



**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](http://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us)

Email: [kwebster@cityofsebastopol.org](mailto:kwebster@cityofsebastopol.org)

PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING OF: November 14, 2017

SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX

425 MORRIS STREET

APPROVED MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2017

SEBASTOPOL YOUTH ANNEX  
425 MORRIS STREET

**PLANNING COMMISSION:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on November 08, 2017.

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Fritz called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Douch and Commissioners Fernandez, Kelley, Glaser and Doyle (arrived at 7:02 p.m.)

**Absent:** Commissioner Jacob (excused)

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

**3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES:** October 24, 2017.

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

Commissioner Glaser seconded the motion.

AYES: Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Douch and Commissioners Fernandez, Glaser, and Kelley

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: 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.

Mark Johnson, Orchard Street, commented:

- As somebody who wishes to add an accessory dwelling unit, he expressed a concern over the permitting fees and other requirements associated with accessory dwelling units.

Chair Fritz responded that that very subject was likely to come up during the Commission's discussion of agenda item 8A and suggested that Mr. Johnson hold his comments until that time.

Mr. Johnson thanked Chair Fritz and agreed to hold his comments until the appropriate time.

Dan Davis, 8880 Barnett Valley Road, commented:

- Has owned commercial property near Village Park for a very long time.
- Would like to help address our County's housing crisis by developing housing on said property.
- Expressed interest in any discussions that may impact his ability to develop there.
- He and his architect, Kathy Austin, will be following the Commission's deliberations and may make some suggestions as appropriate.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fritz closed the public comment period.

**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:

- At their last meeting, the City Council conducted design review of an application from Armstrong Development of the second building at the CVS site.
  - Under the settlement agreement between the City, CVS and Armstrong, the Council retained jurisdiction of design review for that building.
  - The Council had a number of comments and ideas about the proposed project and formed a subcommittee to work with the applicant.
- On November 21, the Council is scheduled to hear a report from their Housing Subcommittee.

Topics will include:

  - How to fund affordable housing,
  - Whether the City should adopt the kinds of regulations that the County of Sonoma and City of Santa Rosa have as in terms of the recent fire devastation and recovery.
- The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will take place on November 28.

Director Webster update continued:

- Assuming discussion of item 8A does not conclude tonight, a continuation of their discussion will be on the agenda.
- In addition, a public hearing on the draft cannabis ordinance will be on the agenda.
  - The first draft of the ordinance was transmitted to the Commission as part of this agenda packet to give the Commission, and others, an early indication of the ordinance.
  - The hearing has been advertised as not occurring earlier than 9 p.m.
- Agenda items are expected for the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting of December 12.
- The regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting of December 26 will be cancelled due to the holiday.
- The annual Sonoma State Planning Commissioners Conference will take place on December 2.
  - Some people from jurisdictions who were directly impacted by the fires will be there to report on what that has been like for them.

The Commission asked questions of Director Webster.

**7. CONSENT CALENDAR (PUBLIC HEARING IF REQUESTED):** (none)

**8. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A. ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE:** The Commission will conduct a Public Hearing and begin review of comprehensive Zoning Ordinance amendments intended to implement policies of the new General Plan as well as discussions at the City's Housing Subcommittee meetings, and make other policy, procedural, clarification, and organizational changes. The revisions propose creation of several new Zoning districts, make numerous changes to facilitate housing development, propose lower parking requirements, and create or modify requirements for food trucks, beekeeping, community gardens, vacation rentals, inclusionary housing, car washes and service stations, and commercial outdoor barbeques as well as other provisions. Revisions are also proposed to procedural provisions, including modifying the Subdivision Ordinance to allow Planning Commission approval of minor subdivisions. The Commission's recommendations on the amendments will be forwarded to the City Council for final action.

Director Webster provided a brief introduction.

Beth Thompson, De Novo Planning Group, thanked Kenyon for his thorough introduction and was available for questions.

Chair Fritz suggested that the Commission stick to general questions initially so that the public comment period can be opened without much delay.

The Commission concurred.

Chair Fritz asked for general questions of Director Webster and the consultant.

The Commission asked questions of Director Webster and Ms. Thompson.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- The term 'family' is not defined.
  - Suggested that the term, 'family' be defined as, 'see household.'
- There are a number of sections that have definitions, while other sections do not.
  - All of the definitions should be consolidated into one place.

Commissioner Kelley commented that it can be very difficult to hear comments when watching the playback on Live Stream and requested that all speakers be mindful of, and speak clearly into the microphones.

Commissioner Kelley commented on process.

Director Webster and Chair Fritz made clarifying statements.

Commissioner Fernandez asked procedural questions of Chair Fritz.

Chair Fritz responded to Commissioner Fernandez's questions and suggested that the Commission begin their discussion by working through the Housing Subcommittee list, numbered 1 through 11, in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group.

The Commission concurred.

Chair Fritz asked if members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Jennifer Estrella, Director of Real Estate Development for Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County, commented:

- Resides in Sebastopol.
- Has experience working for both market-rate and affordable housing developers.
- Expressed being very concerned over inclusionary housing requirement exemption #7.
- While the land trust is a good model, its placement in the Code seems to steer market-rate developers towards the land trust.
- Habitat for Humanity's model is different in that you can own the land when you buy a home through Habitat.
- Other options are important and should be presented.
- Expressed being available to answer questions should the Commission have any.
- Asked the Commission to consider her statements.
- Thanked them for their time.

Dante Love, Founder of Pendant Homes, commented:

- Currently working to build ten net-zero energy small homes in Sebastopol.
- Wishes to talk specifically about some of the things that are making it difficult for him to build those homes here.
- Referred to Chapter 17.250 and commented that he liked the recommendations to raise the threshold for the inclusionary housing ordinance.
  - Asked the Commission to consider reducing the minimum unit square foot size that is included in the inclusionary housing ordinance.
  - In the County of Sonoma units below 1,000 square feet are exempt.
- Asked the Commission to consider exempting units below 1,000 square feet as well.

Mr. Love comments continued:

- Referred to Chapter 17.40.040 and commented that he would like to see the minimum lot size in the PC District reduced from 25,000 square feet to 15,000 square feet.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Steve Pierce, Jesse Street, commented:

- Commends staff and the Commission for their efforts here.
- Can support some of the proposed changes.
- Some higher density development in order to provide new housing is okay.
- Supports electric vehicle charging and requiring bicycle parking.
- The proposed changes fall substantially short when it degrades our standards for vehicle parking requirements.
- He and his wife attended most of the meetings of the Housing Subcommittee.
  - Those meetings did not really include discussion of reducing our parking requirements.
- Grateful for the opportunity to speak about the issue of parking.
- While he is lucky to be able to walk on most days to his place of employment downtown, he still owns and relies on a car.
- Due to the cost of living around here, multiple incomes are usually required to make it work. This likely results in multiple cars per household.
- Cars will not go away just because adequate parking is not being required.
- People will wind up parking in on-street parking spaces which will have an impact on surrounding residents and businesses.
- West Hills Circle is an example of a development that has almost four parking spaces per unit, when counting off-street and on-street parking, and it's not working.
  - The development is so packed with cars that parking permits were recently required which created stress and hassle, especially when the tow trucks would come to tow away the unpermitted cars.
  - If this development was built according to the proposed standards, there would be around half the number of parking spaces than are there now.
- Burbank Housing currently has around 100 parking spaces for around 150 units. If this development was built according to the proposed standards, it would have around 75 parking spaces.
- What is being proposed is less parking than is required by the City of Santa Rosa.
  - The City of Santa Rosa actually has a working transit system.
- There seems to be a touch of hubris or a disregard to what the impacts with lowering our standards for parking are.
  - For example, thoughts about the future where we don't have as many cars because of autonomous vehicles.
  - While he hopes that that day will come, it is not here now.
  - If it does, then we can lower our standards to match the reality.
  - For now, people have cars and they need to be able to park them.
- Urged the Planning Commission to reject the proposed changes to the vehicle parking requirements.
  - New development must provide its fair share of parking and the current standards have served the town well.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Lisa Pierce, Jesse Street, commented:

- Grateful to staff and the Commission for doing the job that they're doing.
- Expressed being worried about the proposed changes to parking.

Ms. Pierce comments continued:

- If these proposed changes are passed our town, our businesses and our residents will pay a heavy price.
- Expressed being especially concerned over the reduction in parking requirements for new buildings as well as the allowance of on-street parking to count towards fulfilling those requirements.
- Agrees with the prior speaker on it being hubris to assume that we will not be driving our own cars in the future.
- While things may change, we do not know what that may look like in the future.
- Changing these rules now would be premature.
- Parking areas can always be built over later with housing.
  - Once a building is built, the parking is gone.
- While people may not think about this very much, it is important to consider how a parking space that is occupied by a resident of an apartment in town will have a very different impact on the surrounding businesses than a parking space occupied by a customer.
  - The resident might have their car sitting for days in a parking space and never go into a nearby business at all.
  - A customer on the other hand will park their car, go to and support that business, and then drive off freeing that space for the next customer.
  - If residents of new apartments are parking in the parking spots along the street, the customers are left circling the block without finding anywhere to park. This will result in the customer getting discouraged from shopping and eating in our town.
  - Most diners and customers do not live in town, they come from all around and our businesses absolutely depend on them for their survival.
- If these changes go through, a three bedroom apartment would only be required to have  $\frac{3}{4}$  of one of-street parking spot and one parking space that could be satisfied by on-street parking.
  - That amounts to less than two total parking spots for a three bedroom apartment.
- Forcing people to potentially have to park and walk blocks away from their home could result in unintended consequences in terms of safety as well.
- Real life situations matter.
- Under the proposed changes, finding a place to park will become a real stress on people's lives.
- The proposed in-lieu fee for parking is not okay.
  - There is no guarantee that this parking payoff would result in any more parking that would actually help the affected businesses.
  - This part of the plan is much too vague and premature.
- Sebastopol is a small, semi-rural town that is far from a transit corridor.
- Believes changing these parking requirements would have long term and very damaging consequences for our town, for residents, and especially for our businesses.
- Let's wait and see how things develop before we make some serious mistakes.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Laura Burkey, Jewell Avenue, commented:

- Echoes concerns of the previous two speakers regarding the proposed changes surrounding parking.
- Expressed a concern over Florence Avenue.

Ms. Burkey comments continued:

- Even without these proposed changes, people already park on both sides of the street.
- In an emergency, she questioned the ability of emergency vehicles to gain necessary access due to how congested the street already is.
- It is not safe to have a situation where only one car can pass through a street at a time.
- It is virtually a one-way street depending on how many cars are going in each direction.
- Every street in town could be like Florence Avenue if these proposed parking reductions are passed through.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Dev Goetschius, Executive Director of Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County, commented:

- Thanked staff and the Commission for all of their hard work.
- While she did not plan on speaking based on the volume of information for the Commission to cover, based on comments by a previous speaker, she wished to clarify some points.
- Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County does not build or develop.
  - Housing Land Trust partners with for-profit and non-profit developers.
- Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County was initially created to further Habitat for Humanity's mission.
  - 50% of Habitat for Humanity homes are Land Trust homes in Sonoma County.
- Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County tends to stay low-profile.
- The goal of Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County is homeownership for working families.
- Explained how their process works.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Natalie Timm, Fircrest Avenue, commented:

- Thanked the Commission for their service to the community.
- Agrees with comments on misgivings surrounding parking.
  - Seeking parking is a waste of energy.
  - We're trying to do our best in terms of our carbon footprint.
  - In other areas people are spending hours driving around looking for parking.
  - Cars are enlarging, not compressing.
  - It doesn't make sense to cut the number of required parking spaces.
  - Parking around here will get worse if the proposed changes are implemented.
- On the subject of tying affordable housing and parking together;
  - Most people in affordable housing are people who depend a lot on cars because they're working several jobs and need flexibility.
- We have very little flexibility in our public transportation here.
- Asked if any of this took into consideration the parking study that was ordered by the Council during their exploration of the potential Pine Grove Square project.
  - During that process people said that the city could not afford to lose that central downtown parking lot which is why the Council hired someone to study the issue of parking.
- As a senior citizen, she commented that it is important to realize that it takes longer to change than we think.
- The proposed parking reductions are too futuristic.
- Cannot wait for an automatic driving service.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Mark Johnson, Orchard Street, commented:

- Wished to speak on accessory dwelling units.
- Has attended many educational talks on these matters.
- In looking into obtaining a permit to add a junior dwelling unit to his home, he was told by our local Building Department that sprinklers may be required and that the permit fees alone could cost anywhere from \$8,000 to \$10,000.
- Put a small addition on his house this past spring and paid all of the associated fees at that time.
- Understands that fees are involved.
- The fees for somebody wishing to add a junior dwelling unit to their home, which would add to our rental inventory in Sebastopol, should be amended and the process streamlined to encourage more people to do what he is hoping to do.
- Would be willing to work with people on figuring out more appropriate solutions.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Marsha Sue Lustig, a resident of Sebastopol, commented:

- Sent an email to the Commission earlier today.
- The anecdotal stories about what might happen if you provide less parking and allow more living space or business, has nothing to do with public safety.
- Expressed being very supportive of shrinking our parking requirements.
- We cannot enact anything that is not deemed safe by a number of entities.
- On the subject of accessory dwelling units, she suggested that a graduated table to allow up to 1200 square feet, on parcels up to 15000 square feet be included instead of what is being proposed.
- Her email included ideas intended to spur development of accessory dwelling units in light of our need for both temporary and permanent housing in our community.
  - The City could have an architectural competition to identify some number of accessory dwelling unit styles. The City would pay the architect to allow the City to freely use the plans. Anybody who used the approved plans would pay only a nominal charge (perhaps a percentage of the construction costs).
  - Supports a reduction in fees.
  - People are not building accessory dwelling units like they should because they're too expensive to build at present.
- Likes the Lilypad Homes idea.
- Reiterated her support of reducing our parking requirements.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Kurt Olson commented:

- He and his wife own Screamin' Mimi's.
- If you're talking about changing the parking in any direction, it should be tied with time limits for the spaces as well as enforcement of those limits.
- Enforcement around Screamin' Mimi's only occurs two days per week.
- Business owners wind up parking in the available spots.
- He, his wife, and their employees park further away.
- Development of The Barlow has changed things already parking-wise, and Hotel Sebastopol will have a huge impact once built.
- A reduction in parking in the downtown area at this point does not seem to make much sense.
- The intersection nearest his business is very dangerous and should be addressed.
  - Has contemplated moving his business out of a concern for the safety of their customers.
- Thanked the Commission for their time.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fritz closed the public comment period.

Chair Fritz reiterated his early suggestion that the Commission begin their discussion by working through the Housing Subcommittee list, numbered 1 through 11, in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group.

The Commission concurred.

The Commission asked a number of questions of Director Webster and Ms. Thompson throughout their discussion.

Chair Fritz suggested that the Commission stick to substantive issues and email staff directly with minor changes such as typos, formatting, etc.

Staff and the Commission concurred.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 1 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Allow accessory dwelling units of up to 1,200 sq. ft. on parcels of 15,000 sq. ft. or greater, where there are at least four off-street parking spaces on the site.'

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- 1,200 square feet is a good sized building and a lot of people are looking for something smaller.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Disagrees with this change.
- 1,200 square feet is a full-size house.
- A 15,000 square foot parcel would typically be in a zone that is intended for low density single family residential.
  - The proposal would basically be doubling the allowed density of full-size houses in a low density zone.
- We currently allow an 840 square foot accessory dwelling unit.
- Reiterated his disagreement for allowing accessory dwelling units to be larger than 840 square feet.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- Would not be in support of allowing a 1,200 square foot accessory dwelling unit as a vacation rental.

Chair Fritz commented that the City has already established that any accessory dwelling unit authorized after July 01, 2017 shall not be rented on a transient occupancy basis.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Emphasized that at 1,200 square feet an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is starting to not be 'accessory' anymore.
- An accessory dwelling unit is typically subordinate in size to the primary dwelling unit.

Vice Chair Douch commented:

- An 840 square foot accessory dwelling unit would typically accommodate a two bedroom home.

Vice Chair Douch comments continued:

- A 1,000 square foot accessory dwelling unit could pretty easily accommodate a three bedroom home.
- Can understand the desirability of allowing some three bedroom accessory dwelling units if we're talking about stimulating housing options.
- Commissioner Doyle's points are important to consider.
- Believed that the language about the accessory dwelling unit being subordinate in size to the primary dwelling unit would stand.
- Somewhere in the middle seems sensible.
- Suggested 1,000 square feet in order to accommodate a three bedroom accessory dwelling unit.

Commissioner Glaser agreed that allowing larger accessory dwelling units would change the nature of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fernandez commented that reducing the maximum size of accessory dwelling units may allow a reduction in the required number of off-street parking spaces as well.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Expressed being generally in favor of allowing larger accessory dwelling units.
- We need opportunities for larger accessory dwelling units.
- As a member of the Housing Subcommittee, we need to pull out all the stops on creating and providing as much variety in housing types as possible.
- Limiting accessory dwelling units to 840 square feet limits the options available.
- Understands concerns on density.
- We talk a lot about our need for affordable housing in this community.
  - We are always resistant in taking the necessary steps to make that a reality.
  - Concrete action is necessary.
- Sebastopol has plenty of homes that are larger than 2,000 square feet.
- A 1,200 square foot accessory dwelling unit, on a property that has a 2,500 square foot house, would be subordinate.
- Advocates for the allowance of 1,200 square foot accessory dwelling units on lots smaller than 15,000 square feet as well.
- The addition of an accessory dwelling unit of the proposed size would substantially increase the value of the property.
- Understands concerns about density, congestion, and the like, however, it will be quite an undertaking to build a 1,200 square foot dwelling unit.
  - In reality, he did not believe that people's fears about an urban nightmare would be realized.
- We need to take significant steps here.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- There are a lot of things in here, outside of accessory dwelling units, that are aimed at increasing housing availability and opportunity for ownership.
- The State no longer allows for discretionary review of accessory dwelling units which he strongly disagrees with.
- The City used to have very reasonable discretionary review guidelines for accessory dwelling units.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Accessory dwelling units increase the number of available rental units which is a desirable target.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Agrees with Commissioner Doyle on this package including the consideration of other options to increase our ability to build more housing.
- Most of our city is pre-developed.
- There are not a lot of lots available for some of the items that are being considered.
- Accessory dwelling units provide a lot of potential.
- Does not think that this change will result in an onslaught of development.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- Expressed being uncomfortable with 1,200 square foot accessory dwelling units, especially with reductions in setbacks, parking requirements, etc.
- Expressed a concern over the impacts from accessory dwelling units.
- May be able to support accessory dwelling units that are a bit larger than 840 square feet.
- Would like to hear how the City Council feels about this.
- This discussion is premature.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- This package includes a lot of changes to increase our density.
- Does not understand why it all has to be done at once.
- Would be more supportive of not being so radical and seeing how things develop over time.
- Did not think that the Commission would be able to take the time to give every one of these sections the proper review they respect.

Ms. Thompson commented that she could look into options for allowing other types of units and get back to the Commission.

Chair Fritz asked Ms. Thompson about the graduated concept that was introduced by Ms. Lustig.

Ms. Thompson responded:

- Can explore the graduated concept.
- Offered to produce a tally of the various lots in town to see what the potential accessory dwelling unit development could be, based on a graduated concept, when bringing the new Zoning Map to the Commission.

Vice Chair Douch suggested that the Commission table this discussion in that the other sections that they have to discuss may have incremental impact on their thinking here. Doing so would also allow De Novo to return with the information mentioned.

Commissioner Fernandez concurred.

The rest of the Commission concurred as well.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 2 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Reduce setback requirements for detached two-story accessory dwelling units to be the same as one-story accessory dwelling units (current Code requires two-story units to meet the same requirements as the main house, but also requires a lower height).'

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Expressed being opposed to this due to their being no opportunity for discretionary review.
- Believed strongly that we should keep what we have.

Vice Chair Douch and Commissioners Fernandez and Kelley concurred with Commissioner Doyle.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Expressed being supportive of this.
- Understands that he is in the minority on this.
- More housing requires serious action.
- Perhaps this should be considered in specific areas where greater density is expected.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Expressed being borderline on this.
- Agreed on the loss of discretionary review being unfortunate.

Commissioner Doyle asked a procedural questions.

Chair Fritz asked for further comments on Chapter 17.220 Accessory Dwelling Units.

Commissioner Glaser referred to, '6. Mobile Homes. Mobile homes shall not be used as accessory dwelling units' and commented that it should address the intent, not the nature of the use.

Ms. Thompson commented that it could be revised to reflect, 'unless on a permanent foundation.'

The Commission concurred.

Chair Fritz commented:

- The wording under 'D. 4. Architecture' is meaningless and isn't particularly enforceable.
- Accessory dwelling units should not be required to be miniature versions of the main house.
- This language could be unintentionally problematic.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Understands why the language is there.
- The language is pretty nebulous.
- Expressed being in agreement with Chair Fritz in that he would not object to removing the language.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Agrees with Chair Fritz in that an accessory dwelling unit should not need to match the architecture of the primary residence.
- Due to there being virtually no discretionary process, this language would seem to provide some sort of quality control.
- Expressed being hesitant to remove the language.
- Wants the language to remain.

Commissioner Fernandez commented:

- It is important to leave the language in there given that there is no other type of discretionary review allowed.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Deduced that his suggestion to remove the language was not favored by the Commission.
- Given public comment on fees, is there something that the Commission wants to say in an attempt to make the process more affordable.

Director Webster commented:

- Fees are addressed under State law and that is what is reflected herein.
- Generally speaking, the Council sets fees.
- Fees are not typically dealt with in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Part of what the Housing Subcommittee will present to the Council next week will include a discussion related to fees.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- Supports anything that can be done to reasonably reduce fees.
- Understands that the fees are used to support the City operationally, as well as infrastructure, etc. which is important.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 3 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Consistent with new General Plan density standard changes, reduce minimum lot sizes and widths in single family residential zones as follows: a. In RA district, change minimum lot size from 20,000 to 18,000 sq. ft. and minimum lot width from 100 feet to 80 feet. b. In RSF-1 district, change minimum lot size from 10,000 to 8,000 sq. ft. and minimum lot width from 80 feet to 70 feet. c. In RSF-2 and RD, change minimum lot size from 6,000 to 5,000 sq. ft. and minimum lot width from 60 feet to 50 feet.'

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- While the concept is good, the proposed renaming of zoning districts does not make sense.

Chair Fritz agreed that the proposed renaming was too confusing.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Suggested that the districts be renamed per the following:
  - RE, which has a minimum lot size of 1 acre would become R-1A (Residential, 1 acre).
  - All of the other residential districts would be the corresponding letter followed by the number of square feet divided by 1,000.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Cited RD (Duplex Residential) as an example and objected to specifying the type of housing.
- Developing what the form of housing will be to achieve the density is not necessary.

Chair Fritz commented:

- It is hard to decide what the appropriate development standards are without knowing where these properties are located.

Chair Fritz comments continued:

- Seeing the updated Zoning Map would be helpful.
- Sebastopol has a lot of residential zoning districts for as small as it is.

Ms. Thompson commented:

- They are not anticipating huge changes when they return with the updated Zoning Map.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- It would be a good idea for us to provide relief space in between the numbering of these zoning districts.

The Commission concluded that they were okay with changes as drafted.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 4 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Consider a new small lot single-family zone and apply it to existing smaller-lot areas. Requirements may include 4,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size, 40-foot minimum lot width, and reduced setbacks, such as 15' front, 20' rear, and 4' side setbacks.'

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Because a single-family home can be sold for a lot more than an attached home, the Commission should be mindful that some developers may try to construct homes with the smallest amount of space in between them as they can get away with.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Generally speaking, higher density areas should be closer to the city center.

Commissioner Glaser concurred.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Would like to see some opportunities for allowing townhouse development.
- There could be opportunities around our downtown on lots less than 25 feet wide.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- Expressed being uncomfortable with reducing the side setback to 4'.

Commissioner Fernandez expressed being in agreement with Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- This is consistent with our typical formula for side yard setback of 10% of lot width.
- Expressed being fine with the 4' side yard setback when trying to have smaller lots with increased density.

Commissioner Glaser, Vice Chair Douch, and Chair Fritz commented that he they were fine with a 4' side yard setback as well.

Chair Fritz commented that he was fine with the entirety of item 4 as proposed.

The majority of the Commission concurred.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 5 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Allow the Small Lot Subdivision provisions to apply to Medium and High Density areas (presently limited to RSF-1, RSF-2, and RD districts). Use of these provisions may incentivize projects in the higher density residential zones.'

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Expressed being in total agreement with it.

Commissioner Kelley commented that she was okay with this if it would apply to high density areas and not medium density areas.

Chair Fritz commented that it would be helpful to see where these parcels are in town.

Ms. Thompson surmised that the Commission is generally fine with extending the provisions to the medium and higher density areas but want to know where the small parcels are.

The Commission concurred.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 6 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Eliminate the constraining unit square footage standards in the Small Lot Subdivision chapter of the Zoning Ordinance. These appear to act as a disincentive to use of the Small Lot Subdivision provisions.'

Chair Fritz referred to Chapter 17.230 Small Lot Subdivisions and suggested that, '17.230.020 Lot Configuration and sizes required. 2. b.' be revised as follows, 'Lot sizes can range from 1,500 square feet or more.'

The Commission concurred.

The Commission agreed to strike, '17.230.020 Lot Configuration and sizes required. 2. a.' entirely.

Ms. Thompson commented that she would change '17.230.020 Lot Configuration and sizes required. 2. b.' to '3.' as it is more of a standalone item.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Referred to 17.230.110 Findings for approval of small lot subdivisions. B. and suggested that it be revised to reflect something having to do with compatibility with existing adjacent development to give the Commission some discretion.

The Commission concurred.

Commissioner Fernandez asked about the use of the word, 'convenience' under 17.230.110 Findings for approval of small lot subdivisions. C.

Ms. Thompson commented that she would look into that.

On the point about townhouses and required side yard setbacks, as raised by Chair Fritz, Ms. Thompson commented:

- Can add a footnote to the zoning table that addresses that setbacks are intended to apply to the entire structure, not to the individual parcels. This would allow people wishing to develop townhouses to not have to go through the Small Lot Subdivision process.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Suggested that the language could read either a 4' side yard setback, or 0' if attached single-family units.

Chair Fritz concurred.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- If the intent is to have a cumulative 8' setback between units, we would have to ensure that we would not wind up with a 0' setback on one side and a 4' setback on the other.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 7 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Change the definition of 'mixed-use' development to decrease the proportion of commercial space required in mixed-use developments in selected non-residential zones from 25% to a lower percentage, or change the requirement to be for ground-floor, street-front commercial to a specified depth such as 30 feet.'

The Commission expressed being in support of the proposed.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 8 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Rather than requiring mixed-use, allowing housing-only development in selected commercially-zoned locations (where there is a high proportion of existing residential uses, such as South Main, Healdsburg Avenue, Petaluma Avenue). So, this could apply to the O and CO zones.'

Chair Fritz commented:

- Expressed being interested in allowing this by-right in some areas.
- Suggested the possibility of creating an overlay zone which could allow housing-only development in selected commercially-zoned locations.

Commercial Fernandez commented:

- Referred to 17.25.030 Development standards. B. 3. and requested that the term, 'strip commercial' be defined.

Ms. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 9 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Via a Use Permit, allow housing-only development in other non-residential districts if certain findings are made---like will not create substantial adverse effect on street-front commercial vitality, will be compatible with adjacent uses and development, etc.'

The Commission agreed that number 9 was similar to number 8 and expressed being in support of the proposed.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 10 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Parking Requirements: a. Reduce 1-bedroom parking requirement from 1.5 spaces, to 1.25 spaces. b. Reduce 2- to 3-bedroom parking requirement from 2.0 spaces, to 1.75 spaces. c. Reduce 4+-bedroom parking requirement from 3 spaces, to 2.75 spaces. d. Reduce senior housing requirement from 0.75 spaces, to 0.5 spaces per unit. e. Reduce assisted living requirement from 1 space per unit for the first 25 units, and .75 spaces per unit thereafter, to .5 spaces per unit. f. Increase downtown residential parking discount from 20%, to 30%. g. Increase allowed compact parking proportion from 40%, to 50%. h. Allow tandem parking for all single-family, and for multi-family development if spaces are assigned. i. Allow street-front parking to count towards multi-family parking requirements.'

Vice Chair Douch commented:

- Items a through d seems like arbitrary reductions as a way of easing the parking requirements which is difficult to evaluate.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Feels similarly to Vice Chair Douch.
- Generally, parking requirements are often kind of random and without much thought being put into it.
- Not sure that the requirements before were any less arbitrary.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Expressed being on both sides.
- There is no right thing to do here regardless.
- From an environmental point of view everybody wants to reduce the number of parking spaces and cars on the road.
- One of the ways to reduce the number of cars on the road is to reduce available parking to make it less convenient.
- Nobody parks in their garages around here.
- Florence Avenue and Murphy Avenue are already narrow with cars parked on both sides of the street.
- We need a parking strategy for our downtown.

Commissioner Fernandez commented:

- Expressed feeling similarly.
- It is hard to evaluate the reductions as proposed.
- Items h and i should be discussed.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Disagrees with parking reductions.
- Increasing densities will not reduce cars.
- Our parking requirements have already been reduced a lot over the years.
- Items a and b should be left unchanged.
- Could see item c being reduced to 2.0 spaces, but leaving it unchanged is probably better.
- Would like to leave items d and e unchanged unless looked into and found to be appropriate.
- Item f should be left unchanged.
- Item g should be left unchanged.
- Item h, if assigned to same household, is okay.
- Does not support item i.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Street-front parking comes at a cost to the City.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Street parking should serve as guest parking spaces, because we don't require that they're provided otherwise.

Commissioner Fernandez agreed with Commissioner Doyle on item i.

Commissioner Kelley agreed with Commissioners Doyle and Fernandez on item i and commented:

- There is a misconception that people in multi-family housing don't need as many vehicles.
- We don't live on a transportation corridor.
- Our ABAG numbers reflect that we are more of a bedroom community.
- May feel differently about allowing street-front parking to count if on a main street.

Vice Chair Douch commented:

- Generally agrees with remarks from other Commissioners.
- We are already on the low side when it comes to our parking requirements.
- There already is a mechanism in place for a reduction to the amount of required parking if the request is compelling enough.
  - With that mechanism, a reduction across the board doesn't seem to make a lot of sense.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Could offer car-share exemptions for developers wishing to reduce parking requirements.

Commissioner Fernandez commented:

- We should add reference to 'mechanical parking' as that has been requested by developers in the past, if not already included.

Director Webster commented that he believed that there was a provision already but if not one could be added.

Chair Fritz expressed being in agreement with Commission Doyle on reducing item c to 2 spaces.

Chair Fritz asked if the Commission had other comments on the topic of parking, not just as outlined in item 10.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Referred to Chapter 17.110 Off-Street Parking Regulations G. and H. and commented that references to subsection (B) (3) through (5) and (B)-(6) be stricken as they do not exist.

The Commission concurred.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- References to 'Level 3' EV charging stations should be removed as he was unaware of any such thing.
- 480V outlets are not commonly used.

Commissioner Glaser comments continued:

- With regards to EV charging stations, he suggested that the language be more about the required infrastructure and less about the specifics of the stations.
- Because there are different standards, he suggested that references to, 'standard EV charging stations' be revised.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Suggested that 17.11.040 EV charging stations, C. be rewritten to say, 'At least one EV charging station shall be accessible as required under the California Building Code.'

The Commission concurred.

The Commission agreed to strike 17.11.040 D. 3. which read, 'Each Level 3 EV charging station installed beyond the minimum requirement in this SMC shall be counted as 2.5 vehicle parking spaces and the required number of vehicle parking spaces shall be reduced accordingly.'

The Commission agreed that it was best to not be too specific on the topic of EV charging as it is evolving.

The Commission agreed to continue their discussion of pre-wiring for EV charging stations at another time.

Ms. Thompson referred to item number 10 and commented:

- It sounds like the Commission generally agrees with item h, if assigned to the same household.

The Commission concurred.

Ms. Thompson referred to item number 10 and commented:

- Item i, to allow street-front parking to count towards multi-family parking requirements, is not agreed upon.

The Commission concurred.

Ms. Thompson commented that she did not have a clear understanding of the consensus for items a through g.

Vice Chair Douch commented that the consensus was to leave items a through g unchanged.

Chair Fritz commented that some had expressed support for reducing item c to 2.0 spaces.

Vice Chair Douch commented that he could be okay with that due to the small number of properties it could apply to.

Commissioner Kelley commented that she could go along with it, even though she doesn't like to reduce requirements.

Commissioner Fernandez commented that item c should be left a 3 spaces.

Chair Kelley asked a member of the public if she wished to comment on parking requirements for senior housing.

Chair Fritz reopened the public comment period.

ila Benavidez-Heaster, Bodega Avenue, commented:

- It looks like we have a greater need for parking.
- Just because a resident doesn't have a car, doesn't mean that a car isn't there.
  - It is really important to understand this, especially when it comes to senior housing.
  - Seniors often have caretakers, medical providers, ambulance and EMT's coming and going.
  - 12 people in her apartment complex have passed away just this year and there are three more who may not make it through December.
  - Visitor parking, group visits, special events, and classes compress the issues surrounding parking and traffic as well.
- Commended the Commission and staff for all of their exceptional work.
- Has not heard any discussion on workforce housing.
- After the recent fires, she expressed a great concern over the discussion surrounding 0' setbacks.
- It is important to recognize that we are lacking the infrastructure to accommodate all of this development.
- Feels like too much.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Staffing is usually substantial when it comes to senior housing.

Director Webster commented that the standard intends to account for that fact in a simple way.

Hearing nothing further, Chair Fritz closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Doyle surmised that items a through g will stay as is, item h is accepted, and item i is rejected.

Chair Fritz commented that he supports item i.

Commissioner Fernandez noted inclusion of a reference to 'mechanical parking' being allowed as well.

The Commission concurred.

Commissioner Doyle commented that the in-lieu fee is intended for a centralized parking structure in the downtown and should be explicit to that fact.

- Expressed being against collecting an in-lieu fee for bicycle and pedestrian improvements as stated herein.
- An in-lieu fee should not be charged until a piece of land is identified and acquired by the City with a plan to develop a parking structure.

Commissioner Glaser commented:

- Improving transit and transportation in general are just as important.

Chair Fritz commented:

- Agreed with Commissioner Doyle on the purpose of the in-lieu fee.
- Once set up, developers in certain areas should be required to pay the fee rather than being given the option to provide onsite parking.

Chair Fritz adjourned the meeting at 10:20 for a brief break.

Chair Fritz reconvened the meeting at 10:25.

Chair Fritz asked to hear from the Commission on item number 11 under Housing Subcommittee in the memorandum that was provided by De Novo Planning Group which read, 'Modify Inclusionary Ordinance to allow satisfaction by use of land trust deed restriction on 20 percent of the lots/units in ownership developments.'

Ms. Goetschius, Executive Director of Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County, explained the work and mission of the Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County.

Ms. Estrella, Director of Real Estate Development for Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County, explained the work and mission of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County.

The Commission asked questions of Ms. Goetschius and Ms. Estrella.

Ms. Thompson commented:

- This could be placed within the language of the ordinance as one of the ways to satisfy the requirement, rather than being an exemption.

The Commission concurred.

Mr. Love, Founder of Pendant Homes, commented:

- Working to develop at the corner of Bodega Avenue and Golden Ridge Avenue.
- Hopes to revisit exemptions for units below a certain square footage.
- Trying to build small homes here.
- Expressed being available for questions should the Commission have any.

Commissioner Doyle commented:

- Attachment C is a good start, however a comparison of in-lieu fees would be helpful.
- Sebastopol has outrageously high in-lieu fees.

Ms. Thompson responded that she would bring more information back on that.

Commissioner Kelley commented:

- One of our goals is to have economic diversity.

Commissioner Doyle commented that there needs to be a balance.

**B. ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE:** The consultant and staff have developed supplemental potential Zoning Ordinance revisions regarding response to the Sonoma County fire emergency, and potential future emergencies, for the Commission's review and comment.

The Commission deferred discussion of this item to their next meeting.

**9. DISCUSSION:** (none)

**10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:**

**A. PRELIMINARY DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE CANNABIS ORDINANCE:** Pursuant to City Council and Planning Commission direction, staff has developed a draft comprehensive cannabis ordinance that would replace current regulations. It is being transmitted to provide early opportunity for review. This draft will be the subject of a future Commission agenda item.

**11. ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Fritz adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m. to the next regular meeting of the Commission. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 12, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at the Sebastopol Youth Annex, 425 Morris Street, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Kenyon Webster  
Planning Director