

From: [steve.spratt](#)
To: [Joshua.Miranda](#)
Subject: Battery Energy Storage System Facility's site design
Date: Friday, October 14, 2022 4:48:44 PM

EXTERNAL

Joshua;

I sent this to DesignReview, but an HOA e-mail suggested your address.

I own a home in the Adobe Creek neighborhood. I pass the abandoned 9 holes of the closed Adobe Creek Golf Course on my morning walk (enclosed photo). Have you surveyed that field (zoned as a public access golf course through 2039) which is under power lines and stretches from the power station to the homes? I suspect you could not find a more flammable looking field anywhere in the county. To the "course's" owners credit they seem consciences in providing the minimum clearance between the tall dense bone-dry weeds and the homes, though I wonder if those those minimums imagined such an adjacent tinder box.

My suggestion (hope) for the design of any battery storage facility is that in addition to requiring a generously large clearance around the batteries, it also includes some rational civilized requirements for the maintenance of the adjoining field.

Steve Spratt
[REDACTED] Adobe Creek Drive



• [Field.jpeg](#)
[4.3MB](#)

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.

Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected, **do not** click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.

From: lydiaasselin@gmail.com
To: [Joshua Miranda](#)
Cc: [Liz Goebel](#)
Subject: File # PLP22-0005 / documents digitally available prior to public meeting October 19, 2022
Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 4:32:26 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[AI Proposed Parcel Layout 7.27.20.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL

Hello, Mr. Miranda,

At Liz Goebel's suggestion, I'm reaching out with an overall proposed parcel plan question regarding the above file number. Unfortunately, I will be unable to tune into the Zoom Design Review Meeting this coming Wednesday.

Here's my original question from the start of this email thread:

I'm a resident of Adobe Creek in Petaluma, and I'm writing because I received notification last Friday of an upcoming public meeting scheduled for October 19, 2022 regarding the BESS Facility being proposed for a subdivided parcel within the former Adobe Creek golf course.

I've read through all the materials available on the link provided in the meeting agenda, especially the 30-page Proposal Statement / Project Description. There are multiple references to a proposed parcel map that describe proposed Parcels 1 & 2, as well as Parcel 3 (the BESS site). While the digital materials that were uploaded along with the meeting agenda include a site plan for the 15.61 acre BESS parcel, the actual proposed parcel map showing the disposition of proposed Parcels 1&2 in relation to the Parcel 3 BESS site is not included.

I wasn't really asking about the current parcel map(s) because I already have them. I was just curious that the BESS proposal speaks to a different subdivision of land just outside the City-County line, yet no proposed parcel map was included in their design review exhibits.

Some backstory:

Adobe Creek residents have been going round and round with this owner of the old golf course land for going on six years now. My personal opinion is that they keep moving the goalposts with every new proposal, and there's always a change to what was being proposed to the neighborhood. The BESS facility was first proposed in August 2020, after AI discovered that there was a 15.61 acre part of the old golf course that fell outside of Petaluma's UGB. The battery array footprint was first proposed as a 10-acre amount. By October 2020 the battery footprint was proposed to homeowners as a reduced 7.5 acres. The neighborhood gave their approval to the BESS project back in 2020. The current proposal looks to fill up almost the entire 15 acres. I don't see this as an issue, but it speaks to the bait-and-switch tactics of this applicant.

The attached 7/27/20 Site Layout entitled "Exhibit B" is what was initially proposed for the BESS project—note the re-zoning of the land into five different parcels. AI is now proposing three parcels,

with the previous parcels 4 and 5 are now new proposed parcel 3. My concern is not knowing exactly how “old proposed” parcels 1,2 and 3 now shake out into new parcels 1 and 2. It appears that the proposed parcel associated with new housing will be increasing beyond what was “sold’ to the neighborhood as capped at 17.43 acres. I suspect this will raise a red flag when the next phase of work is up for review.

Thanks for letting me bend your ear on this.

Regards,

Lydia Asselin

████████ Falcon Ridge Dr.

Petaluma, CA 94954

████████████████████

████████████████████

From: Liz Goebel <Liz.Goebel@sonoma-county.org> **On Behalf Of** DesignReview

Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 2:22 PM

To: Lydia Asselin <lydiaasselin@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: File # PLP22-0005 / documents digitally available prior to public meeting October 19, 2022

Hi Lydia:

I spoke with the project planners and they mentioned that these materials are available on our website. We don't have a new parcel map at this time for the project, but I am attaching the existing maps for the aforementioned APNs 017-050-006 and 017-140-011/012. I hope this answers your question, but if not, you are more than welcome to reach out to project planner Joshua Miranda at joshua.miranda@sonoma-county.org and he will probably have more information than I do!

In addition, if you have the ability to tune in to the Design Review Committee hearing at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, that would be a great opportunity to voice any comments/concerns during the public comment portion of the meeting.

Liz Goebel

She/Her

Administrative Assistant

County of Sonoma

Planning Division | Project Review

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 565-1947

-

From: Lydia Asselin <lydiaasselin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 12:05 PM
To: DesignReview <DesignReview@sonoma-county.org>
Subject: Re: File # PLP22-0005 / documents digitally available prior to public meeting October 19, 2022

Thanks, Liz!

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 17, 2022, at 11:21 AM, DesignReview <DesignReview@sonoma-county.org> wrote:

Lydia:

Thank you for your comment/suggestion! I grabbed the Assessor's Parcel Maps for 017-050-006 and 017-140-011/012 (the latter two are the same map). I will add them to the packet and send an update bulletin prior to the meeting.

Liz Goebel

She/Her

Administrative Assistant

County of Sonoma

Planning Division | Project Review

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 565-1947

www.PermitSonoma.org



From: lydiaasselin@gmail.com <lydiaasselin@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, October 14, 2022 6:08 PM

To: DesignReview <DesignReview@sonoma-county.org>

Subject: File # PLP22-0005 / documents digitally available prior to public meeting
October 19, 2022

[REDACTED]

Greetings, design review staff & planners,

I'm a resident of Adobe Creek in Petaluma, and I'm writing because I received notification today of an upcoming public meeting scheduled for October 19, 2022 regarding the BESS Facility being proposed for a subdivided parcel within the former Adobe Creek golf course.

I've read through all the materials available on the link provided in the meeting agenda, especially the 30-page Proposal Statement / Project Description. There are multiple references to a new parcel map that describe proposed Parcels 1 & 2, as well as Parcel 3 (the BESS site). While the digital materials that were uploaded along with the meeting agenda include a site plan for the 15.61 acre BESS parcel, the actual proposed parcel map showing the disposition of proposed Parcels 1&2 in relation to the Parcel 3 BESS site is not included.

Is it possible for you folks to upload the proposed parcel map that shows the referenced APN's 017-050-006, 017,140-011, and 017-140-012 as part of the entire package of information?

Respectfully,

Lydia Asselin

[REDACTED] Falcon Ridge Dr.

Petaluma, CA 94954

[REDACTED]

From: [Wade Hufford](#)
To: [Joshua Miranda](#)
Subject: Preliminary Design Review Battery Energy Storage System
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:08:22 AM

EXTERNAL

Mr. Miranda,

As a homeowner in the Adobe Creek housing development I want to make the following comments related to the design review for tonight.

My concerns are related to the property owners in Adobe Creek who purchased houses with the expectation that all the area behind the development in Sonoma County that was zoned for a golf course would, to the extent possible, remain as it was as a golf course (even if not operating). That is, the view would be of open green space with minimal development in the form of buildings or other significant improvements. It is possible that landscaping (trees) could block the project from view from the development. Also on concern would be lighting. Any lights on overnight (or late at night) should take into account light pollution, and should therefore be of such design to shine on the property itself for safety but not be directly visible away from the property (by facing inward and downward from property borders).

It is my understanding that since the 1970s Sonoma County has encouraged growth within the city limit boundaries, not outside the cities in "open space". There is lots of buildable land within Petaluma (and I imagine other Sonoma County cities as well. Changing zoning for the benefit of a developer here and there just erodes the beauty of Sonoma County, which is what makes it such a great place.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wade H. Hufford

Please Note New Address and Fax Number

Wade H. Hufford

Law Offices of Wade H. Hufford

1984 Falcon Ridge Drive

Petaluma, CA 94954

Telephone: (510) 919-5713

From: [Richard Goldstein](#)
To: [Joshua Miranda](#); [Sally Hanson](#); [Patrick Burke](#)
Subject: Adobe Creek Golf Course Battery storage facility
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 1:18:21 PM

EXTERNAL

Good afternoon,

I am absolutely opposed to this facility being built on former Golf Course property.

1. It requires breaking a land trust that we all were aware of when purchasing our homes and gave us security that the investment we were doing in our homes was safe from development. It will lower the value of our homes, affect our peace and tranquility and potential cause our Insurance to increase, and destroy views we paid extra to have knowing the land was dedicated to open space.
2. It sets a precedent to put commercial projects in dedicated open space. This means any dedicated or deeded open space could be broken for the purpose of having a commercial venture enriching the owners of the project, not the public.
3. There is an absolute fire hazard concern with this type of facility and there are documented cases of fires breaking out in these facilities as recently as last month. There is nothing to stop a fire from destroying our development if the battery storage facility is built where proposed. There is a potential for health concerns if a fire breaks out with the type of materials in such a facility.
4. Adobe Investments have not been honorable, forthright or a consistent good neighbor. The Golf Course was closed to profit Rooster Run at the expense of the value of 300 plus homes. The condition of the course land the majority of the time and the clubhouse is disgusting. We have had problems with homeless entering the clubhouse causing security concerns, a consistent fire hazard and has degraded into a dilapidated eyesore. Our development was sold as a Golf Course community. Not a commercial battery storage facility. Our expectations have been shattered and fell on deaf ears from Adobe Investments.
5. If the land restrictions could be lifted there would have been far more support from our HOA to potentially purchase the land around our homes. Why is it ok for someone who is not a resident of Petaluma to change the dynamic experience of a Community and we cannot lift restrictions to stabilize our investment by creating private open space?
6. There has been poor communication and disclosures as to what Adobe Investments wants to build, They have muzzled our Boards by requiring NDA's leaving the community at large in the dark.
7. Adobe Investment has changed the parameters of what they want to do with the land, has refused to honor their initial commitment as what they were going to do, expanded at our expense the scope of the project and ignored our community's efforts to maintain the lifestyle we bought into. They have not been honest or forthright as to what they were planning to do and there has not been enough public input or meetings regarding this issue.

Please deny this project. It has the potential to create litigation for years.

Sincerely,
Richard Goldstein
[REDACTED] Adobe Creek Drive
Petaluma CA 94954

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED OUTSIDE OF THE SONOMA COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM.
Warning: If you don't know this email sender or the email is unexpected,
do not click any web links, attachments, and **never** give out your user ID or password.

October 18, 2022

Joshua Miranda

Sonoma County Project Planner

Dear Mr. Miranda:

My husband and I live at Adobe Creek Estates in Petaluma adjacent to where the proposed Lithium-ion Battery Storage Facility would be located. We understand that tomorrow's meeting is strictly a design meeting, however, we still feel it is important to voice our opinion at this time.

We have lived at Adobe Creek Estates for twenty-four years and always appreciated the fact that there is an easement on the county property that states the land is to be a golf course or open space in perpetuity. The same goes for the city property where our homes are located. We always felt protected with open space if the golf course were ever to close.

We are not in favor of this battery project for many reasons. Specifically, the fact that there is no history of long-term safety in an industry that is only a few years old should be of public concern. We believe from empirical evidence that a Battery Storage Facility represents a high-fire risk and may eventually catch fire. It is the nature of the beast, and fires have occurred in Australia and most recently at the new facility in Monterey County. What toxic debris will the air carry to the organic farm (Green Strings) across the street or the vineyards on the other side of the street or to the entire city of Petaluma and other surrounding cities? The Australian fire affected a twelve-mile radius with only a population of 11,000. A twelve-mile radius from the facility would include all of Petaluma, Cotati, Penngrove, part of Rohnert Park, part of Sonoma and part of Novato with a combined population of around 150,000 people.

We have heard from a reliable source that Adobe Investments may be trying to bypass comprehensive environmental study and fast track this to the Board of Supervisors. Since there will be a housing application coming after the Battery Storage Facility, then an additional use for the remainder of the property, presented at a later date, this represents an incremental approach that may violate the law concerning addressing entire environmental consequences for the totality of a project, including potential uses currently envisioned for the property. In addition to the environmental concerns that will be subject to legal recourse, particularly if the project is done in a piecemeal fashion, we are also aware that a new request has been submitted that would double the size of the battery facility. What would the noise level be? Do we know?

Finally, we believe our seven-person board of directors for Adobe Creek support this project. However, while they may represent our HOA, they do not represent our opinions or those of many of our neighbors.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns and those of our neighbors in the Adobe Creek community.

Kim and Sara Hanson

████ Falcon Ridge Drive

Petaluma, CA 94954

Kimsal1886@gmail.com