



**City of Sebastopol**  
Incorporated 1902  
Planning Department  
7120 Bodega Avenue  
Sebastopol, CA 95472

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

## **UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES**

PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY OF SEBASTOPOL  
MINUTES OF November 9, 2021

### **PLANNING COMMISSION:**

The notice of the meeting was posted on November 4, 2021.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Fritz called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. and read a procedural statement.
- 2. ROLL CALL:**
  - Present:** Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Oetinger, and Commissioners Burnes, Douch, Fernandez, and Kelley
  - Absent:** None.
  - Staff:** Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director  
Kelly Hickler, Senior Planner
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None.
- 4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:** None.

### **5. STATEMENTS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:**

Chair Fritz disclosed that he had met with a group of residents adjacent to the Huntley Square Townhomes project onsite during the previous week and had a telephone conversation with project developer Bob Massaro of Huntley Square LLC.

Vice Chair Oetinger disclosed that several years before joining the Planning Commission she joined a group of planners to visit the Huntley Square Townhomes site and walked through the back of the existing townhomes to view the site.

## **6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. 7950 BODEGA AVENUE "Huntley Square Townhomes"** – Public Hearing to consider an application for a 10-unit townhome project located at 7950 Bodega Avenue. Requested entitlements include: a zoning amendment to modify the zoning from R7 to a Planned Community, Use Permit, a Tentative Map, and an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND, Environmental Review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act/CEQA).

The Planning Commission will provide a recommendation to the City Council, who will hold a public hearing at a City Council public meeting for a final decision.

Director Svanstrom introduced the item.

Senior Planner Hickler presented the staff report.

Chair Fritz asked for Planning Commission questions of staff.

### **Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

A point of clarification regarding the reduction to the original traffic trip number: Was that simply a mistake at the time of the report, or how did that come to be so high?

### **Steve Weinberger, Principle of W-Trans**

When we were asked to do an evaluation of the project the main issue that we were asked to address was the frontage dimensions to ensure that parking could be provided, that the future bike lanes that are now in design could be accommodated, and to look at the sight distance restrictions that exist as one approached Bodega Avenue from Golden Ridge Avenue. There was not going to be any operational analysis so we used what is closest to the project description, multiple-family housing. I was not aware that the project is all studio units when we did the original traffic study so we dug deeper on that and determined that the rates that we used from the ITE Trip Generation Handbook for multi-family are based on surveys of similar uses and multi-family housing vehicle trip generation rates are based on apartment units that have somewhere between one and three bedrooms, and they even provide the number of residents per unit that were used in the surveys that produced that rate. So, with only studio units we then did an estimate of how much trip generation there might be with only studios that would have less people per unit. Rates do not exist for studio only residential units so we used the data that was available to do some factoring to come up with an estimate that Kelly showed in her presentation.

### **Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

That's what we used in the CEQA analysis, the more conservative, higher multi-family counts, which did not reach a significant threshold, so anything less than that is a "lesser impact" and therefore doesn't need to be redone. We were just trying to get a more realistic idea of the actual likely trips.

### **Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Are there any other projects in Sebastopol that would be similar or where this type of approval was conducted?

### **Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Similar in terms of process?

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Yeah, process. I know it's hard to find another comparison. I'm just trying to see if there are other projects that were a result of change to a planned community.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

We actually have a number of them in Sebastopol. In fact, the development just to the east at the corner of Golden Ridge Avenue and Bodega Avenue was done through a planned community rezone, as well as the development directly to the north. The most recent the Commission has seen was actually the Davis Townhomes, which are now called the Barlow Crossing Townhomes, that are at the intersection just south of Highway 12 and Morris Street, so that's between the Sebastopol Inn and Park Village. The history of planned unit development is pretty typical for most cities. A lot of times in planned unit development or planned community development rezoning happens and in the past you would just sort of accrue the site plan without a lot of the development standards and possibly building envelopes, things like that. One change that we have done in the last couple of years is to do with the table of standards that would actually be incorporated to the ordinance with regard to what happens if someone wants to do some changes at a future time, and so in this regard are they allowed accessory structures? The Davis Townhome project units were smaller than what the regular R7 zoning would be, which is 400-500 square feet. Obviously that would not be appropriate here, and in fact the applicant is proposing to not have any accessory structures, and that would be included in the zoning forwarded and adopted by City Council if the project is recommended.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

This was touched on about the Bodega Avenue pavement and bike lanes. Does that cause those plans to be modified, or how is this going to be worked around those parking spaces?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

We'll make sure to coordinate with the applicant. Obviously I don't know when this project, if approved, would be constructed but the applicant would be responsible for the frontage improvements, including the sidewalk gap that the City previously had in its plans for the Bodega Avenue project. Just like any other project where there is a private project and a public project going on they will inherently coordinate through their encroachment permits at the Public Works Department, which will also know the schedule for the Bodega Avenue project. I've actually worked on this type of project before where there's a full road reclamation project going on, like replacement of sewer and everything 10 feet down at the same time, as a significant private project. In some ways it's actually nice because you can coordinate to ensure the utilities get in before the final asphalt overlays are done so that you don't get that saw cut into the brand new pavement like we have at Healdsburg Avenue and Murphy Avenue where that unfortunately happened right after Caltrans paved. It does take a little bit more coordination but it's certainly something the City is used to doing.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I did go to the site but I didn't run into anybody, just for the record. I meant to check out the flow of traffic on Golden Ridge Avenue but I had to go a different direction. So, you can come in from the west and turn left onto Golden Ridge legally. Going out of Golden Ridge going south, I can't remember if you can make a left-hand turn or not on that street. I thought it was prohibited, but I may be mistaken.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

That is a regular T-intersection.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

So, you go either left or right on there?

**Steve Weinberger, Principle, W-Trans**

There are some faded no left turn pavement markings on Bodega Avenue. You can no longer read that and it is effectively ignored but we did evaluate sight distance and provided some recommendations for striping. Essentially, we recommended that the project and its frontage improvements provide striping which would be the bike lane stripe just to give vehicles pulling out of Golden Ridge Avenue a little more guidance in pulling forward, knowing where the edge of the travel lane is to gain adequate sight distance. What you're referring to is I believe eastbound on Bodega Avenue to turn left into Golden Ridge. There was the time of a no left turn pavement marking but that is now faded and no longer legible.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

But does that mean it's no longer a law by policy, or is it just faded and not readable and people do it?

**Steve Weinberger, Principle, W-Trans**

I know it's there because of my length of time in the town and I remember that being there, but I would venture to say that 95% of the public doesn't know it exists because it is not readable marking anymore and effectively is no longer enforceable.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

And Steve, just to add to that, I happen to drive across that every day and there used to be a standing no left turn sign there until probably a year or two ago when that was taken down.

**Steve Weinberger, Principle, W-Trans**

And I'm afraid I don't know the history behind that. Maintenance or police may have taken that out. I can't answer that.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I'd be curious to know because that type of decision seem to have to be made to change the street rather than all of a sudden there be no sign or direction, so that was a little confusing to me. Is it a law on the books or not, and is it enforceable or was it eliminated by some public means on public record? I don't know if anybody can answer those questions.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Sounds like we don't have an answer for that tonight. I understand the concern, but I don't know that we can really decide the fate of this project based on whether or not those traffic markings exist.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Right, but it is a point that if you're talking about putting more traffic on there and people aren't supposed to turn left, it's just something I'd like to know and take into consideration what the real rules are for that street. That's what I'm asking for, not that I would consider that to be something to not have the project, but to take into consideration. If you're looking at all the factors, I think that needs to be looked at.

**Steve Weinberger, Principle, W-Trans**

Can I add to that? Like I said, in my opinion it no longer effectively exists. I don't know the history of the reason why it went in. I can tell you as sort of a warning device it's unusual to see a no left turn off of a main street where you don't have, say, a median blocking you from turning left. In this case, in my opinion and looking at the sight distance, there's not a compelling reason to have a no left turn there, so that's a list of my thoughts for that issue.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks, Steve. Deborah, would you like to ask your question?

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

Just to add to that left-hand turn, I think there is a compelling reason because if you're adding ten new dwellings and all the traffic, if you've ever tried to make a left-hand turn on Bodega Highway it can take quite some time during the busy hours, and so I can see that traffic on Golden Ridge Avenue stacking up. I did go to the site, I didn't talk to anyone, but I spent quite some time there and counted cars and looked at neighbors and density and so I actually think that is a good point. I'm not quite sure if this is the right time to address this question, but I understand with that zoning because it's a studio it's considered a half of a unit, so legally or technically these are considered five units instead of ten, however, there are still ten individual dwellings there and that will increase the density of the population in that area differently than would five dwellings. My question is has any of the research been done, and can you provide us with that, as to 500 square feet is a fairly small sized dwelling, so who is this targeted for and how long would they live there for? If we're looking at it as an entry-level and you're thinking of a younger, single person, eventually they could become a couple, have a family, and they're going to be moving on, but if we're looking at it for an elderly person it wouldn't be conducive to that, so I'm wondering how long we think the average person is going to stay? And 500 square feet, again, is a fairly small dwelling.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I think we'll have to save that question for the applicant, because now we're just asking questions of staff and the staff report. Do you have any other questions about staff issues?

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

No, but thank you so much.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

So hold that question until after the applicant's presentation.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Okay. I did have a few questions of staff. Because this is a tentative map and there's going to be ten lots I'm just wondering about the development standards table for minimum lot size, if we need to address the minimum size of one of the future subdivided lots, or is it okay to leave that out of that table?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Chair Fritz, are you recommending that we include the size of the smaller ten lots?

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Because in our development standards we have a minimum lot size, and in the staff report in the development standards table... Oh, I'm sorry, I see it. It did say the individual lot size.

Another question. This is in the use permit resolution, which is on page 29 of the staff report at the top of that page, Item B, Roman numeral I, "The project will utilize existing

fencing, providing landscaping to serve as a buffer, and provide compatibility between adjacent properties.” And maybe this will come up in the applicant’s presentation, but in my conversation with the applicant I asked that question about fencing and he said they’re actually providing new fencing, not relying on the existing fencing, so I just thought that item should be clarified in the resolution. And then Item 4 under that same item says, “Ten-percent of the gross site area equals 1,697.2 square feet,” and I think I know what that means but it’s a little vague as to what that’s referring to, so I think there should be a little bit more explanation. I think that’s the open space requirement if I’m correct. Just the wording of that was not super clear to me.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Chair Fritz, I think certainly on the fencing we can modify that. I think that does make sense given the public comment we got about some of the fencing being down on the western side of the site. Where was the second comment?

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

In that same section of the resolution, it’s Roman number IV, “Ten-percent of the gross site area equals 1,697.2 square feet,” and then it goes on to say what the project will provide in private open space, but there’s no reference that that initial number is the minimum required private open space. It just throws out this random number as this is a number, so again, that’s a number, but what is that?

There is a reference that that’s a minimum requirement and they’re providing more of that minimum requirement. And then I had a couple questions about the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The first one has to do with the aesthetics, which is on page 10 of the Initial Study document. The first three, A, B, and C, are all noted to be less than significant with mitigation and I have a hard time understanding why any of those three have a significant impact. I don’t see the development of this property having an impact on a scenic vista. It’s not blocking a view of any particular scenic vista so I’m wondering how that determination is made. The second one, Item B, is in reference to a state scenic highway. Bodega Avenue, if I’m not misunderstanding, is not a state highway at that point anymore, so I don’t think that applies. I think that’s no impact because obviously you can’t see it from downtown, so it don’t think it’s going to have an impact on that scenic view. Item C is, “substantially degrade the existing visual character.” I mean, it’s going to be a two-story residential development just like the rest of the neighborhood, so I don’t see how that would be a significant impact. It’s just being developed as allowed and the rest of the neighborhood is already developed. I’m trying to understand how those determinations are made as being a significant impact.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

I do know that one of the items, I believe Item C, is the potential for basically ugliness during construction and there is construction fencing that is required as mitigation to keep that from view, so that’s a temporary impact during construction and that’s pretty typical of this kind of a project. The Davis Townhomes have the fencing with the green screen on it so that it keeps all the dirt and piles and debris from view. It’s also good for safety, but it is an aesthetic note. Then Item B, you’re correct, the Initial Study does note that it is not located on the scenic highway. It does reference the trees as a scenic resource and discusses the trees a little bit, and the mitigation that’s incorporated for that is for the trees that are being removed with additional trees replanted on the site being required. Additionally the DRB/Tree Board will review those as well. Kelly, did you have anything to add to these?

**Kelly Hickler, Senior Planner**

No. That's what I was going to say for both of those.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Chair Fritz, I do hear what you're asking—is it really an impact at all?

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Yes.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

This is a bit more of a conservative approach to say let's mitigate the construction impacts and let's make sure we mitigate anyone who has views of the trees to include new replanted trees.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

So that's Items A and C. We don't have a mitigation specifically for Item B, and I don't think it really applies, but I want to make sure that we're not going to get caught down the road if someone says, "Well, you don't have a mitigation for Item B." To be honest, Item B doesn't really apply because there's no state highway within visual distance of this property, so is that something that should be a concern or do we just leave it as is?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

This is a draft until it gets reviewed by the Planning Commission and recommended to the City Council, so if the Commission feels that it really isn't a significant impact, that it's not on a scenic highway and the trees that are on the site aren't hugely significant, you could always recommend that that be changed to a less than significant impact and not require the mitigation. It's the heritage trees that we as a city felt like discussing.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I'm fine with A and C staying. We do mitigation and I don't think they're significant impacts. I just want to make sure that we're not going to have a problem with a Mitigated Negative Declaration if we have an item such as B that doesn't have a specific mitigation associated with it.

**Kelly Hickler, Senior Planner**

I can clarify that. Under Item B in the description, it might be hard to see in the text the way it's written, but down towards the bottom of that second paragraph it does mention mitigation measure Bio-3. So essentially what we did was refer to the Bio-3 mitigation measure rather than come up with a separate one just for this item.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Okay, fine. And then page 15 of the MND—this is just clarification for my understanding as well—has to do with air quality sensitivity, because under D it says, "There are no existing senior residential apartments, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, hospitals, or medical clinics adjacent to the project site." And then it says, "On the north, east, and west there are multi-family residential developments, including a senior housing complex, Burbank Heights." Burbank Heights is not adjacent but it is a senior complex down the street, so I'm wondering if that needed to be clarified or taken out because it's not adjacent to the property?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

I would recommend we strike that. It is looking for things that are adjacent to the site for this component, and yes, I recall discussing Burbank Heights with the county but it's not

within the range, so in this case I would strike “including the senior housing complex” since it is not obviously adjacent.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Okay, great. And then the last item on page 40, and this goes back to the traffic count change, I know you said it’s revised to a less than significant, but if this is a draft and we can change that then we might as well change that since we have updated information on the actual trip generation.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

What I would recommend here—but Steve, let me know how you feel about this—is that we discuss that the trip generation rates are based on one to three bedrooms and the 2.7 residents per and note that given the scale of this, the size of the units for this, being studios and the lesser square feet, that the impacts are likely less, but I would prefer leaving in the 73 trips as that is the worse case. We can certainly revise and enhance that with the additional information.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Okay, that would be good to document that that was clarified.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

And for those commissioners who are not used to seeing CEQA documents, because most of the projects we do are exempt, anything that includes a rezoning is not exempt, we do CEQA review on a case-by-case basis for those. But just to remind everyone, CEQA is not a test that you pass/fail, it is a disclosure document of the potential impacts for making a decision on the project. So, in that light, Chair Fritz, I think the additional information about the traffic does make sense so when the City Council reviews it they’ll have that incorporated.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks. And then to clarify kind of the same item, I think it’s mentioned in the MND, but Kelly also mentioned, the threshold 110 car trips. What is that threshold based on? Just any residential development, or is it based on the number of units, or how does that 110 unit threshold as a level of significance get determined?

**Kelly Hickler, Senior Planner**

Senate Bill 743 determined that if a project can demonstrate that it will generate a less than significant level of vehicle miles traveled, if the project includes affordable housing, housing within a half mile of transit, or housing projects generating fewer than 110 trips per day, if a project can demonstrate one of those things then it’s considered to be a less than significant impact. Since it falls under the 110 trip threshold it’s considered less than significant.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks for clarifying that. That’s all my questions. Any other final questions from any commissioners? Linda, do you have any questions of staff.

**Linda Kelley, Commissioner**

Just a quick one about the nine on-street parking spots. I know they’re not required to produce those, but they’re not dedicated, so that means anybody could park there?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

That is correct, yes. They will be public parking spaces.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Any other final questions of staff before we move on to the applicant's presentation? Kathy?

**Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair**

Maybe this question is for staff. I know people are concerned about parking, so I wanted to bring this up. One of the parking spots they've created is a handicapped zone. If none of the residents are handicapped or no one has a handicapped sticker for their car can other residents park there, or are you saying that's a completely public lot and anyone can park there?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

The way this will work is that each person will have an assigned space, so ten units, ten parking spaces. I believe if the person assigned the handicapped space is not handicapped they will still be able to use it or a guest can use it, but I think this actually goes to the applicant's presentation, because I know they have four units that are universally accessible as part of that, and so that may be a desire for the project actually.

**Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair**

Thank you. That makes that feel a lot better for the people who are worried about parking.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

And having lived in a condo development, even though I technically owned a space I swapped spaces with someone who needed something closer or needed a bigger space. The HOA is all residents/owners, and most will tend to operate that way, but the applicant can maybe talk about that a little bit more.

Chair Fritz thanked the Commission for their questions and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

The applicants, project co-developer Bob Massaro of Huntley Square LLC; architect Beth Farley of Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group; and Dante Love, co-developer of Huntley Square LLC, presented and were available for questions.

Chair Fritz thanked the applicants and asked for Planning Commission questions.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

Thank you so much for your time and the work that you put into this, both our planning commission and to your staff. My initial question was answered with who you are targeting this for and it seems to me like the unit with the loft, you've included the square footage of the loft in your overall square footage, and that has two bathrooms and the unit without the loft has one bathroom and that's where the additional square footage comes from, is that accurate?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Yes, that's correct.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

And you said the price is going to be about half the median price. I will tell you I was shocked because I've been following the real estate and I didn't realize that the median price was quite that high, so are you saying that the price of these will be around \$500,000?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

That's what we're looking at. The market moves all the time. We'll see where we are when we finish, but that's the ballpark that we're in.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

That makes sense to me if you can sell your house for \$970,000 and you want to downsize, but it would be interesting to see what the median salary is in Sebastopol compared to what this house price would be, because our salaries have not kept up, which is one of the issues that we have here with people being able to afford homes and work and live in Sebastopol. I think that even \$500,000 is a little steep for the entry-level homebuyer that you had on your slide. I think it was entry-level, downsizing, senior, and I can't remember the rest. Love the concept, love the idea of community, love your concern to the environment, and the style for building, but I still have some questions about is this truly entry-level? So, each person is going to individually own their own home and then pay the HOA, is that accurate?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

That's right, just like a townhome. I just wanted to address your question about the other person who it would serve, which would be young professionals, and if you had a couple that were both professionals more than likely they could afford a \$500,000 mortgage. The California housing market is really terrible right now and we have hardly any entry-level homes, so we're really trying to make this work. I think that it will hit most of that market, but everybody is in a different situation.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

I totally hear you and I hope you're right. I have a daughter who is a doctor and a daughter is a nurse, born and raised in Sebastopol, but they can't buy in Sebastopol. And my daughter who is a nurse has been on a COVID ward all year and even with the overtime she can't, so you're right, the market is hard. I just want to know if we're going to all this effort and creating this density and looking at traffic, and Bodega Highway is really a very difficult highway to migrate turning left and right under the best of circumstances and we're looking at evacuations. I sat there and I counted the cars going by and I tried to turn several times and I clocked how long it took me to turn, both left and right on Bodega Highway. Taking into consideration the project is beautiful but the density of it, so I guess really looking at the research for projects like this in our socio-economic community, is the purpose really served? Is it making a difference?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

I think that question is going to be answered when the project comes online and for sale. The fact is though that throughout Sonoma County to find anything new in the \$500,000 price range is rare, and we are taking a risk—we have built small before—but we believe the market is there. We believe that either people downsizing, or people like your daughters who can't afford the median house of \$978,000...

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

They couldn't afford this either. Do you have examples of the small houses you have built and how it served those communities? I would love to see some research and see how it impacted positively.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

We have some data in our business plan. As I said, we feel confident that we'll succeed, we feel confident that we'll sell, we feel confident we will really help the housing stock in Sebastopol. And to have zero net energy, remember, the utility bills are almost zero, so we're confident that this will work. Are we absolutely sure? No. Real estate is a gamble and

particularly in the Bay Area, but we feel that this is a really good gamble. We've put a lot of money into this and we're going to put a lot more money into it, so I guess that's the best bellwether of how we feel about how successful this will be is that we're putting a lot of money into the project; we believe in it.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

I think my question is a little different, and then I won't take up any more of your time. Not will it be successful, but how it positively impacted the community by offering housing to those underserved, if there were any projects you've done like that that we could see the positive impact.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

I have condo projects we've done in the past. They're small and sell in this price range and greater. We're here in Napa. I'll send you a link of one of them. This is not the first time we've done small and this is not the first time we've done townhomes, and I do know that in the past frankly we sold them before we finished them, so time will tell. And before you leave, God bless your daughter the COVID nurse. That's amazing. Good for her.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I just had one question to clarify. You're asking in your development standards for 8-foot setbacks from the side yards, which will be your development's rear yards for the townhomes, but looking at the site plan it looks like you've set that 8 feet at the northernmost unit and the site splays out a little bit, so as you get towards the front those setbacks actually become greater. Also, it looks from the site plan like the buildings themselves step in and out compared to one another, so again, the 8 feet would be like the unit that's closest, but then the adjacent unit would actually be more than 8 feet because it's not as aligned with the adjacent building and the property lines are splaying out. Am I looking at that correctly?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

That's right.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

You're absolutely right. It's 8 feet minimum and they get much greater as they get closer to Bodega.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Yeah, okay. I think that's all the questions I had. Kathy, I see you have your hand up.

**Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair**

Yes, Kari was alluding to the fact that some of the main floor units would be accessible. Is there a number that you're thinking of right now?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

I believe when we go through the building process all of the ground floor units will need to be adaptable, and I think there will be one fully accessible unit. From doing other multi-family projects I think that's probably where we're going to be and that's where the ADA parking space comes from. Let me just talk about that a little bit. I think it's the same as Kari thought. There are ten parking spaces back there and there are ten units, so if we don't have a person who needs an ADA spot that spot will just be filled by the last resident. All of the bathrooms on the first floors are ADA compliant at this point; they'll all have enough room in them to have the ADA space in them. We'll use all lever doorknobs and toggle switches and try to get as close to universal design as we can. We want to make this

accessible to anybody who can live there. Obviously, a wheelchair can't go up the stairs, but I would hope they would want to just live in the one-level unit.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

I want to expand on that. I spent four months in a wheelchair in the middle of my career and it changed me as a builder because now, for example, all our interior doors are 3 feet wide, and we put backing in for grab bars in the showers automatically; it's just the way we build. The single-story units will be very adaptable with kitchen countertop height, all that type of stuff, so it is something we're very sensitive to.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Great, thanks. Zach.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Thank you for the thorough presentation and the accompanying documentation. First off, on the parking to the north of the project, is the distance for backing up compliant? Is it reduced in any way? I know it's a little tight and I know you have a demonstration in one of your drawings showing the radiuses, so is that within standards? That's one question. I see you are providing two EV chargers. Will you be putting infrastructure in for more than two so that if you do end up with several electric vehicles, which is probably not unlikely, will that infrastructure be available? Will you be able to add it? Thirdly, the common area, Parcel B, I know it's a storm water bio-retention area. Does it have any other uses or is it accessible by the residents? How do you picture that area being used, if at all?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Do you want me to take the first one? Zach, let me see if I can remember your questions. The backup area is definitely a 20-foot backup, which is standard. The very last parking place to the west is a compact space and it is a bit tight, but I do believe we've got the right radiuses in there on our diagram that explained how you can get the car out of there. Did that answer that question?

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Yes, it was the 20-foot. I couldn't find that number.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Yeah, it's definitely 20 feet. What was the second?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

The second one had to do with are we going to be able to upgrade the other parking spaces to EV charging? I have to tell you, I didn't think about that until you just brought it up, but for the sake of some underground conduit, yeah, I think we're going to lay the conduit in. So, Mike Robinson, who is our civil engineer and who is listening here, please make a note that we want to put some underground conduit in to go to the parking. As far as your third question, the landscaping one, go ahead, Beth.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

The location of the bio-retention is basically where we're going to plant three new oak trees, and it is accessible from the sidewalk. You could go up there and sit down under a tree if you wanted to. We're not going to put any fencing along there. I would describe it as kind of a natural woodland area. We just wanted it to be sort of natural and have those beautiful oak trees there.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Okay, thank you. So, that's not really accessible per se to the residents?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Well, you could walk. You would have to go down the steps, down the sidewalk, and then walk back up in there. But it's an odd shaped lot, so it made sense to put the bio-retention over there.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Absolutely. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thank you. Any other questions of the applicants from the Commission? Deborah?

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

One quick one. You mentioned that it would be a low water impact usage, which to us in Sebastopol is a very big issue. I noticed the garden in the common space. Will you do any rainwater collection, or what is the strategy there for the low water usage besides the obvious low-water toilets and showers and things of that nature?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

I think we can have our landscape architect answer this one. Sierra, are you here?

**Sierra Hart, Landscape Architect**

Oh yeah, absolutely and thanks for the question. As far as the landscaping is concerned it's all in the preliminary concept design, it's all designed to be compliant with our water efficient landscape ordinance, and it actually goes above and beyond what's required by that ordinance. All the plants are in the low water use category with the exception of maybe a couple of plants that are moderate water use. That goes along with efficient irrigation; so the landscape water use is in the very lowest category to still have landscaping around the property. That's from a landscape perspective. The bio-retention area serves as a rainwater catchment area. There are not many rain gardens, but that would be the main rain garden for the site.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Thank you. You mentioned a little bit about the walls as far as between the buildings, and the community involvement this project brings is great assuming everybody gets along, but I think it's also important to provide sanctity and quiet and so forth, so I would encourage anything you can do to mitigate or reduce sound between one structure to the next townhome, because like I said, everything is kind of open, which is great, but then it would be nice if people want a little bit of peace and quiet to be able to have that in kind of a small space.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

The sound ratings for townhomes and condominiums are actually greater than it is for apartments, so this is going to be built to townhome standards.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

We have a double wall for our structure because of fire code, and we've built these before. I wish I had the sound transmission class (STC) rating right on my tongue, but the double walls don't transmit sound very well because they don't even vibrate together.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

One of the things that always surprises people when they come into our homes and our apartment units is how incredibly quiet they are, and the reason is because in addition to the insulation that goes into the walls we put one inch of insulation on the outside of the building, so it serves as a thermal break and a thermal barrier, but it's also a tremendous sound barrier, so these are very, very quiet units. I'm always proud when people talk about how quiet our buildings are.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Also the other thing that helps with sound are really good windows, which make a big difference in a unit, and we will provide very good windows.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I appreciate the extra parking that you added. My concern is that's a very busy street and it's hard to imagine parking there or getting out, and as I mentioned, the concern about turning. I think the reason that the left turn in the past was a concern is because if you look to your right it's kind of a hill and you can't see a vehicle until it's almost on top of you just because of the slope of the right-hand side. I don't know what could be done there. I think people are going to turn left regardless of what the rules are. And then people who are parked on the Bodega side that want to go back into town probably creatively will figure out a way to do it, hopefully not there but somewhere down the road; might be Pleasant Hill Road or something like that.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

With the new development of that road there is a bike lane that will be on the outside of the cars where our parking is going to happen, so we will have a bit of a buffer there from the moving cars to where our cars would be parked or the public parking would happen, so there will be a little bit of space there. It won't be so tight.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Okay, thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Any other questions? Linda, do you have something you'd like to ask?

**Linda Kelley, Commissioner**

Yes, I do, thank you. I appreciate the acknowledgement and work on accessibility. The City has a checklist on further universal design that you can put in that we require of new development and also substantial additions. Have you already looked at that or not? I think my concern right now is accessibility from Bodega and I'm wondering can you somehow incorporate a ramp for wheelchairs or whatever, including delivery? I don't see where people or deliveries are going to get into that development without going around to the back, so if you could explain that, that would be great.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

I've seen a lot of deliveries happen into apartment buildings, upstairs, with handcarts. I'm not really that concerned about deliveries getting into this unit up the stairs. We don't have a ramp in the front. I suppose we could consider that. It would take up a lot of space out there and it would take a lot of the plant material out.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

It would take a lot of the front yards out too. I wish the project were bigger. I wish we could put in a ramp but there just isn't room. We tried to make it as accessible as possible. It is

zoned multi-family with the City and we've done everything we could to make it as accessible as we can but we are limited to what we can do.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Right now the space in front of the retaining wall is a public utility easement, and so we can't really put the ramp in the easement, and there is only I believe five or less feet from the retaining wall to the wall of the first unit, so there's not a whole lot of wiggle room in there to get a ramp in.

**Linda Kelley, Commissioner**

How about one of those little units that raises the wheelchair like they have at the HopMonk Tavern?

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Oh, you mean going up the steps somehow?

**Linda Kelley, Commissioner**

Well, it doesn't have to go up the steps; it just rises from one level to the next. I'm sure the planning commissioners are familiar with that. There's one in the front and one in the back at the HopMonk, and it's just like a little utility freight elevator that you roll into and it just brings you up to the next level. It doesn't take much room. We had a neighbor who had one installed by one of the non-profits that helped to renovate seniors' homes. It doesn't take up much room, so you might want to think about that.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

Yes, we will think about it. In my head my going through every square inch of that property and where we could possibility put something like that. I will tell you that we will definitely take a look at it.

**Linda Kelley, Commissioner**

All right, thank you. That was my one comment until we get to deliberations.

Chair Fritz asked for additional questions from the Planning Commission. Seeing none, he opened public comment.

**Marcel DeGross, a member of the public**

It seems to me the Planning Commission has bent over backwards for this project to change it from R7 to PC and it seems for the most part that it's a done deal. I've heard all the comments about how everyone is bent over backwards to accommodate the Bodega Bay HOA, and we are townhouses, not condominiums, FYI. What hasn't been said or viewed on these plans is we haven't seen these buildings that are going to tower over the people and Candice and Tom and Heather's units. You talk about building community. You're going to be blocking, A) all of the light from the west, and B) all the air from the west, so that is a health problem as far as I'm concerned, circulation of air. You say it's only five units but technically it's ten units. It's more traffic, it's more density, and it's more everything. The last thing I'm going to say is Sebastopol is not New York City but it seems like it's headed in that direction, and having lived in New York City I live in Sebastopol because I don't want to live in New York City. That's it. There are no shots. We haven't seen any shots (inaudible) between the condos on the east side and the current buildings that exist there now, Bodega Bay HOA. That's all I have to say. Thank you for your time.

**Rich Ressler, Facilities Manager, Bodega Bay HOA**

I'd like to ask a few questions. I can just ask my questions and then you can take it from there rather than one at a time. I just wanted to be clear that we are a planned unit development; we're not townhouses or condominiums. We own all the land below us, above us, and the areas around us. My unit is the first unit in the easement and Candice's is the second, so all the construction and all the people that are living there are going to be using that easement and passing our building on a regular basis, so that's why we have a concern. The question I have is when I drive up from Washington Avenue going west I count nine driveways. That does not include Virginia Avenue and Nelson Way. So you're driving up Bodega Avenue, you're heading toward Pleasant Hill, and there's a driveway, and then you go another ten feet and there's a driveway and you go up another 20 feet and there's another driveway. My question is why can't we have access from Bodega Avenue? There's one that's right next to Pleasant Hill, the property that's in the back. One more is not going to make a big difference as far as whether traffic gets jammed up or whether people have got to go slower. We can always take 35 miles an hour and reduce it to 25, because I know it changes from 25 to 35 at around Virginia Avenue. We just keep it at 25. I just want to know why we can't come off of Bodega Avenue? That's one question. The other question is how high is that wall when I'm standing next to that retaining wall? My other question is all the presentations always exclude our properties and the properties around and what it actually looks like. Our easement is completely destroyed by the garbage truck right now. Where are the sewer lines going to come from? Are we going to take our sewer and share it with ten peoples' toilets? And are the power lines going underground or would they be pulling off that power pole that's on the corner of Golden Ridge Avenue? And where is the power going to be headed? Another question would be is there going to be a facilities manager for that HOA on property to make sure that the 15 garbage cans that are down there in front of my place are pulled up in a nice, timely manner rather than 15 garbage cans sprawled across Golden Ridge Avenue? I'm the facilities manager here at this homeowners association. I take care of all the property here and I've also been the one that would call the fire department and ask them to have them come mow the property. The property has not been maintained by the owners. Can you answer some of those questions?

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

We will answer questions after all the public comments, so thank you for the questions and do we have anyone else that would like to make any statements? I see Tom's hand up.

**Tom, a member of the public**

Hello. I would like to thank Ms. Burnes and Ms. Kelley for some of their really cogent questions on how this development moves forward. The more I look at it, and I've sent a lot of input to the process, I wonder how we are going to put this into place with other people living here? At present we have some very great people that live in our process that don't have any word or are able to get their input into this process, so I'm concerned about all the people that are being left out I suppose is what I'm saying. I put a lot of input into this and part of what I was wondering about was things like these things on top of the roofs, the heaters and the air conditioners. There are ten of them and nobody seems to care that they are going to put a lot of air and noise into our environment, so things like that. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thank you, Tom. Next I will go to Sheen.

**Sheen McCwean, a member of the public**

I'll keep it brief; I don't want to take up too much time. This is a problem in general in most small towns. Street corners where the signs are that will say "Oak Tree Street." It's confusing to me because they're green. You've got the green trees and it's a green sign. I don't have great eyesight; I don't see them much when I'm driving. I know some towns

have white signs or maybe a black, just something to help differentiate. I don't have great eyesight; I'm kind of an old gentlemen, so just an idea.

**Anna Ressler, a member of the public**

Hi, my name is Anna Ressler and I live in 124 Golden Ridge and I just want to thank Evert Fernandez, Linda Kelley, and Deborah Burnes. Thank you so much for bringing up these issues. It's really going to be very noisy. We are six units at the end. We are planned unit developments (PUDs) and the entrance is only one entrance to the easement, and it's not wide enough to have two cars next to each other. I wonder how they're going to bring in those huge crane trucks? We have four families in here working from home and it's very noisy, and thank you Evert from bringing it up, because I'm going to be working. I'm not against building and the housing, it's wonderful, but I think it would be nice to consider having less units, because who is going to be in control of these people who are going to be buying in there? We're talking about it will be 16 units using one exit and one entrance only, and the easement is not wide enough. And if you're going to go onto my property, we own the land, so we're going to have to talk about that, because we are the homeowners association and we own the easement. Well, we don't own the easement but we have some covenants in there that it has to say how wide it has to be to have two cars in and out. Thank you so much for letting me talk. I hope they consider having less units. Five hundred thousand dollars is a lot of money, but it is what it is. Thank you so much.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thank you, Anna. Candice.

**Candice, a member of the public**

Hi. Thank you for hearing our concerns tonight and I appreciate everyone paying such close attention to the details. I just want to refer to you all to the letter that Tom wrote you today that listed I think very comprehensively most of our concerns that really haven't been addressed in this meeting; the issue of safety, number one. I know these people have a right to build and I support their right to build. I'm just concerned that it's not being done in a way that's good for the community around them. The building sounds beautiful. They're green and all of that sounds wonderful, and like Tom said, it looks really good on paper but in reality there are a lot of little details that are going to make it difficult. The accommodation of taking the trashcans down to the curb; those trashcans are very noisy. I get to hear them every Tuesday morning, just the four that we have, and if you have ten people with at least ten, maybe twenty, and you're bringing them down there, what is Bodega Avenue going to look like on Tuesday morning? That's not really feasible, I don't think. And not only that, but the trash company, Recology, wants their cans to be two feet apart in order to pick up. So the little details like that that don't seem like a big deal, but they are in everyday use, are a concern for me. Another concern is the noise of not just the building but also the noise of people driving in and out of the easement. My personal thought is you're going to probably have a lot of people working from home living in those units. It would be people who are doing tech projects and things, single adults that will probably be living there mostly that can afford it, so I have concerns about the safety of the easement, that's there are going to be problems with people backing into each other, and the noise and the exhaust. I have concerns about the noise coming from the tops of the units. My biggest concern personally is that the units are going to be eight feet from my fence, 20 feet high, and completely block all sun and wind to my house. That's not healthy for me. The noise and exhaust is not healthy for me; it's not healthy for any of us. So, all of that is really addressed in this letter that Tom wrote today, so I'm hoping you all read it carefully and see if you can address some of those concerns. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thank you, Candice. Anyone else.

**Linda, a member of the public**

Hello, can you hear me? I'm on a landline. It's very interesting. I haven't been attending the Planning Commission meetings for a while, probably years, and so the only reason I'm doing it now is because I'm on my fully corded landline phone. In any event, I live in a 60-unit apartment complex here in Sebastopol where I've been for 20 years. I am electro-sensitive and I'm one of a growing number of people who require accommodations and I am living, like I said, in an apartment here where I've got shielding on all the exterior walls, ceilings, and have a lot of shielding that I'm wearing; a couple of face masks, head and neck, six t-shirts, an apron, and I've got a \$900 canopy under which I sleep to prevent me from electro-magnetic fields. My otherwise wonderful neighbors microwave radiation. They've all got wireless devices and it goes right through the walls. What this has to do with your development is the exposure to and the intensification of microwave radiation that your development and the people and their cell phones and also the power lines will bring to the neighborhood and neighbors. It will be exposing them to more microwave radiation poisoning. It's cumulative damage that telecoms have spent a lot of time and energy in preventing the public from knowing about the harm and danger of cell phones and all the other wireless devices. Also, the power lines, that was a good thing that somebody mentioned there. Just because the power lines are undergrounded doesn't mean that they're undergrounded properly in order to neutralize the magnetic fields that are a byproduct of anything with electricity flowing through it, and that includes your charging stations, your electric cars, your electric stoves, all those things' byproduct is magnetic fields which biologically speaking it is bioactive and what it does to put it very simply is that it promotes cellular growth, as in cancer. We already have a cancer cluster that the City tried to do what they could at the Palm Drive homes near what used to be the hospital. There is a cell tower there.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Linda, your time is up.

**Linda, a member of the public**

Well, basically you get the drift. It's not a good fit for Sebastopol. I urge that you reject it.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thank you for your comments, Linda. I see Mr. Thompson with his hand up. Would you like to make your comment, Mr. Thompson?

**Mr. Thompson, a member of the public**

Yes, I would. Hello, everyone, thank you for hearing me out. My name is Mr. Thompson. I was walking this afternoon and I saw this nice young lady and she had a dog with her, and the dog was on a leash and I walked up to her and I said, "May I pet your dog?" and she said, "Oh no, I'm sorry. This is a service dog," and I thought to myself shouldn't I still be able to pet it? That's what I said to her, I said, "Shouldn't I be able to still pet it?" and she said, "No, it's the law. You're not allowed to." And I was wondering if maybe we could try to change something into a regulation that people can pet service dogs, because it would have brightened my day and I would have liked to have done it.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I'm sorry, Mr. Thompson, do you have something to say about this project? This public hearing is specifically about this project. If you have something to speak about that's not related to this project, that time was earlier in the meeting, and you may also try bringing

this to the attention of the City Council, but we are here to talk about this proposed housing development on Bodega Avenue. Do you have something specific about that project?

**Mr. Thompson, a member of the public**

Well, I live near there and that's where I saw the dog.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Well, thank you for your comments and we will move on to the next person. Is there anyone else that would like to make a comment about this proposed housing development? So, I will close the public hearing and bring this item back to the Commission for discussion and deliberation. There were some questions that were asked and maybe we can go through those first.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Chair Fritz, I know there are a number of questions about the utilities. I know the civil engineer for the applicant is here and can probably address those pretty quickly.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Sure, that would be great. Mr. Robinson, can you address some of the questions about where the utilities are coming from or going to?

**Mike Robinson, Civil Engineer**

Yes, thank you. The water supply is on the opposite side of Bodega Avenue and there would be a connection T that's brought across Bodega Avenue and up into the project to end with a fire hydrant that's back by the parking area. The water meters would be placed along the curb line along Bodega Avenue so the meters could be read there, and they would include a fire riser for the first suppression system in the units and the domestic water supply from the City water. The sewer would be collected from the units and would go toward the north and discharge down the access easement. There's a sewer manhole there and a sewer line has been stubbed to the property line. When the development on the easterly side was developed it was intended to provide access for this property with the easement as well as sewer discharge down that existing sewer line. I might add that there's also one other easement from a property to the north and west of this particular project. Their sewer lateral comes along the northerly side of the planter strip, makes a turn and already discharges down that existing sewer line, so that will be the point of connection for that. The drainage is collected from the back yards in the storm water pipe and area drains as well as off the roofs of the building structures. They're collected and they run behind the proposed retaining wall and they discharge into the bio-retention filter before discharging to Bodega Avenue. The utility lines, the electric supply, would be from Bodega Avenue. There would be a transformer and a drop and all the utility would be undergrounded into the site to the units. The specific locations of the electric meters I don't think has been determined yet, but there's the basic supply source for the electric.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Great, thank you. There was also a question about the height of the retaining wall.

**Mike Robinson, Civil Engineer**

On the original tentative map, and it shows on the grading plan of the tentative map, the grade of Bodega Avenue changes and it's going down a little bit as it goes westerly. The height of the wall on the most westerly unit from the front grade of the street is nine feet and at the easterly side it's seven-and-a-half feet tall, and that's from the ground level at Bodega Avenue. The slide that Healthy Builders showed where they've added the curb and landscape up the side of the wall in front of the wall to reduce that wall height view from the street I think is a really good idea; I think it would fit in really nicely, but ground level varies. Oh, and at the far corner of the neighbor's property where that large tree is, the height of that wall is six feet right at the corner where it makes its turn, the one where we were talking about using drilled piers to support the wall between the roots of the tree that are hand dug.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

All right, thank you. I think that was all the civil questions. Do you have any other civil questions you were noting, Kari?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

I do not. I do have one question about the noise and the heat pumps, and I don't know if the applicant wants to talk about the location of those, but I would note that as planning staff when we review building permits we do regularly request the equipment noise specifications, decibel ratings, to ensure that they meet the noise ordinance at the property line. We do that for generators, we do that for anyone who adds a heat pump after the fact, so we do require that and it is at the property line that they need to meet the noise ordinance, not at the next residence, so it's stricter than some. I do have one more note on the construction because of the noise, which are the construction components. I know Bob Massaro could perhaps talk a little bit about how he sees the construction logistics happening, because I know staff has discussed that with him, given concerns for disruption.

But I would note that Sebastopol's noise ordinance actually allows construction activity on Saturdays and Sundays, however, we are limiting construction for this project to Monday through Friday hours so that there is less disruption than would normally be possible under our municipal code, but that's in respect for wanting to make sure that people have weekends quiet and free from construction noise and activities.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Did you have anything you wanted to add, Bob, about the construction activities?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

The majority of the work in the beginning would be on Bodega building the retaining walls, bringing in the utilities, clearing the site, dealing with the trees, building the sidewalk. We want to get all those improvements in first along with the foundations. We build a lot of our building components in our factory so the construction times of the buildings is significantly diminished, which will also cut down on the noise factor. For example, if this were a conventional construction, somebody was doing stick framing out there and pounding nails, it would be a lot longer and a lot noisier than the way we build it, so I think everybody will be surprised. Look, it's going to be noisy. Construction is noisy, there's no way around that, but because we're building a good part of the building components in the factory we're going to reduce a lot of the noise associated with the buildings. I think that's all I have, Chair Fritz.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

There was a couple of other questions, just so that they do get acknowledged, one about whether a driveway from Bodega would be considered and another about how facilities would be managed. Just important to hear from the applicant on those.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

It would be extremely expensive and somewhat dangerous to bring the access from Bodega. We bought that property with the easement in place, so we always knew that whatever we built there we were going to bring it from the easement. I'm sorry, what was the other question?

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

The management and how the trashcans would get dropped off at the street and delivered back to the location.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

It is an HOA, and just as the neighbors next door and the neighbors behind us have an HOA we'll have a landscape maintenance firm whose part of their scope of work would be to bring the trashcans down. Therefore, we won't be relying on any particular resident. There's no manager onsite, but there are ten neighbors, and if there are any issues they can address them with the neighbors, but we are dealing with the trashcans and the landscape maintenance by contracting it out to a service.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

All right, thank you. Mike, did you have something you wanted to add? I see you have your hand up, Mr. Robinson.

**Mike Robinson, Civil Engineer**

Yes, thank you. I just wanted to reiterate the elevation difference of the Bodega grade and the grade of the site. Unless that was fully excavated with retaining walls on the side of the property to get a driveway in from Bodega Avenue this road would have to have a cut of

almost eight feet, and in typical street standards where a normal street might be a 15% grade, trying to get up eight feet into the site would take you three-quarters of the way into the site with lots perhaps on either side of that, which wouldn't be practical to have any driveways, so it really is not a feasible thought to have a driveway into the site from Bodega Avenue, which I'm sure is the reason why this easement was established for access at the beginning with the other projects next door. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks, Mike. Kari, do you want to say something?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Chair Fritz, just in terms of the access easement I wanted to note that the access easement has been in place since before the adjacent project was developed and my understanding is part of that is, yeah, the engineering and the safety factors of access from Bodega Avenue. You never want to have people backing out onto an arterial if you can help it. We recently saw the Habitat for Humanity project that is taking access off of the side street, not side access, a similar access easement rather than having people coming and going from 116, so it's a traffic safety and just practical issue in this case with the topography, but it was in place prior to the adjacent development ever being done because the City understood at that time that that was going to be a requirement.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks for that clarification. Did anyone else hear any questions that haven't been answered yet? Deborah.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

Basically one of the neighbors had asked why the scope of the project couldn't be done with nine or eight units, thinking that that would solve some of the issues for the adjacent neighbors, and I don't know if that was addressed or not.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I don't think that was specifically addressed, but we're looking at the project as presented to us. There are plenty of things that could have happened with this development, but this is what's being brought forward so I think this is what the Planning Commission needs to discuss.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

No problem. I just want to make sure we heard all the neighbors' questions and if there were a way to answer them that we could, and if not, that's fair enough, so thank you so much, Chair Fritz.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I mean unless Bob wants to answer that question. Do you have any thoughts of why you have ten rather than eight? I mean, I can imagine what the answer is, but do you want to jump in?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

I think you had answered it better than I could, Chair Fritz.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

We have concerns about the cost of these units, and if there are ten units that share in the site development costs versus eight units that are sharing the site development costs that changes the cost of the units at the end of the day, so the more units the less it's going to

cost at the end of the day. I think it's harder for us as a planning commission to ask for fewer units that are cheaper. It just doesn't really work that way in the construction world, so unfortunately I think this is probably they're trying to hit a price point and this is the number of units that work for them to get that price point.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Kelly wanted to note one thing, that right now the conditions of approval do allow construction on Saturdays, but I would recommend that we strike that and only allow it Monday through Friday. I think that's what the applicant is anticipating at any rate. I know that's what we had discussed with them.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Is that your understanding, Bob, that it's Monday through Friday construction? Is that acceptable to you for that to be in the conditions of approval?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

Yes, I'm fine with that, and I'm sure Dante is also.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Okay, great. Let's make a note to make that correction in the conditions.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Chair Fritz, I do have one other question that I'm not sure was answered regarding the height of the buildings and the blocking of sunlight and air that somebody had brought up. I don't know if anybody addressed that question.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

If Bob wants to say something about that. The site is allowed to go to 30 feet, nine feet from the property line; that's our City development standards. Any development on this property by right is allowed to go to 30 feet tall nine feet from the property line. What they're bringing forward is lower. I can't remember the exact height, 22 feet or something to the tallest parapet and eight feet from the property line. I haven't done a shadow analysis of that, but I would imagine that what they're proposing is actually less impactful than what could be if they were following strict development standards.

Chair Fritz asked for deliberation from the Planning Commission on the item.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

I'm happy to kick this off. Hopefully we'll hear from everybody with their general thoughts before we get into specifics. This has been going through the process since 2016, and I know this isn't going to undo the nervousness and concerns and anxiety the neighbors have. I don't blame them, they're going to be exposed to a year or more of construction and I fully understand why that would be a scary prospect, but I've watched this developer spend five years getting this project the best they can, and if I think of the alternative to this project or what a more conventional development might look like for the neighbors, again, I don't expect the neighbors to be pleased by this statement, but three or four big townhomes in there would be so much more impactful and so much more unpleasant, and a developer is going to maximize the development. For 30 years it's been a vacant lot. I completely understand how attached the neighbors are to that, to the light, to the trees, to the sunset, the evening sunlight coming through the site, and this is going to change some of that, and I see those impacts. But also what I see is a project and a project team that have tried their hardest to create a development that has intrinsic values that meet what the community and the City and the General Plan are looking for and have put the work in,

have spent five years getting their entitlements and making adjustments. So many of the actual concerns of the neighbors, again, I sympathize with them, I sympathize with the potential of the noise of the bins going down the road, I sympathize with the construction and the dust and the noise, I sympathize with so many of these issues, but the fact remains this is a high-density lot that will be developed and I think the responsibility we have here is to approve the best possible development, and I cannot imagine a development that would be less impactful on the neighbors than this one with the commensurate improvements to the Bodega frontage. I am trying not to be dismissive of the neighbors. I appreciate the concerns, and more than that I appreciate the anxiety that this engenders as any big construction project would. That said, when I evaluate the planning issues before us, the conformance to high-density, the planned community district designation, the CUP, the discussions around the mitigated negative declaration and tentative map and use permit, I find that I'm in favor of the applicant's requests on these items and I'm in favor of recommending the project for approval by the City Council. I'm definitely laying my hand out there early on, but I don't want to be disingenuous to anyone. I want to hear the concerns and I want us to hear those, and I find that I think this development is appropriate and really does offer a new and much desired type of development for the City.

**Kathy Oetinger, Vice Chair**

I'm really happy to follow Zach because he said everything that was on my mind, and probably said more than that. Something I would add to that is that I have been around long enough to remember how people felt about the neighbors to the east when that development came in, because people were so concerned about the driveway getting out on Bodega Avenue, and I know that you probably experienced some of those concerns as well. So, we've been here before and we know that each development is cumulative on the highway, but it's not just our development, it's other places. I also think I'm really happy with the way Sebastopol is moving forward with this particular project because of the size of the units, because that's something people in the community have been asking for for all those years, and if we'd done this 20 years ago I don't think they'd be that expensive, but I think the project we have now is so clean and efficient and so perfect for the way we are living today that it is the right project for that site. I particularly understand the loss of the winter sun and the setting sun in the evening and the open space, and to lose that I can understand how that feels, but we are living in a small town adjacent to a transportation corridor that's really important to the area and we're going to see more dense housing along those areas just as the neighbors have become more dense as well. I also would approve recommendation to the City Council of the four elements that we're considering right now. I'll add one more comment. Someone mentioned changing the speed limit to 25 miles per hour as routine. I haven't looked at that in a technical sort of way but I think more and more the speed on the street will be slowing down, and I don't know whether the City wants to look at a time when that would be appropriate, but it certainly should be looked into to see whether it merits some consideration.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I appreciate a lot of the comments that have been made. First of all, let me say that as far as the developer and the efforts and the project that's going in there, a lot of work has been done to make it the best possible, and yeah, there could be other things that could go on there that may or may not be worse. I'm just conflicted with what some of our requirements are. The second paragraph of the staff report says, "The zoning amendments require Planning Commission and City Council review to ensure that it is consistent with General Plan land use goals and policies and will not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood." Now, maybe this project is good for the community and maybe it's a well thought out project, but I cannot say that it is not going to be a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood so I don't know if that in the future might need to be written

differently, and either I think it's to acknowledge that there is not going to be an impact on the neighborhood and so you're going to approve it and vote for it, or that it will be an impact on the neighborhood and I don't see how we can say that it isn't because we don't live there but you're going to vote for it anyway, and that's kind of the position we have been put in. I really appreciate the concerns of the neighbors and what they're going to have to go through. The one positive way to look at it as far as the neighbors is that all the amenities that they mentioned, the sun from the west, the air, the quiet and so forth, they should look at that as having had that for the last 30 years or whatever versus something could have been built there right away, so it's not something that's being taken away, which it is, but it's something that they've been able to enjoy and appreciate that could have been gone a long time ago. I've gone through similar things from that standpoint with property around my house that has been developed. I still have a concern about the traffic and the rules, the turning from that road or not. Just odd to me that it either is a rule or it isn't. Was that changed? Is that still there? Was it just forgotten? Because if it was put in there for safety reasons whenever it was I couldn't imagine it not being more dangerous now than it was before; you're adding more vehicles and stuff like that. So, that would be a question: If that was put there for a reason, is it still there and just not being followed? It's a question that may not affect my decision or your decision as far as this project, but I think it's something that I need to have answered before I can make this determination. There were a lot of changes that were made to the proposal, a lot of positive and so forth, but it was in a short time frame that we as planning commissioners are used to, get information on a Thursday and having our meeting on Tuesday, but for neighbors there may be things that they may not have had a chance to comment on. I'd be more concerned if we were to make a final decision but all we're doing is making a recommendation to City Council and they will have the opportunity to speak to City Council down the road. Anyway, the impact is to try to limit the construction impact on the neighbors and do everything that's possible. The same thing with the garbage cans. Twelve garbage cans rolling down, I don't know if perhaps we might want to put a limitation on when that could be done. If somebody comes in and at midnight they can move the garbage cans, you can hear it from your neighborhood, people put out their garbage cans at all hours, you can just imagine a bunch of them being put out at the same time, because whoever is doing it is going to do it at one time versus neighbors where it is spread out. I support the project as far as what has been done. I appreciate the meetings where the developers have come before us and how they've made changes and taken ideas, so no problem with that at all and I commend the developers, but I do have those concerns and my unanswered question regarding the traffic, whether that's going to cause me to not support it or not I can't really say, but it is an unanswered question as far as I'm concerned.

**Deborah Burnes, Commissioner**

I have some hesitation, as does Commissioner Fernandez; I was going to quote the same exact sentence he did. I'm wondering about the impact to the community, and yet I think this was well thought out. I'm coming into it later; I haven't been here since 2016 but I appreciate and can see all the work and transformation that has happened to this, really taking the community and the concerns into consideration, so I do appreciate that and I think it's a lovely project. The reason I mentioned my daughters were professionals was because with \$75,000-\$100,000 down payment, I Goggled the average income in Sebastopol and it's \$40,000, so even two young professionals I think would have a hard time managing this. I guess I agree with the developer that I do think they will sell, but my question is are we trying to provide housing right now to support our current community, people who are currently living here and cannot afford to stay here and have to move to other places, or are we trying to attract people from other areas who could afford this? So, I find myself conflicted as well, and I really appreciate all the work and effort that has happened to this point.

**Linda Kelley, Commissioner**

We had a very long-term serving Councilmember, Bill Roventini if you all remember him, and he would say about a project, "Well, it's like trying to fit a size 9 foot into a size 7 shoe," so a very ambitious project. I have major concerns about massing to the east. The accessibility certainly from the street, seems a shame if that can't be included. The idea of the units are small, theoretically should be cheaper, however there aren't any inclusionary units because of the size so it's still going to be driven by the market. I have the same concerns that several of our other commissioners have around the traffic. The easement is so tight. It's just too much, too tall, the massing is just a little too ambitious, but I do appreciate the amenities that we will as a City get in terms of the sidewalk and eventually the bike path and some more parking. These are my preliminary comments. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks. I definitely agree with Zach and Kathy's statements in terms of I think you have to look at this as a developable piece of land in the City of Sebastopol that's zoned for high-density residential, as high as Sebastopol gets, 25 units an acre. And even if you do count all ten units as a unit, ten units are what they're allowed to do on this property. The adjacent property to the east is six units, it's on a smaller piece of land, and it comes out to 16 units per acre. The property to the north has seven units, it's also a planned community, and it also comes out to 16 units an acre. So, this project is right in there with its neighbors. I met with the neighbors onsite, I hear their concerns, I hear the anxiety. It's hard to accept a fairly significant project being built on the property adjacent to you, but we have to understand that this project is zoned to allow exactly this project, if not more, to be built on that land.

The applicant is proposing units that are less than 600 square feet. These are not family units. They talked about their target demographic; it's going to be one or two people households. There's nothing in our zoning code that limits the number of bedrooms in a unit. These could be two- or three-bedroom units; you'd have ten three-bedroom units. Again, the height allowed on that property is 30 feet. It's allowed to be developed at this density and more, so if this project were not to be approved someone could come up and propose something more intense.

I think this is a great project. I think they've done so many things that they've asked for. The list of General Plan goals that this project meets is really large. To be quite honest, I haven't seen a project come through that meets so many of our requirements for smaller units, affordable by design, and try to get more housing. We are in a housing catastrophe in California, we do not build enough housing, and this is a really unique project with a really unique product type. I think we need so many more of these kinds of developments in Sebastopol and I'm so hopeful that as this project hopefully goes forward and is built we will see that this is a great way to provide much needed housing in Sebastopol. Housing in Sebastopol is outrageously expensive. I mean the \$900,000-and-whatever is the median sales price? It's outrageous. And yes, \$500,000 for 600 square feet is outrageous, but that's what it is. I'm an architect. Construction costs now are \$450 a square foot at least. That doesn't include land, design costs, hundreds of thousands of dollars of impact fees I'm sure this project is going to contribute to the City. These projects are very expensive to build and I think that the developer is trying to make it as affordable as possible, and I get that it's not super affordable, but it is probably some of the most affordable by far for new housing in Sebastopol. You might find some older housing that might be a little bit more affordable, but not a whole lot. Just looking on Zillow, the townhouses adjacent are in the mid-to-high \$400,000 range and they're 30 years old, so this project is right in the ballpark. It's going to be brand new, net zero energy, low utility bills. I can't see why we wouldn't approve this.

There are so many positive aspects. I get that it's going to be different. I get a 22 foot building eight feet from the property line feels like a lot, but the development to the east, two stories plus a fairly steep roof, has got to be 22-24 feet, and some of those are eight feet from the property line. The development to the north has units about five feet from the property line. So, again, I get the concern but I just feel like this is so important for us to start building housing in Sebastopol. We've been denying projects like this for these kinds of reasons for years and this is why we're in the situation we're in. We have to start approving housing projects, and yes, it's not going to have zero impact on the neighbors, I get it, but we can't be afraid to approve projects that have so many positive attributes to them; I would hate to see that happen to this. I wanted to address a few other comments that were made.

We've been looking at this project for five or six years now, I believe, and we've been encouraging it pretty much all along. We've been generally saying yes, this is something we'd like to see in the City, bring us back something else, and they came back. We've had two preliminary Planning Commission hearings, they've been to the City Council already, they've been to a preliminary design review, and all of them have given this project the green light, so I think that for us to not approve this would be a catastrophe for Sebastopol because Sebastopol has a reputation of being a very difficult place to develop. Developers do not come to Sebastopol because of this kind of thing. They go through the process for years only to be denied at the very end, and then we're left with no more housing. We don't build housing because people don't want to come here to build it. I'm excited that this team wants to come to our community and build ten units of housing. It's so rare. It happens so rarely that I really think we need to say yes when we have the opportunity.

And again, I understand the concerns about the cost and who is going to be buying these. Can it really be a first time homebuyer? I would love these to cost \$250,000 but there's just no way that they can cost that unless the City is going to kick in a bunch of money or there's some big subsidy available and that's not going to happen, so we can wish for that all we want but saying no to this project isn't going to bring another project forward that's going to cost \$250,000 a unit; it's just not. We need to start building housing units. We're so far behind on what we need in this community. We need to catch up as soon as we can.

I hear the concerns about accessibility. I feel that four ground floor single-story units that are accessible or can be made fully accessible for a ten-unit housing project; that's more than they are required to do by the building code for sure, and I think it's great that they're offering that. I get that there's some concern about accessibility from Bodega Avenue, but the grade difference is nine feet. That is a huge grade difference to make up with an accessible ramp. An accessible ramp for nine feet, I can't even think of how long that would be. It would very, very long. Unfortunately, this is not a site that lends itself to just walk off the sidewalk and you're at the right elevation, and so again, I appreciate the concern about the accessibility from the street, but that's why we haven't had a sidewalk there ever before, so I think the fact that they'd be putting in a sidewalk is awesome. It's going to allow the people that live around Golden Ridge to walk up to that commercial area on the corner of Pleasant Hill safely and not have to go either over a muddy hill in the wintertime or walk around from the street in that lane of traffic.

I think that's a great opportunity and we should be so thankful for this developer coming and bringing a project like this to our community and providing these much needed infrastructure improvements. Again, this concern about it's too tall, it's too much, the massing is too big, but it meets the requirements. They're asking for very little to our seven development standards. They're asking for a one-foot difference in a setback; that's essentially it. And again, they're not asking for very much and I think they're providing a

great deal of much needed healthy, safe, comfortable housing. I appreciate the neighbors' concerns. I hope that when this project gets built that in the end it becomes a benefit to the rest of the neighborhood, that the people that move in will hopefully will be your friends in the end and they'll be expanding the community up there, and I think it's going to be a great contribution. I know it's going to be hard during construction, and it's going to be hard for the units in the west side of existing development, but for the greater good of Sebastopol I think we have to approve this project. I'm sorry I've taken up a lot of time rambling on but I'm very passionate about housing and our need for housing in our community and I think we have to approve this project and move forward. Zach.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Thank you, Paul. As we know, our purpose as a Commission is to debate projects and form an opinion as a Commission. Deborah is concerned about affordability. I'm sympathetic in the same way Paul just articulated, but frankly affordability is not something that we as a Commission should or can take into consideration in this decision. We have to set that aside.

One of our commitments as Commissioners is to focus on the planning issues before us and make the best decisions for the City in accordance with the laws and standards protecting neighbors from dangers or degradation of quality of life. I think Evert's point with respect to language in the planning report is a reasonable one. I was looking for technical zoning language because I think it reads slightly differently about negative impacts on neighbors, and I think the negative impacts on neighbors that we have to be paying attention to are causative issues, such as sidewalks that aren't safe or adequate or change their ability to interact with access and egress. We can never stop a project changing the lights or changing what happens on an adjacent site. This will go to the Design Review Board and the Design Review Board will undoubtedly talk about massing. I imagine that the parapet height will come up and they will look at could that be sloped or stepped, or could there be things that would gain 18 inches of light for the neighbor? There is a process around design that is still to play out and hopefully we'll find incremental improvements. But we have to focus on the questions that are presented in the staff report and I think, for me, I can't find any reason to not approve what is being asked by the applicant, or at least make a recommendation to City Council.

Evert, you raised the left turn question. I think that's a very good question and I think it should be something that's passed on if we decide that we can recommend this to the City Council, I think that's a question that could be asked and answered. I don't think it has a significant effect on the project itself, but you're raising a very good point. There's a left turn here; there has been no left turn historically. Is that intentional? Has someone just taken the sign down? I think that's a very good and reasonable question but I think we have to look at the planning land use questions before us and try to speak to those primarily.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I was going to say the same thing, to pass that concern on to City Council to make sure that is looked at or addressed, because that's where it would go. Also, the concept of how it's written as far as not negatively impacting the surrounding neighborhood, maybe that needs to be looked at as far as some more description of that. What does that mean exactly? I am acknowledging that it does have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood, but hopefully in time that will be a positive, people are going to appreciate their neighbors and be a good community. The thing is how are these units going to be put up for sale? First come, first served? Is there any way to legally give preference to someone who is already living in our town? Because the point was brought up that we're creating more places for people to live but is it people from outside our community to come in and buy these and

continue to create more expensive housing? Is there some way to offer that without being discriminatory?

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

That would be against the Fair Housing Laws.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I guess, yeah, so it's unfortunate. I know some communities have done some similar things. I'm not sure how they've gotten around it, but if there's just some way somebody could hopefully take that into account. But again, I cannot say that it would not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood, but I believe that this is the right project, we need it, and I just want to be clear about that.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Kari, you've got something to add?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Thank you. I wanted to respond and say yes, I can work with Steve and the City engineer to clarify the left turn issue from Golden Ridge to Bodega Avenue - Is it a safety concern? Should it be this way or that way? No one knows what the official status of it is so we'll either clarify the official status or work with Council to designate it as appropriate for safety for the entire neighborhood, and that takes into account the police chief and City traffic engineer, and of course Steve will help us with that assessment as well.

I apologize if it wasn't clear in the staff report, but we will certainly clarify for the City Council that the conditional use permit is associated with the planned community zoning. The changes that are being requested from the R7 zoning, basically going from nine foot to seven foot setback, is not to evaluate the fact that there is going to be a residential in a residential zone. If they weren't doing the planned community this would be permitted by right without the requirement for a use permit. It is consistent with our zoning and our General Plan as Kelly has noted in the staff report, so I just want to clarify. All development has impacts of some sort and as the planning director I see this all the time and certainly the architect and a couple of others on the Commission have already acknowledged that, but I do want to clarify that the conditional use permit isn't about is this residential project going to have negative impacts, it's actually are the requested changes for the planned community zoning going to have significant negative impacts to the community? I apologize if that caused some angst with the Commission but we'll certainly look to clarify that when this goes to Council.

And then I can respond with respect to the local housing preferences that these are for sale units. Certainly we would hope that they advertise the units in Sebastopol and that there's a waiting list, that would be great, but they will be for sale on the open market. As Chair Fritz had noted, I believe the only way you can do a local preference is if they are deed restricted, but you can't restrict for market units in this way.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

One thing I forgot to mention is I support a couple of the recommendations Kari had made. One is to eliminate the construction on Saturdays, and I can't remember if there was anything else on there, but I wanted to make sure we didn't forget that.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks, Evert. And thanks for those clarifications, Kari. I think those are important and I appreciate the note about the use permit issue. It's one thing if you're approving a use

permit for light industrial next to a residential neighborhood; it's kind of a different impact than a residentially zoned use in a residentially owned parcel in a residential neighborhood. Obviously there would be impacts in the neighborhood but it's consistent with the General Plan land use and the zoned land use. I also want to acknowledge something Kathy said earlier that I appreciated, that the development to the east was controversial in its day as well. I asked Kari to do a little research on that and I saw that when that unit was approved it was approved on a 4-3 vote by the Planning Commission, so it was certainly not a slam dunk, and I'm sure there were some people that were concerned about it 30 years ago and here we are 30 years hence and it's a welcome part of our community, it's part of the neighborhood, and I'm hoping that it takes less than 30 years for this new development to fit into the community and be a part of it. Bob, do you have something you'd like to say?

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

I just want to add one thing. Kari asked me about the Saturday, and then I read the staff report and it was in there that we could work Saturday, and now I've agreed to not work Saturday, but I want to bring to everyone's attention that we typically do work Saturdays. Our goal is to get out of the projects faster, so by not working Saturdays—I just did the calculations—we extend the time by 16%, so I'm not sure if the neighbors would prefer us getting out of there sooner or not working Saturdays. And I'm not saying we'd change anything right now, but maybe between now and going forward. I have the sense the neighbors may want us to get out of there 16% faster by working Saturdays, but I just want to bring that to your attention. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thank you, Bob, and maybe that's something that can be discussed before it goes before the Council to make sure that that item gets ironed out a little bit better just so there is clarity. I don't know how you take a poll of the neighbors to do something like that, but maybe there's some way that that could be done, some neighbor outreach to maybe refine that point before the Council sees this.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

Agreed. Thank you.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Well, that condition could have language in there that says the applicant will not work Saturday and Sunday unless by agreement of the neighbors. The language could perhaps leave the option open to get agreement to get out of there 16% or 32% quicker, so I would hope that that language could have that sort of flexibility either way. I do have a question for Kari. What are you looking for tonight in terms of motions? Are you looking for motions to approve the two resolutions separately or is it simply a motion to forward to the City Council?

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

It is to approve the two resolutions and it could be done in one motion. We want you to approve the resolution related to CEQA first and then the conditional use, and the reason for that is that's how Council will need to do them as well. We'd need to certify and then adopt the environmental document before you can approve a project and do the rezoning ordinance.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks, Kari. Would you like to make a motion, Zach?

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Yeah. My intention is not to cut off debate and discussion.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Well, we can always discuss more.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Commissioner Douch made a motion to adopt the following:

- The California Environmental Quality Act resolution recommending City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration subject to the findings and mitigations included therein, as well as the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.
- The Planning Commission resolution recommending City Council approve a Conditional Use Permit per the draft ordinance rezoning the parcel from R7 to PC and approve the tentative subdivision map subject to the findings and conditions included in Exhibit A and Exhibit B.
- Recommendation that the City Council consider the left turn issue raised at this Planning Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Oetinger seconded the motion.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

Did we also want to add about the construction days or times?

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

That was the one I was struggling to remember. Yes, I think we should have the recommendation that the Council analyze whether to prohibit construction on Saturdays unless before construction the neighbors favor a faster construction timetable and have construction on Saturday. At least that should be looked at and incorporated into our recommendations.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

Thank you, and Zach, actually it would be an amended motion to include that, and if you could also include the revisions as outlined by staff in the staff report, which are the changes to the draft conditions of approval, striking the one about a car port and those that Kelly had read out previously.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Yes, we should include the revisions as noted in the staff report.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

I'll assume that's your motion to amend, and so whoever seconded that, if you could second if you're amenable to that.

Vice Chair Oetinger seconded the amended motion.

Chair Fritz asked for any further discussion of the motion as stated.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

I again would just like to plug that I think this is such an important project and I hope that we can give this a good recommendation to the Council and I look forward to the project getting done.

Director Svanstrom conducted a roll call vote of the motion. The Commission voted as follows:

AYES: Chair Fritz, Vice Chair Oetinger, and Commissioners Burnes, Douch, Fernandez, and Kelley.  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

The amended motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Congratulations, and good luck at City Council.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

Thanks for bringing such a wonderful application and such thorough work and being willing to put the time in and respond to the various comments and concerns. I know this is a hard process but we really appreciate when we can get to this stage at least on the commission.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

On behalf of everybody on our end involved with this project, what you did tonight, we're going to make you proud, so thank you very much. And we've got our fingers crossed at City Council. Thank you very, very much.

**Beth Farley, Architect, Healthy Buildings Design and Construction Group**

Yeah, thank you.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Thanks again, and yeah, I really appreciate the thoroughness of your application package. The drawings were great; it really helped. And I do appreciate, because there was a comment made by a member of the public about not seeing the impact all together and you had those elevations along Bodega that included the project to the east, you had sections that showed the project to the east, and all that is really helpful. So, good luck at the Council and design review. I know you still have to go through that hoop as well, so hopefully you can make it through and start working on your construction drawings.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

You've got half the old Design Review Board here.

**Bob Massaro, Co-Developer, Huntley Square LLC**

All right, good night, everybody.

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Great, thank you.

**7. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES – None.**

**Paul Fritz, Chair**

Does anyone have a subcommittee report they'd like to provide?  
Seeing none, I will just add that it sounds like we have a design guideline meeting next week, so it looks like that's getting kicked off again, which is exciting. How about a Planning Director's report?

**8. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Director Svanstrom provided updates on the following:

- Design Review Board:
  - The DRB met November 3<sup>rd</sup> and held preliminary review of Habitat for Humanity four-unit townhome project.
- Housing Element:
  - Community outreach.
    - Met on November 9<sup>th</sup> with consultants who have over 100 surveys.
    - Will do additional outreach through flyers.
    - Will do focus groups and stakeholder interviews.
    - Survey will close December 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- Planning Commission:
  - The PC's December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting:
    - Will present Housing Element survey results.
    - Will present Calder Creek naturalization project.
    - Will consider the gas station ban.
  - The reserved November 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting will not be held.
- Design Guideline Subcommittee:
  - Next week will have an RFP asking Council to authorize a consultant to help with objective standards as well as addressing SB9.
  - Have been working on standard conditions of approval that will come to the Planning Commission once it goes through the Design Guideline Subcommittee.
- Safe Parking for RVs:
  - Was an update to Council at the last City Council meeting and will be on an upcoming City Council agenda.

**Evert Fernandez, Commissioner**

I plan to attend the December 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting but I will be in Mexico, so don't rely on me to be the quorum just in case of technical issues, although I expect to be present for the meeting and have good service.

**Zachary Douch, Commissioner**

The Ceres Garden has been looking for a site. If you have ideas I intend to suggest or at least maybe talk with Patrick about possibly the area of land behind the teen center. They desperately want to stay in Sebastopol but at this point they have no options available to them, so your thoughts and creativity would be much appreciated.

**Kari Svanstrom, Planning Director**

And you can certainly let me know as well if you have ideas. I have spoken with the Ceres about looking at some potential sites like what used to be the Global Student Embassy on the north side of Park Village and it sounds like there may be some space. I believe they told me they were looking for about a half an acre ideally, so that is obviously a pretty large piece of land. Thank you, Commissioner Douch. Some crowdsourcing ideas would be great.

**9. ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Fritz adjourned the meeting at 9:41 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will take place on Tuesday, December 14, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.