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

PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF: August 09, 2016
SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX
425 MORRIS STREET

APPROVED MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
MINUTES OF August 09, 2016

SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX
425 MORRIS STREET

PLANNING COMMISSION:

The notice of the meeting was posted on August 04, 2016.

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

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Kelley called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present:	Chair Kelley, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Pinto, Douch, Doyle, Skinner and Jacob (arrived at 7:06 p.m.)
Absent:	Commissioner Fernandez (excused)
Staff:	Kenyon Webster, Planning Director Rebecca Mansour, Planning Technician

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: There were none.

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 agendized business to be conducted.

There were none.

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

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

Director Webster provided the following update:

- Each Commissioner was provided with a copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Hotel Sebastopol prior to the start of tonight's meeting. This item involves a Use Permit for the hotel along with some Code amendments related to height, and parking arrangements. This item requires a 30-day public review period and will be before the Commission for a public hearing at their regular meeting on September 27th.
- At the City Council meeting on September 6th, the Council will hear an update, possibly some kind of proposal from West County Community Services that is looking at possibly taking over management of the Village Mobile Home Park from the City and implementing some limited homeless housing in some of the vacant apartments and perhaps a couple of mobile home spaces as well.
- The City expects to rollout its new website sometime in September.
- Later in September the Council will receive an update on the Wayfinding Sign project.
- The Skategarden Expansion project is nearing completion and is expected to be open to the public in September.
- Assistant Planner, Jonathan Atkinson, has accepted another job. His last day with the City will be Monday, August 15th. The Planning Department hopes to fill the vacancy within 6-8 weeks.
- The next Planning meeting will take place on August 23rd. That meeting is available for continued discussion of the General Plan, if necessary. A Use Permit will be on that agenda as well.
- Climate Action 2020 is expected to be before the Commission at their regular meeting on September 13th.
- As mentioned previously, a public hearing on the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Hotel Sebastopol is expected to be one of the items before the Commission at their regular meeting on September 27th.

The Commission had no questions for Director Webster.

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

8. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. The Planning Commission will conduct a hearing on the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and Draft General Plan. The General Plan sets broad, long-term City policy in a number of areas, and may result in changes to land use and zoning designations, changes to the Zoning Ordinance and revisions to other City codes. The FEIR provides an analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan. The FEIR identifies significant environmental impacts related to the following environmental topics: Aesthetics/Visual Resources, Flooding, Noise, Traffic and Circulation, Wastewater Treatment, Cumulative Visual Character, Cumulative Noise, Cumulative Transportation and Circulation, Cumulative Utilities, and Irreversible Effects. The purpose of the public hearing is to provide an opportunity for public comment on

both the FEIR and draft General Plan, and for the Commission to provide recommendations for revisions to the draft General Plan that they may deem needed. The EIR and Draft General Plan are available for review at the Sebastopol General Plan Update Web site, at: http://sebastopol.generalplan.org/.

Director Webster presented the staff report.

Director Webster introduced Ben Ritchie and Beth Thompson of De Novo Planning Group.

Mr. Ritchie gave a presentation and was available for questions.

Chair Kelley thanked Ms. Thompson and Mr. Ritchie for all of their work.

The Commission asked procedural and clarifying questions of Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. Ritchie commented that there were a handful of significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR. He then summarized what those were, why they were significant and unavoidable, why there was no meaningful mitigation, and explained the analysis and thought process behind those conclusions.

The Commission asked questions of Mr. Ritchie.

The Commission asked procedural questions of Director Webster.

Chair Kelley opened the Public Hearing on the FEIR and Draft General Plan.

Nancy Prebilich, 7600 Leland Street, commented:

- Provided the Commission with a handout.
- Wished to comment on her request to downzone 7600 Leland Street and 7605 Bodega Avenue.
- The proposed Land Use Map shows a change from medium density residential for both properties, to high density residential for the property at 7605 Bodega Avenue. The density of the property at 7600 Leland Street is proposed to remain medium density residential.
- The request is to change the land use designation to low density residential, or at most, medium density residential for both parcels.
- Both properties have been in her family historically and the intent is for them to remain that way in the future.
- She placed an unmanned petition in support of retaining the agricultural condition of these properties on her property and it garnered 125 signatures over the course of one week.
- This is more of a community request and it is the spirit of preserving what has been going on on these properties for 80 years without interruption.
- Referenced California State Law, which requires preservation of open space, including agricultural, and enjoyment of scenic beauty, among other things.
- Available for questions.
- Thanked the Commission for their time and consideration of her request.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Kelley closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Kelley brought it back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Douch made a motion to adopt a Resolution recommending Certification of the FEIR and Adoption of Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Vice Chair Fritz seconded the motion.

AYES:	Chair Kelley, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Pinto, Douch, Doyle, Skinner and Jacob
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

The Commission discussed the procedure for discussing the Draft General Plan.

Chair Kelley asked to hear from the Commission on the Land Use Element of the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Ritchie updated the Commission on updates that will be made to the General Plan as a result of recent action as it relates to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Commissioner Fritz commented:
- UGB related updates are needed on page 2-2 as well.

The Commission asked questions of Mr. Ritchie and Ms. Thompson.

Commissioner Fritz commented:
- Expressed having a concern with The Barlow remaining an industrial zone.
- Urged consideration of a combined/unique zoning district or overlay for The Barlow.
- It would be unfortunate to wind up with uses like auto sales and repair and/or a construction yard in The Barlow.
- Interested in trying to increase the variety of housing options in Sebastopol.
- There are a lot of opportunities for smaller multi-family buildings that could fit into medium density single-family neighborhoods. This would allow for more affordable housing options in town.

Commissioner Fritz asked a clarifying question of Mr. Ritchie.

Chair Kelley asked a clarifying question of Director Webster and Mr. Ritchie regarding previous discussions on doing an overlay for The Barlow.

Director Webster and Mr. Ritchie responded:
- One option could be that the General Plan includes another policy that suggests consideration of revised zoning parameters for The Barlow development given its unique character.
- Doing so would provide an opening in the Zoning Ordinance discussion to possibly keep the base zoning but add an overlay within The Barlow's geographic area.
- A wholesale land use change in the General Plan wouldn't necessarily be required.

Commissioner Fritz commented that creation of a possible overlay, as part of a Zoning Ordinance discussion would be a good approach.

Commissioner Doyle asked if The Barlow was referenced specifically in the General Plan. He commented that it would be more appropriate to reference it by its boundaries instead.

Director Webster and the Commission agreed.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Discussion of Commissioner Fritz's comments regarding smaller multi-family buildings being mixed in with medium density single-family neighborhoods should not be discussed during the General Plan process, except for possible reference in an Action Item. Discussion during amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would be more appropriate.

Mr. Ritchie suggested that a bullet be added under Action LU 1e on page 2-8, which is a carryover from page 2-7, which calls for development of standards for The Barlow.

Commissioner Doyle and Douch commented that The Barlow should at least be defined if used anywhere in the General Plan.

Ms. Thompson commented that a figure could be added to show the boundaries of The Barlow.

The Commission agreed that that would be a good approach.

Commissioner Jacob asked Vice Chair Fritz if he was concerned about auto-related uses in all industrially zoned areas, or just at The Barlow.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that he was primarily concerned with those uses at The Barlow.

Mr. Ritchie summarized talking points on the subject of The Barlow and its zoning during the GPAC process. Adding the additional bullet under Action LU 1e on page 2-8, as previously mentioned, would accomplish the goal of future consideration of this issue as discussed by both the GPAC and Commission.

Chair Kelley asked to hear from the Commission about allowing duplexes and other smaller multi-family buildings in medium density single-family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Expressed not being in favor of that.
- Second dwelling units are already allowed in any residential zone, therefor a single family residence can have a second residence of up to 840 square feet which he considered to be a good compromise between adding additional units and maintaining the character of single-family residential districts.
- Would not be supportive of allowing duplexes on any single-family residential lot.

Commissioner Jacob asked Commissioner Doyle what the downside of allowing a duplex in a single-family residential district would be.

Commissioner Doyle responded:

- Duplexes are already allowed in single-family residential zoning districts so long as one of the units is not greater than 840 square feet.
- Duplexes are more often rentals versus owner-occupied.
- Property values would be impacted.

Vice Chair Fritz commented:

- Understood Commissioner Doyle's points.
- Lives in a mixed-income neighborhood himself. The impact on his neighborhood is positive, not negative.
- Affordable housing is important.
- Allowing smaller multi-family buildings would not drastically change or compromise the character of our medium density single-family neighborhoods.
- Understands the controversy.
- Expressed having no issue with rentals being mixed in with owner-occupied residences.

Commissioner Douch commented:
- Expressed being sympathetic to the idea, however, changing medium density single-family zones to allow duplexes is too broad a brush, which he was not in favor of.
- Expressed being interested in ways of adding density, as appropriate.

Commissioner Jacob commented:
- Supports Vice Chair Fritz's comments.
- Lives in a medium density neighborhood with a nearby mix of single-family and duplexes side by side.
- In general, most of our town is pretty built out.
- Any change to the landscape of Sebastopol will be very slow and incremental.
- Giving us a twenty-year horizon of more options to make the City denser and to have more diverse neighborhoods is a good thing.

Chair Kelley and Commissioner Doyle asked a clarifying question of Mr. Ritchie.

Ms. Thompson commented that 'Medium Density Single Family Residential' on page 2-3 under Policy LU 1-4 could be revised in order for it to be left open for future consideration. The language could be revised to read; Designates areas suitable for residential development at a density of 2.6 to 12.0 units per acre.

Vice Chair Fritz asked if an Action could be added to consider revising the Zoning Code to allow for multiple-family units in the medium density single-family zoning district.

Ms. Thompson responded that an Action could be added.

Commissioner Jacob asked a clarifying question of Ms. Thompson.

Chair Kelley commented that there are some areas where duplexes would be appropriate in medium density areas.

Commissioner Douch suggested that the Action be added under Goal LU 6 on page 2-15.

Mr. Ritchie agreed that that would be a great location for it, if the Commission wanted to include that language.

Hearing support from the Commission to do so, Mr. Ritchie commented that the description of 'Medium Density Single Family Residential' on page 2-3 under Policy LU 1-4 would be amended to read, Designates areas suitable for residential development at a density of 2.6 to 12.0 units per acre. In addition, an Action would be added on

page 2-15 under Goal LU6 to 'Consider revisions to the Zoning Code that will allow for duplex development in some areas zoned for medium density single-family residential.'

Commissioner Doyle asked for a vote because he was not in favor of that.

Commissioner Fritz clarified that his request was for smaller multi-family buildings, not just duplexes.

The majority of the Commission was in favor of the changes as stated by Mr. Ritchie in that they'd like to look into this topic further during revisions to the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Doyle referred to Action LU 6b on page 2-15 and commented:
- Expressed being totally against it and requested that it be removed.
- This would be allowing high density in any residential zone.
- People buy in to residential neighborhoods with an expectation and an understanding of densities.
- His feelings on this are consistent to those that he expressed during the previous discussion of allowing smaller multi-family buildings on single-family residential properties.

Commissioner Skinner commented:
- Lives in a high-density residential district currently.
- Neighborhood wise, the mix of housing feels like a positive thing.
- Expressed not being in support of striking Action LU 6b.

Commissioner Douch commented:
- The issue of allowing smaller multi-family buildings on single-family medium density residential properties is about density, as is the issue of tiny homes. Both issues are related.
- Action LU 6b is not appropriate in the General Plan.
- Expressed being in favor of substituting Action LU 6b with something along the lines of exploring densities in single-family dwelling areas in order to promote Goal 6.

Mr. Ritchie responded:
- Read Action G-4 in the Housing Element as referenced in Action LU 6b.
- Suggested that Action LU 6b be stricken and replaced with language along the lines of, consider Zoning Code revisions to allow duplexes and/or attached housing in appropriate medium density residential areas.

Commissioner Jacob asked a clarifying question of Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. Ritchie asked if the Commission was amendable to the change to Action LU 6b as well as a change to the description of 'Medium Density Single Family' as previously discussed.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Ritchie summarized key issues that had been raised thus far.

Commissioner Doyle asked a clarifying question of Mr. Ritchie on Policy LU 2-6(d) on page 2-11.

Director Webster and Mr. Ritchie responded.

Commissioner Skinner asked a clarifying question.

Mr. Ritchie responded.

Commissioner Doyle asked a clarifying question of Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. Ritchie responded.

The Commission agreed to leave Policy 2-6(d) as is.

Commissioner Skinner asked if, in light of earlier discussions on increasing densities, the Commission wished to discuss Industrial and Light Industrial properties that are marked for Open Space.

Mr. Ritchie responded.

Commissioner Doyle asked a question of Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. Ritchie responded.

Chair Kelley asked to hear from the Commission on Ms. Prebilich's request regarding downzoning 7600 Leland Street and 7605 Bodega Avenue.

The Commission asked questions of Director Webster.

Commissioner Pinto commented:
- It's intriguing to be at this point of the General Plan process with a request to downzone, it's usually the opposite.
- Expressed being open to the idea.
- The main feature of the property is the open creek. Preservation of which he appreciates and supports.
- Any landowner does not have to build out to the full extent of the permitted uses.

The Commission asked additional questions of Director Webster and Mr. Ritchie.

Commissioner Pinto asked a question of Ms. Prebilich.

Commissioner Jacob commented:
- Lives near Ms. Prebilich's property.
- Knowing the neighborhood the way he does, he expressed being in support of the request to down zone the Land Use designation of these properties.
- Grappling with this being a matter of public policy versus a one-off situation.

Commissioner Pinto commented:
- Expressed being very supportive of the city taking on as much high-density as possible.
- The city should be a place where density happens.
- There is a lot to be said about the livability of a community when you have interfaces between different land uses.
- Likes the juxtaposition of the properties in this area.
- Expressed being in support of this request to down zone.

Mr. Ritchie commented:

- There are very specific, robust policies in the Conservation and Open Space Element that protect creeks.
- Wouldn't use the tool of a Land Use designation to protect a natural resource in this particular instance.
- Advised against coming up with a Zoning Code provision to be drafted later to be kind of custom tailored to this request.
- Encouraged the Commission to focus on the fundamental question.

Commissioner Jacob commented:

- Recommends that the Commission accept Ms. Prebilich's request to down zone these properties.

Commissioner Doyle asked a question of Ms. Prebilich.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Downzoning reduces the value of the property.
- Supports the request, however, he would like to hear from the owner of 7605 Bodega Avenue to ensure that she is in support of this request as well.

Ms. Prebilich responded that she could provide confirmation from the owner of 7605 Bodega Avenue.

Commissioner Douch commented:

- Expressed being in support of this request to down zone these properties.

Mr. Ritchie commented that he was hearing support for a down zone of both properties pending verification from the owner of 7605 Bodega Avenue.

The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Doyle commented that this change would result in a little island of two medium density properties to the left.

The Commission asked clarifying questions of Mr. Ritchie.

Chair Kelley commented:

- Expressed a concern with pollution from the animals and agriculture uses in relation to Calder Creek.

Chair Kelley asked questions of Director Webster.

Director Webster responded.

Ms. Prebilich interjected.

Chair Kelley asked questions of Mr. Ritchie.

Mr. Ritchie responded.

Chair Kelley commented that she was hearing support for a down zone of both properties pending verification from the owner of 7605 Bodega Avenue.

The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Pinto asked for an explanation of the steps moving forward in terms of their taking the Commission's recommendations to the City Council.

Mr. Ritchie explained.

Hearing nothing further, the Commission concluded their discussion of the Land Use Element.

Chair Kelley adjourned the meeting at 9:12 p.m. for a brief break.

Chair Kelley reconvened the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Commissioner Pinto asked a procedural question.

Commissioner Pinto commented that he would need to leave the meeting at 10 p.m.

The Commission discussed the procedure moving forward.

Chair Kelley asked if the Commission was amendable to reopening the public hearing per a member of the public who wished to speak.

The Commission agreed to reopen the public hearing.

Michael Carnacchi, a Sebastopol resident and business owner, commented:

- Commented on the structure of the meeting including opportunities for public comment after discussion of each Element.
- During discussion of the Land Use Element there was a reference to not specifically calling out The Barlow. Historically the area now known as The Barlow was referred to as the 'warehouse district'.

Chair Kelley commented:

- Explained the typical format for these meetings.
- Reminded Mr. Carnacchi that he could hear the Commission's discussion and take his comments to the City Council when it is their turn to discuss the draft General Plan.
- Ordinarily the public hearing will have closed but with the Commission's okay, it could be reopened at the next meeting, which will take place on August 23.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Carnacchi agreed to hold his comments until the meeting on August 23.

Chair Kelley asked to hear from the Commission on the Circulation Element of the Draft General Plan.

Vice Chair Fritz commented:

- Expressed having concerns with the way the Level of Service (LOS) policy is written.
- Specifically referred to Policy CIR 1-6 on page 3-2.
- LOS is measuring the wrong thing.

- The draft General Plan has a lot about making Sebastopol more walkable, pedestrian and bike friendly, and on focusing development downtown. All of which are great.
- The LOS analysis works against many of those things.
- Asked about substituting Vehicle-miles Traveled (VMT) for LOS.

Mr. Ritchie responded:
- SB 743 is moving CEQA and traffic analysis towards VMT.
- A lot of jurisdictions are choosing to retain LOS because that's how you figure out how to exact appropriate fees for fair share improvements towards impacts intersections and roadways.
- In this document, Policy CIR 1-6 and Policy CIR 1-7 are working in tandem.
- Your concerns about making sure that we don't overemphasize the vehicle over a pedestrian or bicycle are very clearly and robustly addressed in the Circulation Element.
- Doesn't think that Sebastopol is ready to abandon LOS completely as a tool for decision-making.

Vice Chair Fitz commented:
- Biggest concern is with people perceiving traffic in Sebastopol as being horrendous.
- Expressed a concern with people using LOS as a tool to glom on to in order to put a stop to an otherwise good project due to backlash from the community.
- LOS gives opponents to good projects, downtown where we want them, an ability and tool to glom on to.
- The free flow of traffic through intersections is not what we should be concerned about.
- We should be concerned about urban form, walkability, and bicycle infrastructure, among other things.
- There must be a way to use VMT instead of LOS.

Mr. Ritchie commented:
- The CEQA overarching intent is applicable to cities like Sebastopol.
- If the traffic flow fix is going to be problematic in terms of your multimodal and community character goals, Policy CIR 1-7 states that you don't need to require that traffic fix.
- Doesn't believe that the City is ready to migrate away from LOS and abandon it completely.
- This has been written to allow the City to use LOS as a metric tool of analysis without being beholden to it.

Vice Chair Fritz asked if language about moving away from LOS could be added.

Mr. Ritchie commented that Policy CIR 1-8 accomplishes that.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that he was not happy with that.

Commissioner Jacob expressed being in support of Vice Chair Fritz's comments; however, he agreed that Policy CIR 1-8 spoke to his point.

Commissioner Pinto agreed.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that he'd like to add something to specifically address phasing out of the auto-oriented LOS system as new models are developed.

Chair Kelley commented that she is of the opinion that LOS should serve as a tool to allow the City to reject a project and felt that the language in the draft was a good compromise.

Commissioner Doyle commented:
- Referred to Policy CIR 1-18 on page 3-4 and commented that it, along with the box on shared space, should be removed as he didn't consider it to be realistic for Sebastopol.
- Policy CIR 1-18 on page 3-4 is in conflict with Policy CIR 2-2 on page 3-11.
- The concept of 'shared space' sounds dangerous and doesn't belong in the General Plan.

Commissioner Jacob commented:
- He has seen shared space in Southeast Asia.
- Unsure about how this concept would work in an urban setting.

Mr. Ritchie and Ms. Thompson responded:
- Policy CIR 1-18 says consider so as to not commit the City to anything.
- The concept of shared space can make sense in plaza areas.
- Might not make sense on collector and local streets.

Commissioner Jacob commented:
- Shared usage is safer if it is a known system.

Commissioner Pinto commented:
- Expressed being okay with Policy CIR 1-18 because it begins with the word consider.
- Shared space is a trend in Italy and France and in small communities.
- Agreed that shared space is safer.
- Shared space is much slower.
- Unsure about how shared space would work in an urban setting.

Vice Chair Fritz commented:
- Not sure that the concept of shared space would ever be appropriate anywhere in Sebastopol.
- There is a really fascinating video online about conversion to shared space in Poynton England.

Commissioner Doyle commented:
- There are a lot of fun, urbanist ideas out there. The concept of shared space is not a good one.
- Wants Policy CIR 1-18 stricken.
- There should be delineation between pedestrians and cars.

Commissioner Skinner commented that he was in favor of leaving it in.

Vice Chair Fritz commented that he was okay with leaving it in as a something to consider.

Chair Kelley commented:
- It is an entirely different culture.
- Expressed being okay with striking Policy CIR 1-18.

- The concept of shared space shouldn't be given a lot of emphasis.

After a straw poll, the majority of the Commission agreed to leave Policy CIR 1-18 as is.

Commissioner Fritz commented:
- Referred to Policy CIR 6-5 on page 3-17 and asked about generating revenues for schools.

Mr. Ritchie responded that striking schools would be appropriate.

The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Pinto excused himself from the meeting at 9:59 p.m.

Vice Chair Fritz asked a clarifying question.

Ms. Thompson responded.

Commissioner Doyle asked a clarifying question.

Mr. Ritchie and other members of the Commission responded.

Commissioner Doyle commented:
- Referred to Action CIR 6d on page 3-17 and asked how it could be rectified with the very specific parking requirements as indicated in the Zoning Code.

Mr. Ritchie responded:
- Action CIR 6d is meant to work in tandem with Action 6b and 6c.
- The General Plan sets you on a path to adjust and revisit and have some more flexibility in your parking requirements on a go-forward basis.

Ms. Thompson agreed that Action CIR 6d could be revised to be clearer.

Commissioner Doyle commented:
- Yes, it should be revised to clarify that it would be for projects that don't meet the requirements in the Zoning Code.

Mr. Ritchie agreed with the need to clarify that.

Commissioner Jacob clarified that Action CIR 6d was in a sense a mitigation measure for projects that don't meet the requirements in the Zoning Code.

Mr. Ritchie responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Jacob asked a clarifying question of Director Webster.

Director Webster responded.

Commissioner Doyle suggested that Action CIR 6d be revised to say something along the lines of, consider developing a protocol for provision of a parking impact study for major developments that do not meet the standard parking requirements.

The Commission and Mr. Ritchie agreed.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Kelley made a motion to continue discussion of the Draft General Plan to the regular Planning Commission meeting of August 23rd.

Commissioner Doyle seconded the motion.

AYES:	Chair Kelley, Vice Chair Fritz, and Commissioners Douch, Doyle, Skinner and Jacob
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: There were none.

10. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Kelley adjourned the meeting at 10:09 p.m. to the next regular meeting of the Commission. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 23, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at the Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kenyon Webster
Planning Director