are on any of the upper stories."

Councilmember Jacob asked if we have lesser parking requirements in the Downtown Core.

Mr. Ritchie responded that the General Plan includes Actions to revisit and reduce parking in the downtown as part of the subsequent Zoning Ordinance update.

Councilmember Jacob asked why we wouldn't be striving for a Downtown Core with two to three stories rather than one to one and a half or two.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- A FAR of 1.5 wouldn't necessarily mandate three story buildings in the Downtown Core.
- A FAR of 1.5 could probably be achieved with a 2-story building, depending on the particulars of the site and parking considerations.
- We have a tandem portfolio of policies in the General Plan; reducing parking standards in the downtown goes hand in hand with increasing densities.

Councilmember Jacob asked if a FAR of 1.0 would become less effective over time with reduced parking requirements in the downtown.

Mr. Ritchie responded that reduced parking requirements would allow for more site usage at a smaller building height, if that's what a project was pushing for.

Councilmember Jacob expressed concern that he wasn't using FAR correctly and asked for clarification.

Mr. Ritchie explained.

Councilmember Jacob commented:

- We have a policy decision to make.
- If what we're looking for is one to two stories in the downtown, a minimum FAR of 1.0 seems correct.
- If what we're looking for is two to three stories in the Downtown Core then we may be looking at something higher than a FAR of 1.0.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- That he understood Councilmember Jacob's point.
- A 1.0 FAR will accomplish a minimum of a two story building requirement just by the nature of not doing away with the parking requirements and setbacks.

Councilmember Jacob commented that he was struggling to understand FAR.

Mayor Gurney commented that each member was likely to come up on something that they just could not comprehend and asked Mr. Ritchie what the best way to handle that would be.

Mr. Ritchie responded that Director Webster was a great resource. He stated that he could be contacted with concerns or questions as well. He added:

- We've got policies scattered throughout the General Plan that promote increasing density and residential uses in the Downtown Core.
- Doesn't want to get too hung up on the 1.0 versus 1.5 of the minimum FAR's.
- The overall intent of the General Plan is clear.
- That being said, the issue of FAR is an important one.
- Identified courses of action on the matter of establishing a minimum FAR as follows;
 - We don't currently identify a minimum FAR for the Downtown Core in the General Plan, but we have an Action saying update the Zoning Code to establish one. We could leave that as is which kicks the can down the road a little bit.
 - We can add a 'for example consider a minimum FAR of 1.0' which sort of helps clarify what you might think about when you do the Zoning Code update.

Mr. Ritchie comments continued:

- We can establish a minimum FAR, stick with it, and see if it starts to yield the type of development you want.
- Always advises that the General Plan be drafted the way they want it with an emphasis on it not being set in stone.
- You are allowed up to four General Plan Amendments per year.
- Doesn't recommend doing something now with a plan to change it later, however, if something isn't working, it can be changed at a later date.
- If you start to see a series of downtown development proposals that are coming in at the very minimum, and you realize that you are not achieving the density you desire for the downtown, that would be an appropriate time to revisit the FAR issue.

Ms. Thompson added:

- They could look into coming up with a recommendation between now and when the draft goes out.
- They can also include a graph that would show a 2.0 FAR.
- Agreed that the concept of FAR can be hard for people to understand.

Mayor Gurney commented that she, Vice Mayor Glass, Councilmember's Slayter and Jacob all seemed to be in agreement on wanting a strong statement with a clear minimum FAR of at least 1.0.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that it'd be helpful to talk context when addressing the issue of FAR.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the direction seemed to be to add, 'at least a minimum FAR of 1.0'. He noted that additional language saying, 'Encourage projects to exceed the minimum required FAR'. Doing so would provide a nudge to go even higher while ensuring a minimum.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Action LU 7c on page 2-16 talks about revising the Zoning Code to allow building heights up to four stories/50 feet in the Downtown Core if residential uses are on any of the upper stories.
- In addition to establishing a minimum FAR, he suggested explicitly calling for no less than two-story buildings in the Downtown Core.

Mr. Ritchie stated that that could certainly be done and asked if the rest of the Commission and Council were in support.

Commissioner Fernandez commented:

- Agreed with adding, 'at least a minimum FAR of 1.0'.
- Suggested adding 'review FAR to determine what an appropriate minimum may be' under Action LU 1c on page 2-7.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the direction received was to add, 'at least a minimum FAR of 1.0' and asked if there was consensus to add language to require, 'minimum two-story buildings for new projects in the downtown'.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Jacob asked why, in the midst of the worst housing crisis we've ever experienced, we wouldn't require commercial projects in the Downtown Core to have residential on the top floor.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- Many cities use more of a pure mixed-use land use designation that requires a mix of uses.
- In other communities, what tends to happen is you actually get folks coming in pushing for residential projects and you have to mandate a commercial component. So, when pushing for mixed-use you have to force the hand to get the commercial component in there.
- It's less common to see a more commercial area where you would require residential to be a component of it.

Ms. Thompson added that, without residential, a maximum FAR of 2.5 would be applied in the Downtown Core.

Commissioner Pinto asked if a big-box commercial facility with a building height of 25' would be considered a single-story building under FAR.

Mr. Ritchie responded that FAR is related to whether or not a whole set of other uses could be accommodated above the first floor, not building height.

Commissioner Jacob asked if hotels would be considered residential or commercial uses.

Mr. Ritchie responded that that had not yet been determined and referred to Action LU 1d which calls to clarify whether hotels are treated as residential or commercial uses.

Commissioner Jacob expressed concern with having things mentioned in multiple locations throughout the General Plan and even within the Housing Element.

Mr. Ritchie responded that, as professionals, it was their job to ensure that the docs were internally consistent. He added that there is some redundancy, however noting, that it is intentional and is meant to highlight issues.

Commissioner Doyle referred to Commercial/Office under Policy LU 1-4 on page 2-3 and questioned the low end of the quoted density of 12.1 to 25 units per acre for High Density Residential. He asked Mr. Ritchie if it was intentional or if it'd make sense to drop 12.1 and just leave it at a maximum of 25 units per acre.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- There are pros and cons to doing that.
- If you're going to see residential uses in the Commercial/Office, putting a minimum on there is beneficial because it precludes folks from coming in and trying to do detached single family in a commercial/office area which is genuinely intended for commercial/office uses and high density residential uses.
- You will get folks from a development standpoint who will push for lower density.
- There is often a higher return on investment for lower density housing.
- Having a minimum precludes someone from usurping the intent of this land use designation.

Commissioner Doyle concluded that the language was intentional.

Mr. Ritchie concurred.

Commissioner Fernandez referred to Commercial/Office under Policy LU 1-4 on page 2-3 and questioned the applicability of 'discouraging' certain types of uses.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- It's providing intent for the designation.
- If someone were to come in with a project that is listed as a discouraged type of project they may not even propose it in the first place.
- Or, if they did, it would provide some policy guidance for the Planning Commission and City Council to say that it does not meet the intended type of use for this land use designation.
- Agreed that it does not outright preclude said uses, however, it retains flexibility while giving the City a bit of policy guidance and a mandate without forcing denial or an outright rejection.

Commissioner Fernandez asked if the Formula Business Ordinance was referred to in the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie stated that it was and cited Policy LU 7-10 as one place that it was referred to.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he had received direction on some revisions to the language on Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and on land use designation descriptions and asked if there were additional comments before delving into other land use topics.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- The Barlow is a very unique area in town.
- The Barlow is currently zoned Light Industrial.
- As originally envisioned, The Barlow was going to be predominately industrial, however, it has slowly morphed into a mix of retail and industrial uses.
- Perhaps a new designation should be created for The Barlow which could also be used in other parts of town, potentially.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- This was a topic discussed at length with the GPAC and it was one of the more closely divided issues that they discussed.
- We had three primary options; one was to leave as is, one was to change the designation to Downtown Core because it seems to be morphing into those types of uses, and the other was to craft a new designation, custom tailored for The Barlow.
- The GPAC was divided; straw polls showed a majority wishing to leave the designation as is.
- It raises an excellent question.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Retail or commercial uses may displace industrial uses over time.
- It seems odd to have a possibly tourist related food, wine and art area that is designated Light Industrial.
- It's unlikely that the opposite, where retail or commercial uses would be displaced by industrial uses, would occur.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The thrust of the GPAC's discussion on this was the intent of The Barlow versus the reality.

Mr. Ritchie comments continued:

- The intent was for The Barlow to provide those light industrial uses, where you had fabricators, local manufacturers, artists and artisans doing their manufacturing and light industrial activities there.
- The reality is that you've had a number of applications that have required conditional use permits that have fallen much more into the commercial/retail description as far as the actual uses ending up there.
- The debate went back and forth on do we hold firm with the light industrial designation and require a case-by-case conditional use permit review of these individual applications. Doing so would make it a little more cumbersome on the businesses but gives the Council and Planning Commission a little bit more control and authority on a case-by-case approval basis which would be sticking with the overarching theme and intent that we would like to see more light industrial uses here so we're going to hold firm to the designation that we've assigned to it.
- The other line of thinking was that it seems to be heading in more of a commercial/retail designation so why don't we just designate it as such. Doing so would smooth the process for additional applicants that want to open retail, restaurant and commercial type uses in The Barlow.
- Doesn't think there's a right answer.
- There are significant benefits to either course of action.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- The Council has already had to modify the Light Industrial designation to allow office uses and hotels.
- The actions of this Council have moved further and further away from its Light Industrial designation.
- Suggested creation of a hybrid commercial/industrial designation which would allow for all of those types of uses.

Mr. Ritchie asked for thoughts on creating a hybrid commercial/industrial land use designation.

Chair Doyle asked Director Webster if he could think of any lease spaces within The Barlow that would not have been approved under the Downtown Core land use designation.

Director Webster responded:

- Yes, except for their offices, Kosta Browne Wines is industrial in use.
- There are other, smaller type uses like that that would not be allowed in the downtown.
- Guayaki, as part of The Barlow although already existing, is primarily warehousing with offices and a cafe as well.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Not ready to give up the light industrial designation of The Barlow.
- There are a number of light industrial activities that could fit very comfortably within our culture and community if we could make an effort to find and bring them here.
- Architecturally, The Barlow is built as a warehouse district.
- Changing the zoning now would be us giving up.

Councilmember Eder clarified that he was advocating for the designation to include commercial in addition to industrial, not to delete or give up its industrial designation. He noted that there would continue to be plenty of opportunity for light manufacturing.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- We need to think about what we're trying to encourage.
- Not making it onerous to locate here would allow us to have a greater range of uses, however, it's harder to get industrial uses here and moving towards solely retail uses will turn The Barlow into more of a shopping center.
- Changing the zoning will not put the message that, from a policy standpoint, we want to attract special uses like artisan cheesemakers and wineries.
- This is a matter of our economic development, we don't want to be just another retail location, and we want a more diversified economy.

Based on the comments he'd heard, Mr. Ritchie offered the following Planning suggestions:

- Leave it as it is currently designated.
- Provide for the mixed designation. Allowing commercial uses by right in a mixed commercial/light industrial designation crafted specifically for The Barlow could potentially result in the market dictating that you end up with primarily retail spaces and no vacant area for industrial uses.
- Creating the mixed designation wouldn't put you in a position to say no if you found The Barlow becoming too retail oriented and losing its light industrial intention.
- If the intent is truly to see manufacturing and artisanal type uses at The Barlow you'd probably be best served by leaving it with a light industrial designation.

Commissioner Fernandez commented:

- Economic factors make it too expensive for the types of businesses that we want to locate here.
- We can say we want them here and encourage them to come here but the reality is that we need to take other actions to make it reasonable for them to locate here.
- Doesn't think that creating a mixed designation would help in bringing desired uses here.

Councilmember Slayter commented:

- With regards to the 'M' Industrial Zoning District; he expressed being okay with changing some conditionally permitted uses to outright allowed uses, however, he did not want The Barlow to become a retail destination.
- Outright allowing retail at The Barlow will remove pressure from developers to look at other sites that are currently designated retail in our Downtown Core.
- Interesting in keeping retail in our Downtown Core, where it has traditionally been.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he was getting a pretty clear picture on where the Council and Commission were landing on the matter of land use designations. If nothing further, he suggested that the Commission and Council move on to the next matter.

Councilmember Jacob commented:

- The Council had recently passed a resolution stating the importance of medical cannabis businesses with the new State law that passed.
- Suggested referencing medical cannabis businesses under Action LU 1e on page 2-7.
- There are a number of other places where there could be mention of working towards policies that encourage maintaining that economy for our citizens.

Director Webster recalled that that type of use was mentioned in the Community Health and Wellness Element.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- Agreed with Director Webster.
- Commented that it could be mentioned in the Land Use Element.
- The Community Health and Wellness Element will be discussed at the next joint meeting to be held on February 9th.

Councilmember Jacob commented:

- Health and wellness is one thing.
- Land use designation for that use and economics around our community are other items.
- Wouldn't want it to be just shuffled into Community Health and Wellness because it has a more significant impact on our community.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Agreed that the list in Action LU 1e on page 2-7 would be the most appropriate place to reference medical cannabis businesses.

Chair Doyle commented:

- Still has a number of Land Use related issues to talk about.
- Referred to the Land Use Map.

Mr. Ritchie and Mayor Gurney requested that discussion of the Land Use Map wait until their policy related discussion had concluded.

Chair Doyle agreed.

Mayor Gurney asked Mr. Ritchie what he'd like to talk about next.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he was looking for comments on the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). He specifically called out Policy LU 2-2 and 2-3 on pages 2-8 and 2-9, referred to Policy LU 2-7 and 2-8 on page 2-11 and summarized their contents.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Given the timing of your draft, that's what it has to say.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- You will usurp what's in here when coming up with a ballot measure.
- We haven't tried to preempt any decision making onto what will go into your UGB initiative.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he was looking for comments on the Growth Management Ordinance (GMO). He specifically called out Policy LU 3-2 on page 2-12 and Action LU 3b on page 2-13 and summarized their contents.

Councilmember Jacob stated that he thought that the GMO had been passed last year.

Director stated that the Housing Element had been passed last year, not the GMO.

Councilmember Eder referred to Action LU 6a under Goal LU 6 on page 2-15 and commented:

- Asked if there was support to change the word 'Encourage' to 'Require' so that the sentence would read, 'Require new housing projects to develop in the upper range of allowed densities.'
- Use of the term 'upper range' is vague.

Councilmember Eder comments continued:

- If we want to be serious about density we need to look at whether or not we want to make that a steadfast requirement, not a suggestion.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Making that change would raise other questions.
- If we establish a range of 6 to 12 units per acre for medium density residential but then couple that with a policy that says that we require development of the upper ranges and interpret that at 9 to 12 units, it wouldn't make sense to establish the minimum number of units as 6.
- It would make sense to go back and change the minimum requirements in the residential designations if that is the consensus.
- Policy Lu 6a is saying that yes, we allow a range of 6 to 12 units per acre but we're going to push and encourage developers to have 10 or 12 units per acre.
- If we truly don't want to allow development in the lower range then we should tighten that range up by saying that medium density needs to be 9 to 12 units per acre which would result in Policy LU 6a being null and void.

Councilmember Eder stated that he was okay with tightening up the range as explained by Mr. Ritchie.

Commissioner Pinto asked how the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will evaluate the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The EIR is going to analyze the General Plan as written following our workshops.
- We have some opportunities to address alternatives but it won't be at the same level of detail as the proposed plan that goes out in draft form.
- Looking for direction from the Council and Commission as to what needs to be in the General Plan as that is what the EIR will analyze.

Mayor Gurney asked Mr. Ritchie to state the question he was looking for feedback on.

Mr. Ritchie stated that the original question was if the Council and Commission were comfortable with GMO Action LU 3b as written on page 2-13.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Expressed a concern with how the changes will relate to Levels of Service (LOS).
- Questioned what type of analysis had been done with regards to impacts on our water and sewer.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- We have a very specific and robust set of policies in the Community Services and Facilities Element that requires;
 - Periodic reviews and updates of your CIP and various Master Plans for water and sewer.
 - Policies that require new development projects to be reviewed to make sure that there are adequate services that are available to meet that demand plus other existing demand.
 - Not approving projects where you don't have infrastructure capacity to accommodate.
- Wouldn't attempt to back into your infrastructure constraint by placing limits on annual growth or maximum residential units.
- The Community Services and Facilities Element will be discussed at the next joint meeting to be held on February 9th.

Vice Mayor Glass expressed having understood.

Mayor Gurney asked if there was a place in the General Plan where we identify opportunity sites. She cited denser housing projects as an example.

Mr. Ritchie responded that yes, opportunity sites for denser housing projects have been identified in the Housing Element.

Mayor Gurney asked if other opportunity sites, commercial or industrial for example, had been identified.

Mr. Ritchie responded that they were not. He added that that would be more of an economic development and local branding and marketing tool.

Commissioner Jacob commented:

- Expressed not being worried about increasing the annual residential allocations to 50 units per year because the existing allocation of 25 units per year had never been met.
- Asked if the thinking behind the two year carry over limit was to distribute the units over more than one development.

Mr. Ritchie agreed that that was part of the thinking behind the two year carry over limit.

Commissioner Pinto expressed concern with getting into specifics with regards to the numbers and asked if this was something that the Commission and Council needed to give the okay on.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- This particular issue has a lot of bearing.
- The EIR analyzes buildout of the General Plan.
- These numbers will have direct, specific bearing on the Environmental analysis.
- Needs to know if the Council or Commission think that they may want these numbers to be higher. If yes, the higher numbers will be analyzed.
- If you think this is as high as you'd want to go but that you may want to adopt a lower number, don't worry because we'll analyze the higher number and if you come in with a lower number, we'll be able to say no worse or more severe than what we analyzed in the EIR.
- If we're going to be off on what we analyze, have us analyze the higher numbers.
- You can always come in and ration this gap.
- The real number of importance is the total residential allocations through 2035.
- There's a lot more wiggle room on the annual allocation and on the carry over.

Chair Doyle commented:

- Referred to the last bullet under Action LU 3b regarding tiny houses.
- Expressed having an issue with assigning them a reduced allocation of 0.5 because there were too many unknowns at this point.
- There hasn't been an example of a tiny house development in this town.
- Tiny houses may be added to the Zoning Ordinance at a later date once the Planning Commission has had an opportunity to be given a presentation on them.
- Expressed having a big problem with Goal 6 which he would address later.
- Would like to see the last bullet under Action LU 3b stricken until we know what we're talking about.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Action LU 6b on page 2-15 calls to revise the Zoning Ordinance to accommodate tiny houses and micro apartments, including allowing multiple tiny houses on a single parcel in any zoning district that allows residential uses.
- That asks that you come up with those very specific standards for how the Zoning Code will treat tiny houses. Including a definition for what a tiny house is and whether or not you want to allow multiples on one lot.
- While might be classified as a vocal minority, we heard a lot from the community and the GPAC on this prominently raised topic so we felt compelled to address it.
- We haven't committed you in the General Plan to allowing multiple tiny houses on a single parcel prior to establishing the standards in your Zoning Code.
- When you update the Zoning Code, you may determine that it's not appropriate to allow multiple tiny houses on a single parcel because it may raise issues of utility connections, on-street parking, or the like.
- Many people felt that it was a very feasible way to provide affordable and alternative housing types.
- There are pros and cons to it.
- The last bullet point under LU 3b was added to acknowledge the fact that, appropriately, tiny houses might not be treated as the same as a traditional single family home or apartment building given the fact that they might have reduced impacts on infrastructure when compared to a traditional detached single family home.
- The suggested 0.5 of an allocation isn't set in stone. It says, include provisions to count as a reduced allocation, which provides a ton of flexibility for how they are treated in the future.

Chair Doyle suggested adding the word 'consider' to the beginning of the last bullet point under LU 3b.

Mr. Ritchie commented that the revision that Chair Doyle suggested may be appropriate.

Vice Mayor Glass suggested revising Action LU 6b as follows; In conjunction with Housing Element Action G-4, revise the Zoning Code to define and accommodate tiny houses and micro apartments, including allowing multiple tiny houses on a single parcel in any zoning district that allows residential uses.

Chair Doyle expressed being in disagreement with Action LU 6b in that it calls to allow multiple tiny houses on a single parcel in any zoning district that allows residential units.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- The General Plan doesn't set you on a specific course of action other than to update your Zoning Code to establish those provisions.
- Agreed with Vice Mayor Glass' suggested revision to Action LU 6b.

Mayor Gurney noted that it was 8:45 p.m. and expressed being worried about the Council and Commission's level of conversation in terms of being helpful to the consultants and asked for feedback from Mr. Ritchie.

Councilmember Jacob commented:

- Expressed that enough time wasn't being spent on these topics.
- Felt that it was unfortunate that the Council and Commission were being forced to cram so much into one meeting.

Mayor Gurney stated that they weren't forced to do this and that it was a plan that had been announced weeks, if not months ago. Asked to hear from other members on how the process was working thus far.

Councilmember Slayter commented:

- It was starting to feel like too much detail given the charter of this meeting.
- Appreciates the conversation.
- If we can keep notes, we'll have a chance to revisit these topics significantly in more detail at a later date.
- Appreciates the consultant's guidance in what they need to begin their work on the EIR.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Expressed understanding the frustration over how much they're expected to get through in a short amount of time.
- If we were to open this up to five, eight or ten meetings, comparable to the GPAC's process, we would have significantly deviated from the schedule, budget and work program that we were originally brought in to do.
- The topics that are of paramount importance in the Land Use Element are the Land Use Designations, UGB and GMO. The other critical, paramount topic is the Land Use Map.
- We haven't committed you to anything on tiny houses other than to update your Zoning Code to establish provisions for tiny houses. The appropriate time to discuss said provisions would be during the subsequent update to your Zoning Ordinance.
- When we do our environmental analysis we need to know how much the community is going to grow, where it is going to grow and the type of ways that it is going to grow.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- This is our opportunity to direct you so you do the optimal analysis in the EIR.
- If we decide that the numbers were too high, or we want to rollback we can do that at the Planning Commission hearings on the resulting draft and at the Council level.

Mr. Ritchie agreed and commented that if they're going to analyze something in the EIR that's different than the General Plan they need to overanalyze.

Mayor Gurney expressed understanding that, when in doubt, overanalyzing was the way to go with regards to the EIR.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Referred to the Council's previous work on the Formula Business Ordinance and how they were able to be effective and efficient in their process.
- Perhaps the process might work better if each of us reviews all of these policies in advance of these meetings and then comes up with what we think are really significant problems and provide an orderly list for the consultant to work through.
- Working through a methodical list with a sort of thumbs up, thumbs down approach will result in less discussion.

Mayor Gurney agreed.

Mr. Ritchie agreed as well, and commented:

- He'd visited the Commission and Council in December with the hope that that's exactly how these meetings would be carried out.

Mayor Gurney asked if Vice Mayor Glass was suggesting that Councilmember's and Commissioner's provide their list of issues to the consultants in advance of scheduled meetings.

Vice Mayor Glass responded that yes, which was what she was suggesting.

Mayor Gurney agreed that this process needed to be dialed in.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- If nothing else, we need to get through the Land Use Element and the Circulation Element during this meeting.
- Expressed being okay with sliding the Community Character Element into one of the subsequent meetings, if needed.

Chair Doyle commented:

- Some of his comments on the Land Use Element could probably wait until after the EIR.
- Asked Mr. Ritchie to go over the process of review after the EIR is complete.

Mr. Ritchie explained:

- Following the March meeting, assuming we stay on track, we will have gone through the entire General Plan, we will make all revisions to the General Plan and complete the EIR.
- We are targeting May for the formal public review of the draft General Plan and the draft EIR. That will be a 6-week period.
- Expecting lots of letters from the public and would be happy to receive letters from Commissioner's and Councilmember's too.
- Following the close of the public comment period in July, they will take stock of the comments received on the draft General Plan and then come before the Planning Commission with those comments.
- The Planning Commission will be tasked with providing direction on the comments received, including potentially directing changes in response to said comments.
- Over the course of a couple of meetings, the Planning Commission will provide a recommendation which will then be taken to the City Council.
- The Council will go through the same exact process.
- Reiterated that from about May through July or August, the draft General Plan and EIR will be out for review.
- Hoping for this group of the Commission and Council to find some unified direction.
- Noted that there will be many opportunities for comment and refinement as we go forward.

Vice Chair Kelley commented:

- Asked if there would be a place that would show the changes from our current General Plan to what is being recommended.
- The public may not understand what we're proposing to change if we don't highlight them in some way.
- Not highlighting the proposed changes is disserving the public.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- No, the General Plan and EIR does not analyze the things that change between the current Plan and the proposed Plan. They analyze the buildout of the proposed Plan.
- Early in the process, at our kick-off, we were asked to show a scope of work for what that matrix comparative effort would look like and showed an itemized cost to prepare that comparative matrix between the two Plans and we weren't directed to move forward with that effort.

Ms. Thompson added:

- We will include an alternative that evaluates the continuation of your existing General Plan as a no project alternative showing what the buildout would be under the existing General Plan. Meaning, if the proposed General Plan is not adopted.
- The alternative won't look at each individual policy but it will look at overall development.

Mr. Ritchie added:

- There will not be a clean matrix that says, we used to address this issue this way but now we're going to address it this way.
- This is such a wholesale overhaul that we couldn't practically do a redline version of your current General Plan.
- Doing so would have to be a concerted effort to build a comparative matrix that we weren't directed to prepare.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Recalled having that conversation and nicking the idea as impractical.
- Staff and the consultants know where the significant shifts are and should be able to highlight them in a future staff or consultant report.
- It's important that the public understand upfront the major changes that are being proposed.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- Some comparative matrixes had been prepared for the GPAC's process because they were thought to be of paramount importance.
- A full-scale comparative matrix wasn't practical.

Mayor Gurney asked for any final comments before moving on to the next issue.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Clear to him that many Commissioner's and Councilmember's had a lot more that they'd like to talk about.
- Asked if the consultants were soliciting emails from Commissioner's and Councilmember's on issues ranging from wordsmithing to substantive comments.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Welcomes, on an individual email basis, suggestions on items that they could wordsmith better because he didn't believe that edits that have no substantive change to the policy direction of the Plan would warrant discussions in front of the group.
- Would like to avoid a shotgun approach to different policies where he would be left in a position of having to be a filter.
- Have substantive bearing on a policy should be discussed by the group as part of the forum.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Asked if there would be another opportunity, outside of this meeting, for substantial changes to be brought forward on Elements discussed during this meeting.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Additional meetings can be scheduled if the Council directs him to make amendments to their work program.
- Amendments to the work program will change the budget and the schedule as far as the path forward.

Mr. Ritchie stated that they were making very good progress.

Mayor Gurney stated that a heads up from the consultants on what key issues they'd like to hear from the Commission and Council on would be helpful.

Mr. Ritchie agreed and commented:

- We will provide you with a memo two weeks prior to the next meeting which will highlight key topics and questions that you may want to pay particularly close attention to.

Mayor Gurney thanked Mr. Ritchie for that.

Chair Doyle commented:

- Referred to Goal 8, Policy LU 8-2 on page 2-17 and questioned if 'O/LI Office/Light Industrial' should be a land use designation.
- It may make sense to make it a special district or an overlay zone because the only property with that zoning is the O'Reilly property on the north end of town.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- That's a good point.
- That designation is a carry-over from your existing General Plan.
- Doesn't know that leaving it as is does a disservice, however, there could be more efficient ways to handle it based on the practical fact that you really only have one chunk of land with that designation.

Mayor Gurney commented that annexation could bring in land that could fall under that designation.

Mr. Ritchie agreed and commented that it was a planning tool at their disposal.

Mayor Gurney stated that she'd be tempted to leave it as is.

Vice Mayor Glass agreed.

Chair Doyle asked Director Webster for his thoughts on the matter.

Director Webster commented:

- The O'Reilly site is partially undeveloped so there is opportunity for additional development there.
- In the potential annexation area south of town there is some good acreage down there that could potentially have the O/LI designation.
- Agreed that there wasn't great possibility for it elsewhere in the city.

Chair Doyle commented that it'd make more sense to make it an overlay zone or special district in the Zoning Ordinance so that a General Plan Amendment would not be required to use it.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Procedurally, processing a rezone isn't tremendously different than processing a General Plan Amendment in terms of environmental review and procedures.
- An unspecified location as a zoning overlay wouldn't pave the way for a smoother approval process.
- Considered the O/LI district a useful planning tool.

Commissioner Pinto commented:

- In our Housing Element; the undeveloped portion of O'Reilly is earmarked as the largest parcel in our stock of high density residential properties in order for us to meet our standard.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- It's a bit of a balancing act in demonstrating to the State that you have adequately zoned lands to meet your allocation.
- It doesn't necessarily mean that the City has earmarked it exclusively for residential development, but, based on our current standards it would facilitate it.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Referred to Goal LU 6 on page 2-15 and suggested revising it to read, 'Promote a Range of Housing Options to Provide Affordability for Families, Seniors, and Low Income Households that is consistent with the demographic profile of our general area.'

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The suggested change to Goal LU 6 is fine as it provides clarity without changing the policy intent.
- The primary vehicle for accomplishing this goal is the Housing Element.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that it'd be good to mention home based businesses under Goal LU 8 in addition to the Economic Vitality Element where it is already mentioned.

Mr. Ritchie expressed being okay with that and asked if there were any more comments on Land Use policies before moving on to the Land Use Map.

Vice Chair Kelley commented that she didn't hear an adequate discussion on densities and noted that that would be a big issue with the public.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- If you think the densities might go higher, we should flush that out now.
- If you think they may go lower, you have room to take that up later.
- There appeared to be a general comfort level with the residential densities as laid out now.
- The Commission and Council need to get to a point where they're comfortable with the document that goes out for public review.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear additional comments on density.

Vice Chair Kelley commented:

- When the current General Plan was created we traded off a large parcel which the Laguna Vista project is proposed for.
- Many people felt that it was more appropriate to do high density housing in the town rather than on the outskirts.
- Expressed being comfortable with increasing densities in the Downtown Core, not just throughout town.
- The potential impacts of allowing higher densities outside of the Downtown Core are worrisome.

Commissioner Pinto commented:

- Given the context and the fact that we're going to want to solicit as many alternatives as possible he supported the idea of having the densities increased knowing that we can retreat back at a later date if needed.

Commissioner Pinto comments continued:

- Did not consider the numbers an outrageous jump in density.

Chair Doyle commented:

- The only significant difference is with medium density residential.
- The rest of the changes are negligible.
- With regards to analysis in the EIR he agreed that we should proceed with the numbers in the draft.
- Would enjoy future discussion of this topic including questions like, potential creation of a new single family residential zone, whether we should increase the density in the Downtown Core while leaving the periphery as is, etc.

Mr. Ritchie expressed understanding that the direction was to proceed with the numbers in the draft for purposes of the EIR.

Mayor Gurney referred to Policy LU 2-4 on page 2-11 and asked if there was support for including a statement about preserving our greenbelts and also in creating additional greenbelts to the north, south and west as interest had been expressed at the Council level.

Ms. Thompson commented:

- Because this is from the UGB Ordinance the language has to stay the same.
- Noted that it could be added later.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- That comment is completely consistent with the overall direction of the General Plan so we'll find an appropriate place to put it.

Councilmember Slayter commented that he could foresee significant implications for Goal CIR 4 on the current topic.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- Categorized this as a light overhaul of our current map.
- The draft Land Use Map doesn't deviate much from the current map.
- Asked to hear from the Commission and Council on:
 - Any parcels where they disagree with their current or proposed designation.
 - Any specific changes they would want to see to the map as we move forward.

Councilmember Slayter asked for an explanation of the change to areas G14 and G15.

Mr. Ritchie responded that they were primarily Open Space.

Ms. Thompson responded:

- G14 and G15 were Railroad Forest.
- Railroad Forest doesn't take up all of G14 but it is a larger parcel so the whole thing would up changing.

Councilmember Slayter asked if that was all publicly held land changing from one publicly held land type to another.

Mr. Ritchie and Ms. Thompson agreed.

Chair Doyle commented that those were also being added to the UGB.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Director Webster commented that Tomodachi Park was also included on this map so we're suggesting that it be included in our Sphere of Influence (SOI) so it can be annexed.

Mayor Gurney asked to hear from Councilmember's and Commissioner's on the Land Use Map.

Vice Chair Kelley asked staff where we were in process with the proposed Laguna Vista development and asked if it'd be possible to change the density from high to medium.

Chair Doyle commented:

- The Commission hasn't been too involved with the acquisition of the Village Park and Tomodachi Park area.
- Understood that the original long range plan was for the mobile home park to go away at some point and asked if that had changed.
- Questioned why the mobile home park property had been given a density of high density residential, which may be appropriate for a mobile home park but not for uses consistent with what he understood to be the original plan.

Chair Doyle comments continued:

- Asked what the density of the mobile home park was currently and whether or not it would really require a high density residential designation.
- Asked what the long term anticipated use for the land, which the mobile home park is on, was.
- Commented that he wouldn't want to see a high density residential development there if/when the mobile home park goes away.
- Asked why we wouldn't give this a land designation for the use that is desired long term and consider the mobile home park an existing, legal non-conforming use.

City Manager McLaughlin responding with the following on the proposed Laguna Vista project:

- Technically the Laguna Vista project is theoretically still viable therefor we'd recommend against down zoning at this time.

Chair Doyle reiterated his questions regarding the mobile home park.

City Manager McLaughlin responded:

- The only analysis we'd done led us to conclude that Village Park will remain as is, a mobile home park.

Director Webster responded:

- On the draft Land Use Map, it's only the actual mobile home park portion that is shown as high density residential, the rest of the property is shown as open space.
- The density is pretty intense there with the mobile homes on the smaller portion of the property, however, a calculation of what type of density that would equate to had not been done.
- Understood Chair Doyle's point of view as the City did purchase the overall property for park purposes, years ago, and that that was their original, long term intent.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- The question that needs to be answered is whether or not we want to go with the high density designation as that is not consistent with their long term intent for the property.
- Not sure that that's a location where we'd want to put high density residential in the future, which is not saying that we want to change its current circumstance.

Chair Doyle asked if it could be zoned Community Facility while allowing it to remain as a legal, nonconforming use until it's no longer there.

Mayor Gurney agreed that it'd make sense to change the designation on the Land Use Map to reflect their long term intent for the property.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- The problem is that we don't really have a land use designation that fits mobile home parks.
- Wouldn't want to see Fircrest Mobile Home Park turned into a high density, high-rise apartment development, however, she'd be happy for it to remain a low income mobile home park.
- Questioned how that could be ensured given the land use designations we have.

City Manager McLaughlin and Director Webster noted that some communities do have a specific land use designation for mobile home parks.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- A tool that might make the most sense, rather than adding a designation in the General Plan, would be to add a zoning overlay for mobile home parks and to identify the sites where it would be applied.
- Having that zoning tool in place would allow you to specify that it's zoned for mobile home parks and not high density apartments.

Vice Mayor Glass asked if an overlay would be part of the General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- It would be part of the Zoning Ordinance, not the General Plan.
- An Action Item calling for that addition to the Zoning Ordinance could be included in the General Plan.

Ms. Thompson added:

- The Action Item could also call for specification of the sites for which the overlay shall be applied, in addition to other sites as the City sees fit.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Wants to see a lack of flexibility in converting Fircrest Mobile Home Park to a high-rise apartment development.

Commissioner Jacob expressed being in agreement with Chair Doyle's initial comment in which he suggested that the Village Park property be given a land use designation for the use that is desired long term with the understanding that the existing use will remain as legal nonconforming.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Believed there to be restrictions about what the City could say about the Village Park property because they are the public entity which owns it and because it currently accommodates the most affordable, affordable housing in town.

City Manager McLaughlin responded:

- We have to be quite careful in our discussions of Village Park.
- Did not believe this evening's forum to be appropriate for discussing the long term future of Village Park.

City Manager McLaughlin comments continued:

- Vice Mayor Glass makes a great point; because we are a public entity owning a mobile home park we have to proceed quite cautiously in any discussions about the future of that park.

Councilmember Jacob commented:

- It's really easy to erase our lowest income residents.
- It's really easy for us to want to change the designation in order to turn it into a park or open space in the future.
- Would be shortsighted of the Commission and Council, in the midst of the biggest housing crisis that our Country has ever seen, to look at how to zone out a portion of our community that provides housing to the lowest income residents we have.

Mayor Gurney commented that the Commission and Council appeared to like the idea of creating an overlay for mobile home parks to provide a zoning tool.

Mr. Ritchie recapped:

- We would leave the two parks as designated and call for an action item to call for a mobile home park overlay and to specify where it be applied to the existing mobile home parks with the underlying intention that they are not intended for redevelopment as such should the existing use cease to exist.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Chair Doyle expressed having questions having to do with the proposed addition up in the north quadrant labeled as 'G1'.

- Recalled the GPAC's discussion of including that area in the UGB.
- Inclusion of it was thought to be a good idea because it was adjacent to the high density residential apartment development and could be a good place to put some more high density residential.
- Asked why it was shown as low density residential.
- Feels like an island is being created there.
- Suggested including additional parcels in order to avoid an island issue which is the kind of thing that LAFCO would want us to do too.

Mr. Ritchie commented that he did not have all of the nuance details, pros and cons of the discussion surrounding that area.

Vice Chair Kelley and Vice Mayor Glass recalled that the property in question had been offered up by the property owner for low income housing.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- We had a number of property owner requests for inclusion into the SOI and that was the one property that the GPAC felt was most appropriate and beneficial to the community based on the owners expressed intent for the land.
- Without knowing the site specific and potential infrastructure constraints from a Planning Map perspective, drawing a line across to include the area and avoid a sort of island makes logical map drawing sense.

Mayor Gurney asked if other members had comments on drawing a line across, as suggested by Chair Doyle.

Commissioner Fernandez responded that he did not know the make of the area so couldn't really comment on the suggested change.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that designating a property that was offered up for low income housing as low density residential doesn't make sense.

Mr. Ritchie asked if medium or high density would make more sense.

Mayor Gurney stated that it would, given the surrounding properties.

Vice Mayor Glass agreed as the point was for it to be designated for affordable housing.

Mr. Ritchie agreed that, assuming we're talking about the correct parcel, it should be designated as high density residential.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Mr. Ritchie asked if the Commission and Council were amenable to amending the boundary of the SOI to make rounder map areas and avoid the pseudo-island identified by Chair Doyle.

Commissioner Pinto asked if property owners in that area had expressed not wanting to be pulled into the SOI.

Mayor Gurney responded:

- That that was not known at this time.
- The proposed change was in response to a specific land owner.
- Asked the consultants to confirm what part was intended to be yellow that we're proposing to change to red.
- We may not be creating an island with this map after all.

Mr. Ritchie understood the direction to be to ensure that we're dealing with the correct parcel and to then change it to a high density residential designation.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Finds it very regrettable that the cement plant and excavating business on the east side of Morris Street have created a situation where we've built ourselves and excluded ourselves from the Laguna in the south part of town.
- Expressed concern with the cement plant and excavating businesses remaining zoned for industrial because our communities intent really is to have those be community facilities by way of being turned into a park and increasing our Preserve.
- Asked if it was possible to change, on this map, an intent to see those properties as park or open space property.

Mr. Ritchie commented that the City would run into a significant legal problem in doing that.

He stated you're essentially executing what we call "taking" based on removing the development potential of private land.

Mayor Gurney stated that she understands and finds it regrettable.

Beth Thompson stated we can include an action that prioritizes the sites for purchase by the City if funds are available that identifies a preference for uses appropriate under a Park (PA) and/or Community Facility (CF) land use designation.

Mayor Gurney thanked Ms. Thompson for that rescue because she thinks that's where we're going. The public wants an entrance to the Laguna (off of McKinley/The Barlow). We're identified as the city of the Laguna because it's right there.

Councilmember Slayter stated a private person could purchase the lots and donate them to the City.

Commissioner Pinto commented that the gravel place is still currently on the market.

Mayor Gurney concurred that yes, it has a for sale sign on it.

Mr. Ritchie stated we would add an Action to the Plan to make it a City priority to purchase and acquire those parcels with the intent of conversion to park and open space.

Mayor Gurney interjected, potentially in partnership with a private party.

Commissioner Pinto stated that could go in the Park section too and on a map.

Mayor Gurney agreed.

Mr. Ritchie stated that for logistical nuts and bolts purposes, we would leave the land use map designation as is.

Mayor Gurney stated that she finds that very regrettable.

Councilmember Jacob commented that if we did that, it might counter the effort in that it might make it harder to market the land to a developer so if we leave it the way it is for it to happen, we could work with them otherwise it might be harder for us to find a private partnership.

Mayor Gurney stated she was not worried about that. There might be some partnership where the property is used in a minimal use way, say a parking lot joint with our parking lot to our new Laguna access point. Doesn't want to speculate or give too many examples but think we're looking at it, looking at a direction where it would be built with a building in a no-net fill area.

Mayor Gurney asked Mr. Ritchie if there are any other areas that you want us to talk about regarding land use.

Mr. Ritchie said he did not have anything specific. It was more if you had concerns that you wanted to bring to us.

Mayor Gurney asked the group if there was anything else that you want to talk about.

Commissioner Jacob asked if that office complex at the corner of Hwy 12 and Morris, was that DC before.

Mr. Ritchie stated that was changed to DC.

Mayor Gurney noted the site had been filled and developed.

Mr. Ritchie stated this was more of a change to reflect what's on the ground.

Commissioner Jacob asked if office was a conditional use in the Downtown Core.

Director Webster responded that no, it's permitted.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he was getting the sense that we've hit on the big items for Land Use. Hearing that the residential densities may come back but we won't be going higher with the maximums so what we have in here now is the upper end of what we would expect in the final version. Hearing that the approach to the UGB as outlined is fine. The GMO and units caps and annual allocations are an appropriate starting point and you probably won't be considering additional units above and beyond 750. Possibly to come in lower but we're not interested in going higher so that would be the right approach for the EIR analysis. He asked if there were additional policy issues of concern; if you want to write them up and we could find other opportunities to discuss. If they are substantive he said he would like this group to provide direction as a whole. Wordsmith type changes can be emailed to the consultants directly and would not need to be discussed by the group, so long as they can't be interpreted as substantive changes. He asked if there was anything else anyone wanted to discuss.

There was not.

Mr. Ritchie commented that was the toughest most comprehensive topic front-loaded, and the group did a good job. He stated he knows there was a little frustration as we found our footing. He said it will get smoother.

Mayor Gurney asked for any public comment.

- Paul Fritz, a resident of Sebastopol, commented that he just had a few comments to make. Land Use item would be the Barlow issue. Really thinks leaving that light industrial is not in the best interest. Would like to see some flexibility there. Thinks industrial kind of forces this whole Use Permit process and if we did some kind of combined commercial/light industrial use that allows the most flexibility to meet market demand over the next 20 years instead of us kind of dictating what that will be. It's been industrial for decades, they've been making warehouses there for decades, doesn't see a huge light industrial need around here otherwise he thinks it would have been filled so would like to see some flexibility there. In terms of transportation — one of his biggest concerns is that there are a lot of conflicting messages in that chapter. There's a lot of discussion of pedestrian improvements, bike improvements that are all very good, there's also a lot of talk about traffic flow measures that are going to improve traffic flow but those two things are at odds with each other. Anyone coming to this town and reading the section on transportation will be very confused about what we really want. Do we want traffic to move through town as quickly as possible or do we want to provide a good pedestrian environment. Right now the chapter is very muddled on that issue. We want both. The email he sent includes is a discussion of roads and streets and "strokes". Vote would be to prioritize pedestrians and downplay all of this talk of improving flow for cars. Cars have dominated our development for far too long. He is all for taking our city back. Encourages adoption of policies that are focused on pedestrian environment and not so focused on what we can do to make cars get through town as quickly as possible.

- Marsha Sue Lustig commented: She stated she really could tell that you were being really thoughtful when considering how the different policies would affect specifically about density would affect our ability to provide affordable housing in the future. She said she really appreciates that. With regards to circulation; uniformly the GPAC wanted to get rid of LOS, really wanted to, the only reason we didn't was because there wasn't a substitute for mitigation measures so if you wanted to have a substantial project that you wanted to have it developed but you'd have nothing to measure the impacts and require the improvements and so that's why we put them in there but it's really not satisfying, is cumbersome and a little confusing. It's the best we could come up with the cover ourselves but we understand and our not interested in having LOS just used to stop projects. There are more efficient ways to turn the focus to making sure the projects are pedestrian oriented, respond to the parcels their adjacent to as well. It is kind of messy in circulation and she apologized for it, thanks again for hard work, a taste of what the GPAC went through.
- Michael Carnacchi, a resident of Sebastopol, commented: Land Use — there's a lot of talk about high density in the downtown core and less parking restrictions, we need to answer the question of where will people park. Especially in 20 years from now when we have City Hall taking over the biggest parking lot that we have (the public parking downtown). That's an issue. The trailer park on city property, issue of tiny houses, that may be a great place to develop a city owned low income county tiny house community. The details of which would be framed by the Planning Commission. That might be something that could be low income or trade for full time volunteer services for the City in exchange for housing. Circulation — he said he had always been advocate for a highway 116 bypass and this is a proposed project that's dated 8.15 for upgrading Hwy 116 by Caltrans to make it ADA compliant and it's very specific, he forwarded an email, they recommended through their transportation concept report the eastern bypass of Hwy 116 and he said he thinks that with that there's a lot of things that could open up for us, the parking issues, traffic calming, bicycle lanes, pedestrian friendly, you know that would throw the hat way over the fence so that all our ideas could fit into that. There should be a connection and good effort between the City and Caltrans to make that happen. Relates to pages 3-5 Action CIR 1b speaks to what we're talking about direct action to coordinate with what's going on in current time and so thank you.
- Beverly Beaver Rudolph, a resident of Sebastopol, commented: She referred to an email that she had sent. She expressed concern in your next 20 years your lack of focus on affordable, middle income housing, you've created opportunities in the affordable low income housing as well as having increased density in other parts of town but she would really like you to reconsider the applications (there were approximately 21 applications of people wishing to be included in your SOI). She said she knows you have to research, but they she believes as a majority would have helped you create more opportunities for the affordable middle income people over the next 20 years. Pricing now is getting really difficult for families who are in that income bracket. Thank you very much.

Mayor Gurney thanked the speaker, and said she appreciated having the email to consider as well.

There was no more public comment.

CIRCULATION

Mr. Ritchie stated if we can get through circulation, he would feel comfortable folding Community character into one of our other evening topics so that we don't stay here too late.

Mayor Gurney concurred.

Mr. Ritchie stated that he was joined by Steve Weinberger, one of the founding Principals of W-Trans, the transportation consultant, Steve is a Sebastopol resident, and they are preparing the EIR traffic analysis and were the primary authors of the circulation element. Has worked on a number of GP's together. He'll be the expert to answering questions. Might focus discussion first on policies CIR 16 and CIR 17 on pages 3.2 and 3.3. Steve can help walk us through it. 1-6 lays out an objective for LOS. 1-7 moves on to say we can exempt intersections and projects from the Level of Service (LOS) objectives if we find that the infrastructure improvements necessary to meet the objectives are undesirable. We've also provided some policies that would allow for projects that would result in traffic impacts, for example the downtown, but we don't have to see changes or enhancements to the downtown intersection to make a payment of in lieu fees where alternative improvements could be made elsewhere. For example a new development downtown exacerbates traffic it could be offset by providing enhanced bicycle and pedestrian connectivity elsewhere. Those are some of the big theme items we've tried to touch on. Your input on 1-6 and 1-7 and how we deal with LOS moving forward is something we'd like to hear.

Mr. Weinberg stated that he just wanted to add that we did go back and forth and talked about the option of just precluding any LOS standards in the downtown at all in terms of vehicle traffic and what we decided was we should at least have them, so it gives you the ability to evaluate project impacts and gives nexus to apply other types of multimodal (bike ped improvements) on that project in lieu of its impact on the intersections. Thought it best to include the LOS standard so if the project does have an impact, you've identified, you could then have a nexus towards applying their impacts to something else.

Mr. Weinberger commented:

- CEQA standards in terms of traffic are changing statewide.
- In terms of CEQA, LOS on a statewide basis will no longer be required.
- What CEQA will require traffic analysis to be based on had not yet been finalized.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- It is widely recognized that LOS standards are kind of obsolete because they're based on a different way of life.
- The timing of these changes make it hard to know how to write our Circulation Element.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- Agreed.
- We've tried to write it so we can have it both ways.

Mr. Weinberger added:

- Even though CEQA won't be requiring LOS anymore, they have said that they'll leave it available for the locals to use if they can.
- Didn't want to give the message that LOS shouldn't be used.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- As a matter of policy, it seemed to her that these changes were really more oriented to more urban areas and areas that actually have funding for transit possibilities.

Mr. Weinberger commented that Vice Mayor Glass was absolutely correct and noted that the law was originally written specifically for high transit urban areas but then the State decided to apply it across the board.

Vice Mayor Glass commented that we need to do what fits our town.

Mr. Weinberger commented that they tried to write the Circulation Element to be accommodating, not stringent.

Councilmember asked if Mr. Ritchie or Mr. Weinberger had worked on a General Plan recently with a client that deleted LOS from the General Plan in its entirety.

Mr. Weinberger stated that his firm had worked with De Novo in Cotati where moving towards multimodal was discussed but that they backed off from that and wound up sticking with LOS.

Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- We're basically done prioritizing the car in Sebastopol and want to move as far in the other direction as possible.
- Asked what would happen if we stopped tailoring development to accommodate the traffic impacts.

Mr. Ritchie responded:

- The policies as written would allow the City to go down that path.
- The risks you would run is worsening traffic and congestion.

Councilmember Slayter commented:

- Hoping that the GPAC would have come up with some genius way to eliminate LOS.
- Considered LOS a horrible measure, especially for Sebastopol.
- Sprawl is a significant byproduct of LOS because developers move towards lands where the LOS isn't impacted by what they build.
- The only thing the LOS measures is the free movement of cars with no consideration for pedestrians or bicycles.
- Aren't other areas like Portland, Seattle and San Francisco looking at alternative measures for automotive motion as well as taking pedestrians and cyclists into account.
- Ms. Lustig's comment on the GPAC's feeling regarding LOS and in not having come up with something better was well said.
- Would rather not be using an outdated measure of traffic and circulation in a fresh document that is supposed to carry us through the next twenty years.
- See's what the consultants had done and considered it very skillful.
- Understood that the best option to go with at this time may be what has been presented.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- We're a ways away from being able to realistically and constantly know how a VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) threshold would work at the local level from a policy standpoint.
- We've kept LOS as a metric. You're not beholden to requiring a project to meet a threshold if you don't desire to.

Mr. Weinberger commented:

- We're in a transitional period.
- There are a lot of communities that are looking to move away from LOS.

Mr. Weinberger comments continued:

- It's difficult to set aside LOS and try to negotiate the analysis and suggested mitigations.
- There isn't currently a way to abandon LOS and apply multimodal impact analysis.
- The way we've written it acknowledges that we're in a transitional period.
- We've provided you with a good way to scale the impacts.

Vice Mayor Glass commented:

- Using LOS right now is transitional.
- As we make a transition to multimodal and having more transit we have to deal with the reality now.
- We have to provide some thought as to what will work for everyone in our community, including our aging population.

Councilmember Slayter referred to Goal CIR 1 and suggested revising it as follows; Provide a Transportation System that Promotes the Use of Alternatives to the Single-Occupant Vehicle and Facilitates the Efficient and Environmentally Responsible Movement of People and Goods Within and Through the City of Sebastopol.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Jacob excused himself from the meeting at 10:38 p.m.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- He'd like to see CIR 1-6 and 1-7 stricken or revised.
- Policy CIR 1-3 and 1-5 kind of contradict one another.
- Suggested revising Policy CIR 1-3 as follows; Regarding the quality of life in Sebastopol, pedestrian accommodate/safety and maintaining its special small-town character.
- Suggested revising Policy CIR 1-5 as follows; When analyzing impacts to the circulation network created by new development or roadway improvements consider the needs of all users, including those with disabilities, ensuring that pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders are considered preeminent over automobile drivers.

Mayor Gurney stated that those suggested revisions capture the spirit.

The Commission and Council agreed.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- Action CIR 1c on page 3-5 is good but would add a sentence that says, "assure that all improvements are evaluated by staff to ensure compatibility with a return to two-way streets until this option has been eliminated.

Mayor Gurney stated that that suggested revision could be problematic.

Mr. Ritchie commented that this topic was specifically discussed by the GPAC at their last meeting and that there are pros and cons to it.

Councilmember Eder commented:

- At a minimum, a staff analysis may help them as policy makers on near term improvements in understanding whether or not said improvements would be compatible with a return to two-way streets.

Mayor Gurney commented that that seemed reasonable.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- There are two streets that I would identify differently: Willow Street and Calder Avenue.
- Willow Street functions as a collector rather than Calder Avenue.
- Calder Avenue has an uphill and unusual jog that is dangerous.
- Willow Street allows for an easier bypass of Downtown.
- Designating Willow Street as a collector could also help with financing street repair.
- Calder Avenue is misidentified as a street but used as a road.

Councilmember Eder commented that he lives on Calder Avenue and concurs.

Mr. Weinberger commented that he agrees with Mayor Gurney and that this was likely an old General Plan designation.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Fellers Lane is also another street that is often used by residents to bypass the four main intersections but is not identified as a collector street.
- Litchfield Avenue is listed as a collector street but there are a lot of people, who do not want to go up and down the hill or up and down Fircrest Avenue.
- The map should list Fellers Lane as a collector as it would also help with road maintenance.
- If the group wants to leave it the way it is; that is fine but Willow Street should be a collector street.
- There is discussion amongst the Council that Willow Street should be extended from South Main Street to Petaluma Avenue through the parking lot property to create a grid of streets that make it so people do not have to drive the parking lot.
- Asked if there would need to be a line or dots on the map conveying that possibility.

Mr. Weinberger and Mr. Ritchie commented that a policy could be added but unsure about conveying the possibility.

Mayor Gurney commented:

- Abbott Avenue was going to be extend but would have created small blocks.
- Extending Willow Street would provide a grid of streets and create a larger block.
- The City would also be using its own land to punch the Willow Street through, which is much simpler.

Mr. Ritchie commented that a policy could be added, addressing the improvement of the street network, but would review adding a line to the map.

Mayor Gurney responded that she is concerned that not including a line on the map would create problems in the future, and require a General Plan amendment to extend Willow Street.

Mr. Ritchie responded that not having a line on the map would not preclude the City moving forward with the extension as part of a CIP.

Mayor Gurney agreed that a policy would help then if that is the case.

Commissioner Pinto commented that he has reviewed many plans, including the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. He further commented that the Joe Rodota Trail should be extended going north underneath the Highway 12 Bridge.

Mayor Gurney acknowledged that the idea would be a great addition.

Councilmember Eder commented that the policy, regarding the Willow Street extension, should be worded in a manner that is general so it includes other streets such as Abbott Avenue.

Mayor Gurney responded that there are specific reasons why Willow Street should be extended as opposed to Abbott Avenue, which was previously identified for an extension but did not come to fruition.

Mr. Weinberger commented that there was discussion about extending Abbott Avenue to Morris Street but it did not come to fruition.

Mayor Gurney asked the Commission and Council if they wished to revisit that idea.

Councilmember Eder commented that Abbott Avenue is a potential access point for the area behind the Ford building and Benedetti Tire, as it could facilitate the possible development of housing and/or more parking.

Mr. Weinberger commented that a policy calling for the extension of Abbott Avenue could be added, and could even mention extending all the way to Morris Street, as an option.

Mayor Gurney commented that she understands the intent now.

Commissioner Jacob asked why the Circulation Element map is not multimodal, and includes bicycles.

Mr. Weinberger responded that the bicycle facilities are identified in the bicycle map.

Commissioner Jacob commented that the two maps should be condensed into one multimodal map.

Mayor Gurney suggested that there could be two maps if it is not feasible to have one multimodal map.

Mr. Weinberger commented that both maps would be included in the Circulation Element but separately

Commissioner Jacob asked about the reasons for showing collector streets.

Planning Director Webster commented that there are funding sources that require streets to be designated as a collector street.

Commissioner Jacob asked if it is beneficial to show more streets as collectors for funding.

Planning Director Webster commented that it helps secure certain types of funding but the map should accurately identify streets as collectors and not local roads as collectors.

Commissioner Jacob commented that High Street is identified as a collector street but it is very narrow and almost impossible to have two cars pass each other at the same time.

Planning Director Webster commented that the volume of traffic and the type of use determines how a street is designated.

Vice Chair Kelley asked if there will be any problems with including the bicycle map in the Circulation Element but possibly amending the map in the future.

Mr. Ritchie responded that the bicycle map is mainly a point of reference and that amending the bicycle map would not require a General Plan amendment.

Chair Doyle commented that Ragle Road from Covert Lane to Mills Station Road is not identified as a collector street.

Mr. Weinberger responded that it is not reflected because it is located in the County.

Councilmember Eder asked if the Element should call for more electric vehicle charging stations, to encourage a regional network.

Mr. Ritchie indicated he would add a policy.

Councilmember Eder asked that in policy CIR 1-16, to delete the last phrase.

Mayor Gurney asked for any public comment.

- Tony Brian stated that the City needed to be pragmatic about cars; should look at global solutions be open to parking; ensure a drivable environment; and be thoughtful about solutions.

There being no further public comment, Mayor Gurney closed the public comment component.

Commissioner Pinto asked if the next meeting would start at 6:00 p.m.

Mayor Gurney indicated that was correct.

9. PUBLIC HEARING: None

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None

11. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Gurney adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m. The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 19, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. at the Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472. Chair Doyle adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 26, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. at the Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kenyon Webster
Planning Director